

## 4.5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 4.5.1 Introduction

This section evaluates the potential for implementation of the SAP to result in impacts on known and unknown cultural resources. Cultural resources include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects generally older than 50 years and considered to be important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons. They include prehistoric resources, historic-era resources, and “tribal cultural resources” (TCRs) (the latter as defined by Assembly Bill [AB] 52, Statutes of 2014, in PRC Section 21074).

Archaeological resources occur in locations where human activity has measurably altered the earth or left deposits of prehistoric- or historic-era physical remains (e.g., stone tools, bottles, former roads, house foundations). Historical (or architectural) resources include standing buildings (e.g., houses, barns, outbuildings, cabins) and intact structures (e.g., dams, bridges, roads). TCRs were added as a resource subject to review under CEQA, effective January 1, 2015, under AB 52. This category of resources includes site features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places or objects that are of cultural value to a tribe.

Important terms for specific parts of the project are discussed in detail in Section 4.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis.” The following brief discussion is intended to remind the reader how those terms are defined and used in the EIR analysis, including this section. “SAP area” refers to the entire SAP area, which includes the PRSP area. “Net SAP area” refers to the portion of the SAP area outside the PRSP area. The “project” encompasses the entirety of the SAP, including the PRSP and all associated off-site improvements. “Project area” refers to the entire area covered by the project. Because the project area is composed of three pieces (the net SAP area, the PRSP area, and areas where other off-site infrastructure would support the project), the impact analysis typically is divided into three subsections: “Net SAP Area,” “PRSP Area,” and “Other Supporting Infrastructure.” (“Other Supporting Infrastructure” refers to improvements outside the SAP area and is divided into “Pleasant Grove Retention Facility” and “Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements.”) Some required infrastructure improvements are planned outside the PRSP area but still in the SAP area; those improvements are addressed in the “PRSP Area” sections.

Public comments received in response to the NOP did not raise issues related to cultural resources.

The project site has no known significance relative to unique ethnic cultural values, nor is it a place that supports any known religious or sacred uses. The project would not involve demolition of any structures or natural physical features known to be used for religious or cultural purposes. Development associated with the project would not otherwise preclude cultural or religious groups from gathering or worshiping. No impact would occur, and these issues are not discussed further in this EIR.

As discussed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” the PRSP land use plan has been slightly revised since circulation of the NOP. Changes primarily relate to increasing the distance between the landfill property and land designated for residential uses, modifying the density of proposed residential areas, reducing the proposed commercial intensity, slightly decreasing the acreage of open space, and increasing the acreage of parks to meet County parkland provision standards. The size of the PRSP area (2,213 acres) has not changed since release of the NOP, and the overall area of development would be nearly identical. Impacts on cultural resources relate primarily to ground disturbance. Because the changes to the PRSP land use plan would be consistent with the overall level of ground disturbance associated with the previous PRSP land use plan, and because the changes to the PRSP land use plan would not substantially change the locations in which ground disturbance would occur, the potential impacts on cultural resources that would result under the land use plan identified in the NOP and those that would result under the current land use plan analyzed in this EIR are essentially the same.

## 4.5.2 Environmental Setting

### REGIONAL PREHISTORY

Although the Sacramento Valley may have been inhabited by humans as early as 10,000 years ago, the evidence for early human use likely is buried under deep alluvial sediments that accumulated rapidly during the late Holocene epoch. Archaeological remains of this early period, although rare, have been identified in and around the Central Valley. These archaeological remains have been grouped into what is called the Farmington Complex, characterized by core tools and large, reworked percussion flakes. The economy of this early period is generally thought to be based on exploitation of large game. Later periods are better understood because they are represented more abundantly in the archaeological record.

The taxonomic framework of the Sacramento Valley has been described in terms of archaeological patterns. A pattern is a general mode of life characterized archaeologically by technology, particular artifacts, economic systems, trade, burial practices, and other aspects of culture. Three general patterns of resource use have been identified for the period between 4,500 and 3,500 years before present (B.P.): the Windmill, Berkeley, and Augustine Patterns.

The Windmill Pattern (4,500–3,000 B.P.) shows evidence of a mixed economy of game procurement and use of wild plant foods. Windmill archaeological assemblages include numerous projectile points and a wide range of faunal remains. Hunting was not limited to terrestrial animals; fishing hooks and spears have been found in association with the remains of sturgeon, salmon, and other fish. Plants were also used, as indicated by ground stone artifacts and clay balls used for boiling acorn mush. Settlement strategies reflect seasonal adaptations: Habitation sites in the valley were occupied during winter with populations moving into the foothills during summer.

The Windmill Pattern ultimately changed to a more specialized adaptation entitled the Berkeley Pattern (3,500–2,500 B.P.). At Berkeley Pattern sites, the use of manos and metates declines in favor of mortars and pestles, indicating greater dependence on acorns. Although gathered resources gained importance during this period, the continued presence of projectile points and spearthrowers in the archaeological record indicates that hunting was still an important activity.

The Berkeley Pattern was superseded by the Augustine Pattern in approximately 1500 B.P. The Augustine Pattern reflects a change in subsistence and land use patterns. Augustine Pattern assemblages show that well-developed exchange networks were present, along with an increased emphasis on acorn use, evidenced by abundant shaped mortars and pestles, along with hopper mortars. Other notable elements of Augustine Pattern assemblages include flanged tubular smoking pipes; harpoons; clamshell disk beads; and an elaborate baked clay industry, which included figurines and pottery vessels. The use of the bow and arrow is suggested by the presence of small projectile point types. Mortuary rituals of Augustine Pattern sites include the preinterment burning of offerings in grave pits. Increased village sedentism (living in one place for an extended period), population growth, and an incipient monetary economy in which beads were used as a standard of exchange are all features of this pattern.

### ETHNOGRAPHY

Ethnographically, the project area is in the southwestern portion of the territory previously occupied by the Penutian-speaking Nisenan. The territory extended from the area surrounding the current City of Oroville on the north to a few miles south of the American River on the south. The Sacramento River bounded the territory on the west, and in the east, the territory extended to a general area located within a few miles of Lake Tahoe. As a language, Nisenan (meaning “from among us” or “of our side”) has three main dialects—Northern Hill, Southern Hill, and Valley Nisenan—with three or four subdialects.

The Valley Nisenan lived along the Sacramento River, primarily in large villages with populations of several hundred each. Between there and the foothills, the grassy plains were largely unsettled, used mainly as a

foraging ground by both valley and hill groups. Individual and extended families “owned” hunting and gathering grounds, and trespassing was discouraged. Politically, the Nisenan were divided into “tribelets,” made up of a primary village and a series of outlying hamlets, commonly presided over by a hereditary chief. Villages typically included family dwellings, acorn granaries, a sweathouse, and a dance house, all owned by the chief.

Subsistence activities centered on the gathering of acorns, seeds, and other plant resources. The hunting of animals, such as deer and rabbits, and fishing were also an important part of normal subsistence activities. Large predators, such as mountain lions, were hunted for their meat and skins, and bears were hunted ceremonially. Although acorns were the staple of the Nisenan diet, roots such as wild onion and “Indian potato” also were harvested and eaten raw, steamed, baked, or dried and processed into flour cakes to be stored for winter use. Salt was obtained from a spring near modern-day Rocklin. Hunting of deer often took the form of communal drives, involving several villages, with killing done by the best marksmen from each village. Snares, deadfalls, and decoys also were used. Fish were caught by a variety of methods, including through use of hooks, harpoons, nets, weirs, traps, poisoning, and by hand.

Trade was important, and goods traveled from the coast and valleys up into the Sierra Nevada and beyond to the east, and vice versa. Coastal items, such as shell beads, salmon, salt, and foothill pine nuts, were traded for resources from the mountains and farther inland, such as bows and arrows, deer skins, and sugar pine nuts. In addition, obsidian was imported from the north.

By 1776, the Miwok territory bordering the Nisenan on the south had been explored by José Canizares. Gabriel Moraga crossed Nisenan territory in 1808, and a major battle was fought between the Miwok and the Spaniards in 1813 near the mouth of the Cosumnes River. In 1833, an epidemic—probably malaria—raged through the Sacramento Valley, killing an estimated 75 percent of the native population. The discovery of gold in 1848 at Sutter’s Mill, near the Nisenan village of Colluma (now Coloma) on the South Fork of the American River, drew thousands of miners into the area and led to widespread killing and the virtual destruction of traditional Nisenan culture. By the time of the Great Depression, no Nisenan remained who could remember the days before the arrival of the Euro-Americans.

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), a federally recognized Miwok and Nisenan Maidu tribe, maintains active ties to the land in this project area, which they have identified as part of a geographic area with which the Tribe is traditionally and culturally affiliated. Those ties include cultural, land stewardship, investment, and infrastructure projects.

## HISTORIC SETTING

### Regional History

Spanish exploration of the Central Valley dates to the late 1700s, but exploration of the northern section of the Central Valley and contact with its Native American population did not begin until the early 1800s, as described above. The second quarter of the 19th century encompasses the Mexican Period (ca. 1821–1848) in California. This period is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system across California. In 1833, the missions were secularized and their lands divided among the *Californios* as land grants called *ranchos*. These ranchos facilitated the growth of a semiaristocratic group that controlled the larger ranchos. The work on these large tracts of land was accomplished by the forced labor of local Native Americans. The ranchos closest to the SAP area were in Sacramento County near the southern boundary of Placer County. These ranchos included the Rancho de Paso, the San Juan, and the Río de los Americanos.

Simultaneously with the exploration of the Central Valley, trails were being blazed across Sierra Nevada plains and mountains, facilitating the westward migration of Euro-Americans. Early immigrants to California are typified by groups such as the 1841 Bartleson-Bidwell party and the 1844 Stevens-Murphy party. The commencement of the Mexican-American War in 1846 also affected the exploration and development of California, including the identification of new trails across the Sierra Nevada. The exploits

of the Mormon Battalion and the establishment of the Mormon Emigrant Trail across the Sierra Nevada highlight these activities.

The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in Coloma in 1848 was the catalyst that caused a dramatic alteration of both Native American and Euro-American cultural patterns in California. After news of the discovery of gold spread, a flood of Euro-Americans entered the region and gravitated to the area of the "Mother Lode." Initially, the Euro-American population grew slowly, but soon it exploded as the presence of large deposits of gold was confirmed in the Sacramento area. The Euro-American population of California quickly swelled, from an estimated 4,000 in 1848 to 500,000 in 1850. Sacramento, established in 1848 by John A. Sutter, also grew in population and was incorporated as a city in 1850.

## Local History

The latter half of the 19th century witnessed an ongoing and growing immigration of Euro-Americans into the area, an influx also accompanied by regional cultural and economic changes. These changes are highlighted by the development of Sacramento and cities and towns in Placer County (formed in 1851), such as Auburn, Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. These Placer County cities were associated with expanding business opportunities related to gold mining, agriculture, or the expansion of the railroad.

Rocklin became an important hub along the Central Pacific Railroad in 1864 and was incorporated as a city in 1893. Subsequently, in 1906 the major railroad facilities at Rocklin, which had become part of the Southern Pacific Railroad system, were relocated to Roseville. Roseville quickly expanded with the relocation of the facilities and was incorporated as a city in 1909. The origin and development of Lincoln also are related to the construction of a railroad; the original townsite was surveyed and laid out in 1859 by Theodore Judah along the proposed line of the California Central Railroad.

In addition, Rocklin and Lincoln experienced significant economic development because of an expansion of granite-quarrying activity and the discovery of clay deposits suitable for pottery manufacture. Granite quarried in the Rocklin area was sent to San Francisco for construction of the state capitol and other buildings, and firms such as of Gladding, McBean & Co. were established in Lincoln to exploit the local clay deposits.

## Spring Valley Ranch

The agricultural activities located within the PRSP area are considered part of the operations of the Spring Valley Ranch. The Spring Valley Ranch, also called the Whitney Ranch, was historically situated in the southern part of Placer County and encompassed the southern portion of the SAP area, including the PRSP area. At the height of development of the ranch, it contained a large mansion residence called "The Oaks," a beautiful carriage ride with miles of roads, several citrus groves, wheat cultivation fields, vineyards, and a massive sheep-raising operation.

The inception of the Spring Valley Ranch began in 1854, when George Whitney followed his sons to California and noted that there was a need for good-quality wool and mutton. In 1857, Whitney Ranch, as it was then known, was established when George Whitney purchased a 320-acre parcel of land in what became Rocklin, California, to support his newly established sheep business. Initially, the total estimate of his wool product was 300,000 pounds. Over the years, as the sheep bred, the Whitney family gradually increased its landholdings and stock. In 1873, following George Whitney's death, his son J. P. Whitney took control of the ranch and vastly expanded its operations. By 1876, the sheep from Whitney's ranch produced the maximum amount of wool allowed by the state: 56,550,000 pounds. After the wool business and venture in sheep reached the maximum allowed, Whitney sought other avenues to increase his wealth. The Spring Valley Ranch grew to exceed a reported 20,000 acres, with an area of about 3,100 acres that Whitney incorporated into the Placer County Citrus Colony.

Whitney had plans to develop the land for multiple agricultural purposes and needed to develop an adequate water supply. In 1871, Whitney initiated the process of bringing a permanent water supply to the ranch by using existing mining ditches. He secured rights-of-way for canals and ditches and that same year expanded those ditch networks throughout the ranch. By 1888, Whitney had begun construction of a

reservoir on Douglass Hill with a capacity of approximately 10,000,000 gallons, and another reservoir on the ranch with a capacity of more than 25,000,000 gallons. Upon completion of his irrigation network, Whitney had constructed several miles of irrigation ditches winding throughout the ranch, drawing water as necessary from the massive reservoirs.

Whitney began to increase the size of the agricultural operations for the ranch. In 1872, he planted 1,200 acres of grain in an area of the ranch just below Lincoln, adjacent to the Central Pacific Railroad line. Whitney first planted 250 acres of grapevines in the northeastern portion of the ranch in 1874. Unlike the grapes of the nearby counties, Whitney's grapes were designed to produce raisins rather than wine. Whitney established the California Raisin Company in 1875 with N. P. Cole, F. S. Chadbourne, S. J. Merrill, and B. P. Moore by filing articles of incorporation. Over time, however, Whitney discovered that competing with the cheaper agricultural labor in Europe at the time was a losing venture. Throughout the 1880s, Whitney slowly plowed his vineyards, and by 1888, he had replaced most of the vineyards with orange groves.

The ranch was complete following construction of Whitney's mansion, "The Oaks," in 1884. Built on a large knoll overlooking much of the ranch property, it was an extravagant mansion constructed almost entirely of redwood and surrounded by vast lawns with nearby stables, tennis courts, and a golf course. The mansion was connected to the entire property by more than 25 miles of roads. The main road traveled from Rocklin to the main headquarters of the ranch, through the vineyards up to the moor and out to Penryn. Along the main road of the ranch were 12 granite bridges that crossed the creeks on the property. The most symbolic of the bridges is the Clover Valley Bridge, often viewed as the centerpiece of the modern-day Clover Valley Park in Rocklin. It may be the largest of the 12 bridges and was likely constructed using granite quarried from the Griffith Quarry in Penryn.

After Whitney's death in 1913, ownership of the Spring Valley Ranch and the estate was inherited by his children. The ranch never again turned a profit after Whitney's passing, and by the mid-1920s, his old residence, "The Oaks," was deserted, and in the 1950s, it was torn down. Over time, the property was subdivided and sold, in large part by Whitney's youngest son, Vincent. Increased urbanization and expansion of suburban communities along the Interstate 80 corridor led to growth of the housing market in Roseville and Rocklin during the 1980s. In addition to vast residential expansion, commercial development pushed into the lands previously occupied by the ranch. The remaining open spaces have been leased to ranchers for grazing sheep and cattle during seasonal months.

## RECORDS SEARCHES, SURVEYS, AND CONSULTATION

### Sunset Area Plan Records Search

Archaeological and historical investigations for the SAP area included a records search, archival research and geoarchaeological investigations in March 2015. The results of a records search conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Sacramento, indicated that most of the area has been previously surveyed and that it includes 17 archaeological and historical sites (Table 4.5-1) and four isolated prehistoric artifacts (isolates). Isolates are defined as one or two artifacts occurring by themselves that are not associated with an archaeological site. Because they have no historical context, isolates generally are not eligible for listing in California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and, therefore, are not evaluated for significance (the CRHR and NRHP are described in more detail below in Section 4.5.3, "Regulatory Setting"). Archival research indicated that there are no ethnographic village sites in the SAP area but that Native American occupation of the area typically occurred along watercourses.

Geoarchaeology uses earth-science perspectives and techniques to interpret artifacts' temporal and spatial contexts and may be used to identify past environments, past human use and/or occupation of a landscape, and the location of buried cultural materials. Soils in the SAP area consist primarily of Quaternary lake deposits and soils composed primarily of alfisols and entisols. Many alfisols are relatively shallow with a diagnostic horizon of about 100 centimeters below the surface. Entisols are soils that do not exhibit diagnostic horizons because they are too young, erosion has removed material faster than soil can develop,

or new material is added faster than soil develops. These conditions suggest that any archaeological sites within the SAP area would likely exhibit surface features and/or artifacts.

**Table 4.5-1 SAP Pre-historic and Historic Sites**

Site Number and Trinomial	Date Recorded	Author(s)/Affiliation	Type of Site and Description
P-31-16* (CA-PLA-1354)	2003	Jensen Archaeological Services, Inc.	Archaeological and historic: prehistoric lithic scatter and historic structure remains
P-31-17-H	1978	Betty Flynn, ARS	Historic: stone alignments
P-31-272*	1975	Peak & Associates	Archaeological: light scatter of stone tools and fractured rock
P-31-273* (CA-PLA-147)	1999	Elizabeth Derr, Cultural Resources Unlimited	Archaeological: light scatter of ground stone artifacts and lithics
P-31-274*	1975	Peak & Associates	Archaeological: fire-cracked rock, manos, and flakes
P-31-1250*	1995	Peak & Associates	Archaeological and historical: bedrock mortar and historic site
P-31-1702	1997	Elizabeth Derr, Cultural Resources Unlimited	Historic: ranch
P-31-1405* (CA-PLA-1086)	1989	Unknown	Archaeological: scatter of historic artifacts (located within the PRSP area)
P-31-1424* (CA-PLA-1104)	1989	Archeo-Tec	Archaeological: scatter of ground stone and lithics (located within the PRSP area)
P-32-2647	2005	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: ranch
P-31-2860 (CA-PLA-1979-H)	2004	Peak & Associates	Historic: machinery
P-31-2655 (CA-1874-H)	2006	Far Western Archaeological Resources, Inc.	Archaeological: scatter of historic artifacts
P-31-3155 (CA-2179-H)	2007	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: foundation pads
P-31-3156 (CA-2180-H)	2007	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: water pump and pipes
P-31-3157	2007	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: foundation pads, water pump, and pipes
P-31-3158	2007	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: water pump and pipes
P-31-3500	2007	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	Historic: machinery

Note: \*Although not identified during the AB 52 consultation process, the UAIC subsequently identified these sites, as well as Orchard Creek and Pleasant Grove Creek, as tribal cultural resources (TCRs), Source: Placer County 2015

In summary, the SAP area generally exhibits a low sensitivity for the presence of archaeological and historical resources. Regardless, regional archaeological and ethnographic information indicates that areas within the SAP area adjacent to watercourses should be considered sensitive for the presence of buried deposits of prehistoric archaeological resources.

### Placer Ranch Specific Plan Area Records Search

A records search for the PRSP area was conducted at NCIC on February 10, 2015 (NCIC #SAC-15-20). The purpose of the records search was to determine the extent of previous surveys within the PRSP area and the area within a 0.25-mile radius of it and determine whether previously documented architectural, prehistoric, or historic-era archaeological sites exist within this area. The records search consisted of a review of previous research and literature, records on file with the NCIC for previously recorded sites, and historical aerial photographs and maps of the vicinity.

The records search results indicated that 29 previous cultural resources studies have been conducted within the PRSP area and the area within a 0.25-mile radius of it. The records search also determined that nine

previously recorded prehistoric and historic-age sites are located within 0.25 mile of the PRSP area. Of these, six sites are located within the PRSP area: three archaeological (two historic-era and one prehistoric) and three architectural sites.

In November 2017, a records search at NCIC was conducted for PRSP-related infrastructure areas outside the PRSP area but within the SAP area (NIC 2017). Two historic-era resources were found, one in the Fiddymment Road North area (P-31-1422 [CA-PLA-1102H]) and one in the Industrial Avenue/Campus Park Boulevard area (P-31-816 [CA-PLA-690H]). These are described in detail below. It should be noted that P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H) is a portion of Fiddymment Road that transects the PRSP area and includes the off-site Fiddymment Road South area identified again below under “Records Searches for Other Supporting Infrastructure Areas.”

### **Description of Previously Recorded Cultural Sites**

#### **P-31-816 (CA-PLA-690H)**

The single-line tracks of the California Central Railroad (CCRR) (now Union Pacific Railroad) have been previously recorded as being partially within the Industrial Avenue/Campus Park Boulevard infrastructure area. The CCRR line from Folsom to Lincoln was completed in 1861, and the line from Sacramento to Roseville was completed in 1869. Union Pacific maintains the line regularly by modernizing equipment and replacing worn rails, ties, and bridges, where the alignment remains the only original component of the CCRR, it was previously determined ineligible for NRHP and CRHR listing.

#### **P-31-1405 (CA-PLA-1086) and P-31-1406 (CA-PLA-1087H)**

This site was originally recorded as a surface scatter of 19th-century domestic artifacts within a grove of willow trees (Locus A) and a water well with an additional mixed domestic refuse scatter (Locus B). This was originally recorded as a single site in 1989; however, the NCIC assigned the two loci separate numbers (P-31-1405 [CA-PLA-1086] and P-31-1406 [CA-PLA-1087H]), thereby separating the site. During the 2015 pedestrian survey, the site was revisited and found to be similar to the previous recordings; however, the well (Locus B) was found to have been filled in and graded. Several fragments of glass and white glazed ceramic dinnerware were found within the exposed dirt.

#### **P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H)**

Archival information indicates that this site, Fiddymment Road was constructed in 1887 and fully established by 1913. A 1-mile segment of Fiddymment Road runs north/south through the PRSP area. Fiddymment Road first appears on the 1892 U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) California, Sacramento Sheet, approximately 2 miles west of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks near Whitney. The segment of Fiddymment Road that passes through the PRSP area was evaluated in 2004 and the site record updated as a result of the 2015 pedestrian survey. The road appeared to have been repaved in recent years, and no indications of the original road segment were exposed.

#### **P-31-1424 (CA-PLA-1104)**

This site was originally recorded in 1989 as a low-density prehistoric lithic scatter located west of Fiddymment Road. The site contained an intact groundstone mano, a mano fragment, three primary flakes, and a projectile point fragment with a discolored soil, representing a possible midden. During the 2015 pedestrian survey, the only remaining evidence of the site consisted of a worked groundstone fragment. As part of the testing and evaluation program, archaeologists excavated a total of four shovel test probes (STPs) around the groundstone to explore subsurface potential of what remained of the site. Out of the four excavated STPs, none yielded subsurface deposits, and no midden deposit was observed during the testing at P-31-1424 (CA-PLA-1104).

#### **PG&E Rio Oso-Hurley and Rio Oso-Tesla Transmission Line**

This site consists of a set of electrical transmission lines that travel northwest to southwest through the PRSP area. The 230-kV Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) transmission lines, constructed in 1958, span the area from the Rio Oso Station in southern Sutter County to the Tesla Station in Alameda County. The segment of lines within the PRSP area was recorded and evaluated in 2004, and the site record was updated as a result of the 2015 pedestrian survey. In total, 17 towers were recorded in the PRSP area.

## **Water Well**

This site was recorded in 2004 as a water well located in an agricultural field in the northwestern portion of the PRSP area. The well was identified on USGS maps from 1953 and 1967 and was identified as a capped agricultural well on a square concrete foundation as a result of the 2015 pedestrian survey. It was recorded as a feature within the barn site PR-007 (described below, under “Description of Newly Recorded Cultural Sites in PRSP Area”).

## **Records Searches for Other Supporting Infrastructure Areas**

### **Pleasant Grove Retention Facility**

In 2002, an archaeological records search was conducted for a 1,329-acre retention basin known as the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility (formerly known as Reason Farms (URS 2002a). Only one archaeological site was revealed: a milling slab and two handstones, originally recorded in 1960. This site was not relocated during the 2002 pedestrian survey, and no additional archaeological materials were identified.

An updated records search for the retention basin area was performed in November 2017 and revealed no additional archaeological sites or historic features.

A historic resources analysis of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility was also conducted in 2002 (URS 2002b); the analysis evaluated all buildings and structures that were 50 years old or older at the time. None of the buildings or structures evaluated—a dairy barn, a windmill, two residences, and a rice processing plant—were determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

### **Other Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements**

In November 2017, a records search at NCIC was conducted for other off-site transportation and utility improvement areas (NIC 2017). Three known resources (both historic-era resources) are mapped within these areas: P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H) (described above), P-31-554 (CA-PLA-428H), and P-31-1450 (CA-PLA-1123H) (both described below).

#### **P-31-554 (CA-PLA-428H)**

This historic-era site is mapped as being partially within the Woodcreek Recycled Water Tank off-site area. The site was initially recorded in 1981. The 3.3-acre site includes features related to the former ranch, including concrete foundations from the main house and a windmill, remains of a fireplace, well and privy, debris piles, a cattle trough, cattle ramp, and non-native vegetation.

#### **P-31-1450 (CA-PLA-1123H)**

A segment of the historic alignment of U. S. Highway 99E has been previously recorded as being partially within the Industrial Avenue off-site area. The historic road once paralleled the east side of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. When the segment near the Lincoln Rodeo Grounds just north of where present-day State Route 65 crosses over Industrial Avenue was recorded in 1994, portions of the narrow, dirt road had been scraped of pavement and other portions improved by widening and re-paving.

## **Pedestrian Survey**

Pedestrian surveys were not conducted for the net SAP area, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility site, or other off-site transportation and utility improvements.

The PRSP area was subjected to an intensive pedestrian survey using 15-meter transects in February, March, and April 2015. The short grasses mixed with exposed portions of soil created by rodent burrowing and associated dirt piles yielded an overall good visibility. During the survey, the ground surface was examined for indications of surface or subsurface cultural materials. All cultural materials and sites encountered during the survey were recorded using California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523-series forms. The sites were photographed, mapped using a handheld Global Positioning System receiver, and sketched as necessary to document their presence. All previously recorded sites were located

during the pedestrian survey. As a result, six newly identified sites associated with historic ranching were recorded. After recombination of previously recorded and newly identified sites, there now exist 10 sites.

Archaeologists conducted an intensive-level pedestrian survey for the additional infrastructure areas, both within the PRSP area the other off-site improvement areas on November 2, 2017. No prehistoric or historic-era archaeological sites, or historic-era built environment features were newly identified during survey.

### **Description of Newly Recorded Cultural Sites in PRSP Area**

#### **PR-003**

This site is a historic irrigation well consisting of a partially crushed riveted iron pipe that appears to have been the opening of the well. The well is situated in a depression measuring approximately 20 feet east-west by 10 feet north-south that may have been associated with an infilled irrigation ditch (PR-006, see below) located north of the depression. No artifacts or evidence of a pump or stand were found near the site.

#### **PR-006**

This site consists of the remains of a historic fence line and water conveyance system. The alignment spans approximately 3,800 feet, oriented west to east. The site contains a raised berm along the northern side with a small channel south of the berm. The channel appears to have been used to distribute water throughout the surrounding fields to the south and may have been fed by a well (PR-003, see above) located near the midpoint of the alignment. Overall, the site is in poor condition because of heavy erosion of the channel, removal of fence posts, and construction-related destruction near the middle of the alignment.

#### **PR-007**

This site consists of the remains of a possible cattle ranching operation and contains three features: a collapsed open-aided barn foundation, linear concrete slab, and a previously recorded capped well. One large refuse pile consisting of wire fencing and broken concrete fragments is located southwest of the barn. The well, located southeast of the barn, consists of a concrete slab with a metal cap. Directly southwest of the well is a metal pipe that may have been used to send water toward the barn area. The barn consists of collapsed modern building material. The original barn structure likely was destroyed by a fire, as indicated by burned fence posts in the area. Beneath the modern refuse is a poured concrete foundation. Overall, the site was in poor condition because the barn was destroyed and the functional indications of the slab were removed.

#### **PR-008**

This site, which consists of the remains of a historic fence line and water conveyance system, contains a berm along the western side with a shallow channel/ditch east of the berm. There is also a berm on the eastern side. Along the channel, a few remnants of fence posts are scattered throughout. The channel appears to have been used to distribute water to the agricultural field to the south and appears to have been fed by a well and exposed pipe (see description of site PR-007 above). Overall, the site is in poor condition because of the heavy erosion of the channel, removal of the fence posts, and the presence of cattle trails within the channel.

#### **PR-010**

This site consists of the location of a proposed residence and contains a grove of willow trees, a well, two refuse pits, and a low-density scatter of historic and modern refuse. The well, located northwest of the grove of trees, consists of a pit with a crushed exposed metal pipe. The refuse pits are located south of the well and consist of modern refuse (glass bottles, marbles, concrete post/chunks, and various modern metal fragments). No evidence of a rock alignment or foundation was present near or within the grove of trees.

#### **PR-011**

This site consists of three separate groves of willow trees, two cellar pits, and a historic-era artifact scatter. The cellar pits are located within the middle grove of willow trees. The first pit contained metal straps, wire fence, and braided wire fragments. Material within the second pit consisted of logs, boards, a ladder, concrete, plastic posts, and an iron axle. The historic-era artifact component consists of cobalt bottle

fragments, aqua bottle fragments, white ceramic, and one piece of amethyst glass. This site has been heavily affected by cattle. Heavy dumping of historic trash is concentrated mostly in the two pits.

### **Subsurface Testing**

Some of the cultural sites contained features possibly consistent with habitation and occupation; therefore, they were considered to have potential for subsurface deposits. Because the boundaries and extent of the cultural deposits on the sites were not fully understood, subsurface testing was initiated at sites P-31-1405 (CA-PLA-1086) (combined with P-31-1406 [CA-PLA-1087H]), P-31-1424 (CA-PLA-1104), PR-007, PR-010, and PR-011. STP locations were carefully selected to target locations within the sites that had the potential to contain buried archaeological deposits. If deposits were recovered from a shovel probe, the next shovel probe was placed within 10–15 meters, and these intervals continued until a negative shovel test indicated the site's boundaries. Each shovel probe consisted of a circular hole approximately 40 centimeters (cm) in diameter and was excavated in arbitrary 10- to 20-cm levels (depending on whether buried deposits were encountered) to depths of at least 50 cm, where feasible. Shovel probes were excavated until a sterile level was reached. All excavated material from STPs were passed through a mesh screen. All material remaining in the screen was bagged, labeled, and sent to the lab for sorting, identification, and cataloging. In addition, a surface collection of diagnostic artifacts was completed.

### **Native American Coordination**

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted to request a search of its Sacred Lands File for the PRSP area. In its response, dated March 2, 2015, the NAHC stated that its search of the Sacred Lands File had failed to identify any Native American cultural resources in the immediate limits of the PRSP area. The NAHC letter also identified individuals as current contacts with potential interest in the project and stated that these individuals may have knowledge of cultural resources in the PRSP area. On March 3, 2015, letters were sent to the following contacts identified by NAHC:

- ▲ Rose Enos—Maidu Washoe;
- ▲ Gene Whitehouse, Marcos Guerrero, and Jason Camp—UAIC;
- ▲ April Wallace Moore—Nisenan-Southern Maidu Konkow Washoe;
- ▲ Eileen Moon, Grayson Coney, and Don Ryberg—T'si-Akim Maidu;
- ▲ Judith Marks and Pamela Cubbler—Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Miwok-Maidu Tribe; and
- ▲ Hermo Olanio, Nicholas Fonseca, and Daniel Fonseca—Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (Shingle Springs Rancheria).

In response to the 2015 outreach, Marcos Guerrero requested a field visit of the property, April Wallace Moore requested to be notified when ground-disturbing activities are initiated, and if anything is found, Judith Marks requested tribal monitoring. In a letter from Daniel Fonseca he stated that the Shingle Springs Rancheria was not aware of any known cultural resources on the property and requested copies of the results of all record searches and surveys done in and around the PRSP area. The Shingle Springs Rancheria also requested to be notified if any new information about human remains is discovered.

Senate Bill (SB) 18 requires that, before the adoption or amendment of a city or county general plan or specific plan, the city or county shall consult with California Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the NAHC. SB 18 applies to the project because implementing the SAP involves a general plan amendment, which is the trigger for SB 18 compliance; however, SB 18 compliance is not a CEQA requirement and therefore is not discussed further. As described below under "Regulatory Setting," AB 52 applies to those projects for which a lead agency issued an NOP of an EIR on or after July 1, 2015. The County has consulted with tribes pursuant to AB 52, and consultation is summarized in Table 4.5-2 and below in Impact 4.5-1.

**Table 4.5-2 Summary of AB 52 Consultation Efforts**

Native American Contact Name	Native American Contact Group	Date of Initial Letter	Date(s) Reply Received	Comment
Chairperson Daniel Fonseca	Shingle Springs Rancheria (SSR) Band of Miwok Indians	March 8, 2017	March 29, 2017	SSR noted they are unaware of TCRs on SAP/PRSP and asked to be provided with copies of any cultural reports. The reports were provided on May 4, 2017. SSR did not respond to a subsequent offer to consult on newly identified off-site improvements.
Cultural Director Grayson Coney	T'si -Akim Maidu	March 8, 2017	None received	
Chairperson Gene Whitehouse	United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC)	March 8, 2017	March 29, 2017	UAIC would like to initiate formal consultation, participate in pedestrian surveys, and receive copies of reports and records searches. Subsequently UAIC forwarded proposed mitigation measures for discussion. UAIC also requested to consult regarding two newly identified off-site improvements.
Chairperson Darrell Kizer	Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California	March 8, 2017	None received	
Chairperson Randy Yonemura	Ione Band of Miwok Indians	March 8, 2017	None received	
Antonio Ruiz Jr.	Wilton Rancheria of Wilton CA	March 8, 2017	None received	

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental 2017

### 4.5.3 Regulatory Setting

#### FEDERAL

##### Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Federal protection of resources is legislated by (a) the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 as amended by 16 U.S. Code 470, (b) the Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979, and (c) the Advisory Council on Historical Preservation. These laws and organizations maintain processes for determination of the effects on historical properties eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Section 106 of the NHPA and accompanying regulations (36 CFR Part 800) constitute the main federal regulatory framework guiding cultural resources investigations and require consideration of effects on properties that are listed in, or may be eligible for listing in, the NRHP. The NRHP is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. It is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, and cultural districts that are considered significant at the national, state, or local level.

The formal criteria (36 CFR 60.4) for determining NRHP eligibility are as follows:

1. The property is at least 50 years old (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).
2. It retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and associations.
3. It possesses at least one of the following characteristics:
  - A. association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (events);

- B. association with the lives of persons significant in the past (persons);
- C. distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant, distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (architecture); or
- D. has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history (information potential).

Listing in the NRHP does not entail specific protection or assistance for a property, but it does guarantee recognition in planning for federal or federally assisted projects, eligibility for federal tax benefits, and qualification for federal historic preservation assistance. Additionally, project effects on properties listed in the NRHP must be evaluated under CEQA.

The National Register Bulletin also provides guidance on the evaluation of archaeological site significance. If a heritage property cannot be placed within a particular theme or period, and thereby lacks “focus,” it is considered not eligible for listing in the NRHP. In further expanding upon the generalized NRHP criteria, evaluation standards for linear features (such as roads, trails, fence lines, railroads, ditches, flumes) are considered in terms of four related criteria that account for specific elements that define engineering and construction methods of linear features: (1) size and length, (2) presence of distinctive engineering features and associated properties, (3) structural integrity, and (4) setting. The highest probability for NRHP eligibility exists within the intact longer segments where multiple criteria coincide.

## STATE

### California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires public agencies to consider the effects of their actions on “historical resources,” “unique archaeological resources,” and “tribal cultural resources.” Under 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 Resources

“Historical resource” is a term with a defined statutory meaning (PRC, Section 21084.1; determining significant impacts on historical and archaeological resources is described in the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15064.5[a] and [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 CRHR (PRC, Section 5024.1).
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, 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 that 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 CRHR (PRC 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 CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (under Section 5020.1[k] of the PRC), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1[g] of the PRC) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

#### **Unique Archaeological Resources**

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will affect unique archaeological resources. PRC Section 21083.2(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:

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

#### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will affect TCRs. PRC Section 21074 states the following:

- a) "Tribal cultural resources" are either of the following:
  - 1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
    - A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR.
    - B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
  - 2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant under criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "nonunique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

## California Register of Historical Resources

All properties in California that are listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are eligible for listing in the CRHR. The CRHR is a listing of State of California resources that are significant within the context of California's history. The CRHR is a statewide program with a scope and with criteria for inclusion similar to those of the NRHP. In addition, properties designated under municipal or county ordinances are also eligible for listing in the CRHR.

A historic resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the criteria defined in the CCR Title 15, Chapter 11.5, Section 4850 to be included in the CRHR. The CRHR criteria are similar to the NRHP criteria and are tied to CEQA because any resource that meets the criteria below also is considered a significant historical resource under CEQA. As noted above, all resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR.

The CRHR uses four evaluation criteria for determining significance of a historical resource:

1. It is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; or possesses high artistic values.
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Similar to the NRHP, a resource must meet one of the above criteria and retain integrity to be considered significant. The CRHR uses the same aspects of integrity as the NRHP.

## California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act

The California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act applies to both state and private lands. The act requires that upon discovery of human remains, construction or excavation activity cease and the county coroner be notified. If the remains are of a Native American, the coroner must notify the NAHC, which notifies and has the authority to designate the most likely descendant (MLD) of the deceased. The act stipulates the procedures that the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods.

## Health and Safety Code, Sections 7052 and 7050.5

Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC.

## Public Resources Code, Section 5097

PRC Section 5097 specifies the procedures to be followed if human remains are unexpectedly discovered on nonfederal land. The disposition of Native American burial falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. Section 5097.5 of the code states the following:

No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor.

## Assembly Bill 52

AB 52, signed by the California governor in September 2014, establishes a new class of resources under CEQA: “tribal cultural resources.” AB 52, as provided in PRC Sections 21080.3.4, 21080.3.2, and 21082.3, requires that lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon written request of a California Native American Tribe, begin consultation once the lead agency determines that the application for the project is complete, prior to the issuance of a NOP of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration. AB 52 also requires revision to CEQA Appendix G, the environmental checklist. This revision would create a new category for TCRs. As defined in PRC Section 21074, to be considered a TCR, a resource must be either:

1. listed or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, state, or local register of historic resources; or
2. a resource that the lead agency determines, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to treat as a tribal cultural resource pursuant to the criteria in PRC Section 50241(c). PRC Section 5024.1(c) provides that a resource meets criteria for listing as an historic resource in the California Register if any of the following apply:
  - (1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
  - (2) It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
  - (3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
  - (4) It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

## LOCAL

### Placer County General Plan

The “Recreation and Cultural Resources” section (Section 5) of the *Placer County General Plan* (Placer County 2013) includes a goal to “identify, protect, and enhance Placer County’s important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment.” This plan also includes policies to protect and enhance cultural resources through various means, including implementing incentive programs for private property owners, educating the public, avoiding and mitigating cultural resource impacts in discretionary development projects, coordinating with the local Native American community and the NAHC, and assisting private citizens seeking historic landmark designations for their property. The following policies pertaining to cultural resources contained in the *Placer County General Plan* (2013) are relevant to the project:

- ▲ **Policy 1.1.1:** The County shall require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design. The Planned Residential Developments (PDs) and the Commercial Planned Development (CPD) provisions of the Zoning Ordinance can be used to allow flexibility for this integration with valuable site features.
- ▲ **Policy 5.D.3:** The County shall solicit the views of the Native American Heritage Commission, State Office of Historic Preservation, North Central Information Center, and/or the local Native American community in cases where development may result in disturbance to sites containing evidence of Native American activity and/or to sites of cultural importance.

- ▲ **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.
- ▲ **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. Determinations 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 resource in question.

## Placer County Code

Article 15.60, Cultural and Historic Resources Preservation, of the Placer County Code is intended to promote the general welfare of the public through one or more of the following:

1. The protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of historic structures and/or other cultural resources: (a) that represent past eras, events, and persons important in prehistory or history, (b) which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past or are landmarks in the history of architecture, (c) which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the county and its communities, or (d) which provide for this and future generations examples of the physical surroundings in which past generations lived.
2. The development and maintenance of complementary settings and environment for such structures and/or districts.
3. The preservation and encouragement of the county's varied architectural styles, reflecting the cultural, social, economic, political, and architectural phases of its history.
4. The enhancement of property values, the stabilization of communities and areas of the county, the increase of economic and financial benefits to the county and its inhabitants, and the promotion of the tourist trade and interest.
5. The integration of the preservation of cultural resources into public and private land use management and development processes.
6. The educational and cultural enrichment of this and future generations by fostering knowledge of our heritage.
7. The promotion and encouragement of continued private ownership and utilization of such structures so the objectives listed above can be attained under this policy.
8. The identification and resolution of conflicts between the preservation of cultural resources and alternative land uses, as early as possible in the planning process.
9. The promotion of public awareness of the benefits of preservation and the encouragement of public participation in identifying and preserving historic, architectural and archaeological resources thereby increasing community pride in the county's cultural heritage.
10. The establishment of a basis for coordinating the goal of the preservation of cultural resources, historic structures and historic districts with the need to set standards for and implement other elements of the county's plans, policies, and programs.

## 4.5.4 Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation

### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on the Placer County CEQA Checklist and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, implementing the project would result in a potentially significant impact on cultural resources or TCRs if it would:

- ▲ cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines;
- ▲ cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value that is geographically affiliated with the tribe;
- ▲ disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries; or
- ▲ cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

### METHODS AND APPROACH

As described in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” this EIR evaluates the PRSP at a project level and the SAP at a programmatic level.

The impact analysis for historic architectural resources and prehistoric- and historic-era archaeological resources is based on the findings and recommendations of the *Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report for Placer Ranch* (ECORP Consulting 2015), the *Sunset Industrial Area Public Review Draft Existing Conditions Report* (Placer County 2015), the *Archaeological Reconnaissance of the 1,329-Acre Reason Farms* (URS 2002a), and the *City of Roseville Retention Basin, California Register Evaluation* (URS 2002b). The analysis is also informed by the provisions and requirements of federal, state, and local laws and regulations that apply to cultural resources. In determining the level of significance, the analysis assumes that the project would comply with relevant federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances.

### Application of NRHP and CRHR Criteria

CRHR criteria were used to evaluate the historic significance of the archaeological resources in the SAP area. While these resources were not formally evaluated for NRHP eligibility, the criteria are nearly identical to those of the CRHR. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that CRHR eligibility determinations can be assumed. The NRHP criteria for eligibility are codified in 36 CFR Part 60 and explained in guidelines published by the Keeper of the NRHP. The NRHP and CRHR are discussed in more detail above under “Regulatory Setting.” Eligibility for listing on the NRHP and the CRHR rests on twin factors of significance and integrity. A resource must have both significance and integrity to be considered eligible. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, will become more important than the historical significance a resource may possess and render it ineligible. Likewise, a resource can have complete integrity, but if it lacks significance, it must also be considered ineligible.

The evaluations below use the letter and number criterion references from the NRHP and CRHR, respectively. The evaluations are also based on the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Bulletin 15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, which is the recognized national standard for evaluation of historic significance (U.S. Department of the Interior 2013).

## Historic Sites

### **P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H)**

The 1-mile section of Fiddymont Road located within the PRSP area was previously evaluated as not eligible for listing in the CRHR and NRHP under all four significance criteria. Under Criterion A/1, Fiddymont Road was not eligible because it was not a main thoroughfare, did not link cities or towns, and was used more for local access. It was not eligible under Criterion B/2 because it was associated with the Fiddymont family only by name and the ranch itself had a greater association with the family. Under Criterion C/3, the road was not considered significant because it was a simple two-lane road, without a special engineering method or achievement used in its construction. Finally, the road was not eligible under Criterion D/4 because it did not yield information important in history or prehistory. Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

### **PG&E Rio Oso-Hurley and Rio Oso-Tesla Transmission Line**

The portion of the transmission line within the PRSP area was previously evaluated as not eligible for listing in the CRHR and NRHP under all four significance criteria. The PG&E transmission line was found to not be eligible under Criterion A/1 because it was not the first or one of the first transmission lines of its kind. The transmission line was not eligible under Criterion B/2 because it was not found to be directly associated with any engineer or person of historical significance. Under Criterion C/3, the transmission line was not considered significant because it was a simple, standard design that was well documented. Finally, the transmission line was not eligible under Criterion D/4; it would not yield information important in history or prehistory because the information regarding transmission line technology and history has already been well documented. Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

### **P-31-554 (CA-PLA-428H)**

This former ranch site features concrete foundations from the main house and a windmill, remains of a fireplace, well and privy, debris piles, a cattle trough, cattle ramp, and non-native vegetation. The site has been extensively disturbed with the majority of its features destroyed and the size of the ranch has been reduced; the site therefore lacks integrity. The site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

### **P-31-1450 (CA-PLA-1123H)**

This segment of the historic alignment of U.S. Highway 99E was originally recorded in 1994. No visible signs of the original dirt/paved roadway were found during the November 2017 survey. The portion of the historic alignment within the Industrial Avenue/Campus Park Boulevard off-site improvement area has been completely absorbed into the modern roadway; the site therefore lacks integrity. The site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

## Archaeological Sites

### **P-31-1405 (CA-PLA-1086) and P-31-1406 (CA-PLA-1087H)**

This site consists of a surface scatter of 19th-century domestic artifacts and mixed domestic refuse scatter. Archival research conducted for the 2015 pedestrian survey failed to identify a clear association between this site and persons or events important in history (Criteria A and B/1 and 2). Although site P-31-1405 (CA-PLA-1086) was located within the historic Spring Valley Ranch, owned by J. P. Whitney and his heirs, the property contains no direct historical associations with Whitney, the Whitney family, or the significant agricultural operations of the ranch. In addition, this site does not represent the work of a master or otherwise exhibit extraordinary architectural values and therefore does not satisfy Criterion C/3. Because the site contained materials possibly consistent with habitation, it was subjected to subsurface testing, as described previously. Ten of the 25 STPs were positive for cultural material, which generally consisted of domestic items and building material. The artifact assemblage recovered during the subsurface testing and surface recording, however, does not contain any information that would associate the site with persons or events that are considered significant or important in history. Overall, the artifacts do not contribute anything

new or important to the archaeological or historical record (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

#### **P-31-1424 (CA-PLA-1104)**

No archival information is available on record to support the association of this prehistoric lithic scatter site with important events or persons in prehistory (Criteria A and B/1 and 2). Archaeological sites, by definition, do not exhibit extant features or architecture that would represent the work of a master or possess high artistic values (Criterion C/3). The intensive field survey and subsurface testing conducted around the location of the isolated groundstone fragment identified no additional artifacts or evidence of habitation, such as midden soil. The isolated fragment of groundstone found at the site does not provide any additional information regarding the prehistory of the region (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

#### **PR-003**

This site is an abandoned irrigation well consisting of a partially crushed riveted iron pipe. Wells associated with agricultural production typically do not individually contribute to the broad patterns of history because minor agricultural features often leave no temporal indicators (Criterion A/1). Irrigation wells are difficult to associate with specific individuals because of their lack of association with standing structures and records, and no information exists in the archival record to associate this site with important individuals in history, other than the fact that the land was once part of J. P. Whitney's Spring Valley Ranch (Criterion B/2). Archival and field efforts do not suggest that simple irrigation wells embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual; or possess high artistic values (Criterion C/3). Irrigation wells and other water conveyance systems are common in rural agricultural fields where a water delivery system is needed. Finally, irrigation wells in general do not provide important information in history or prehistory (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

#### **PR-006**

This site consists of the remains of a fence line and water conveyance system. Fence lines and irrigation channels are generally associated with historic-era ranching and homesteading, which typically do not individually contribute to the broad patterns of history (Criterion A/1). Fence lines, irrigation channels and similar features are similarly difficult to associate with specific individuals because of their lack of association with standing structures and records, and no information exists in the archival record to associate these sites with important individuals in history (Criterion B/2). Archival and field efforts do not suggest that the site embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values (Criterion C/3). Finally, fence lines and irrigation channels do not provide important information in history or prehistory (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

#### **PR-007**

This site consists of the remains of a possible cattle ranching operation, containing a collapsed open-aired barn foundation, linear concrete slab, and previously recorded capped well. Archival research failed to identify a clear association between this site and persons or events important in history (Criteria A and B/1 and 2). Although the land on which the site is located was once owned by the Fiddymment family, there is no clear association with the Fiddymments and the barn or ranch complex. In addition, this site does not represent the work of a master or otherwise exhibit extraordinary architectural values and therefore does not satisfy Criterion C/3. It was common for open-aired barns to be constructed of wood beams with corrugated roofs. None of the six STPs dug at the site were positive for cultural material. Because no historic artifacts were recovered during the subsurface testing, the site does not contain any information that would associate the site with persons or events that are considered significant or important in history, such as the Fiddymment family. Overall, the artifacts do not contribute anything new or important to the archaeological or historical record (Criterion D/4). Therefore, the site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

**PR-008**

This site consists of the remains of a fence line and water conveyance system. Fence lines and irrigation channels are generally associated with historic-era ranching and homesteading, which typically do not individually contribute to the broad patterns of history (Criterion A/1). Fence lines, irrigation channels, and similar features are similarly difficult to associate with specific individuals because of their lack of association with standing structures and records, and no information exists in the archival record to associate these sites with important individuals in history (Criterion B/2). Archival and field efforts do not suggest that the site embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values (Criterion C/3). Finally, fence lines and irrigation channels do not provide important information in history or prehistory (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

**PR-010**

This site consists of the location of a proposed residence and contains a grove of willow trees, a well, two refuse pits, and a historic-era and modern refuse. Archival research failed to identify a clear association between this site and persons or events important in history (Criteria A and B/1 and 2). Although this site was located on lands owned by J. P. Whitney, there is no evidence linking Whitney to this site. In addition, there are no architectural features present at the site. Any indication of a foundation or structure has been destroyed or removed. Because the site lacks built features, it does not represent the work of a master or otherwise exhibit extraordinary architectural values and therefore does not satisfy Criterion C/3. Because historic maps indicated a structure present between 1910 and 1953 and because the site contained materials possibly consistent with habitation, it was subjected to subsurface testing. Nine of the 11 STPs dug at the site were positive for cultural material, which generally consisted of modern domestic items. Because the site lacks substantial and significant cultural deposits, the artifact assemblage recovered during the subsurface testing does not contain any information that would associate the site with persons or events that are considered significant or important in history. Overall, the artifacts do not contribute anything new or important to the archaeological or historical record (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

**PR-011**

This site consists of the possible location of a house and barn complex and contains two cellar pits and a historic-era artifact scatter. Archival research failed to identify a clear association between this site and persons or events important in history (Criteria A and B/1 and 2). Although this site was located on lands owned by J. P. Whitney, there is no evidence directly linking Whitney to this site. Because the site lacks built features, it does not represent the work of a master or otherwise exhibit extraordinary architectural values and therefore does not satisfy Criterion C/3. Because the site contained materials possibly consistent with habitation, it was subjected to subsurface testing. Twelve of the 15 STPs dug at the site were positive for cultural material, which generally consisted of modern domestic items. Because the site lacks substantial and significant cultural deposits, the artifact assemblage recovered during the subsurface testing does not contain any information that would associate the site with persons or events that are considered significant or important in history. Overall, the artifacts do not contribute anything new or important to the archaeological or historical record (Criterion D/4). Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and is not significant for the purposes of CEQA.

## PROPOSED SUNSET AREA PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

The SAP includes the following goal and policies related to archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources:

**GOAL CR-1.** To identify and protect the significant cultural resources of the Sunset Area including paleontological, archaeological, historical, and tribal cultural resources.

- ▲ **Policy CR-1.1: Cultural Resource Coordination and Education.** In areas with a moderate to high degree of sensitivity for cultural resources based on location or previous investigations or in areas where buildings and structures are more than 45 years old, the County shall require a cultural resource assessment of the site by a qualified professional before construction activities begin. The assessment would include preparing archaeological and historical survey reports and conducting a paleontological record search using an appropriate database, such as the University of California, Museum of Paleontology. Archaeological and historical sites and materials shall be evaluated and recorded on standard DPR 523-series forms in accordance with NRHP/CRHR criteria. The evaluation report shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist, architectural historian, or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, as appropriate, and submitted to Placer County. Project sponsors shall follow recommendations identified in the survey.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.2: AB 52 and SB 18 Consultation.** The County shall coordinate with the United Auburn Indian Community and any other culturally-affiliated tribes through AB 52 and SB 18 to encourage the preservation, protection, and mitigation of impacts to cultural sites and tribal cultural resources.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.3: Collaboration with Culturally-Affiliated Tribes.** The County shall collaborate with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) to encourage education of tribal and cultural resources and history in the community, strengthen cultural diversity, and support the shared County and UAIC vision of UAIC landholding within the Sunset Area Plan.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.4: Potential Development and Cultural Resources.** The Placer County Development Review Committee shall regularly consult with the North Central Information Center, Native American Heritage Commission, and appropriate local tribes, such as the United Auburn Indian Community, to determine the degree to which a potential development is considered to be in a sensitive location for cultural resources.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.5: Sensitive Locations for Cultural Resources.** The County shall consider, at a minimum, the following areas to be sensitive areas for the presence of cultural resources:
  - a) Areas with existing riparian resources.
  - b) Areas with a clear and distinct floodplain.
  - c) Areas with identifiable historical remains (e.g., old foundations, rock walls, old abandoned equipment).
  - d) Areas adjacent to properties which have previously had cultural resource assessments which resulted in the identification of significant resources.
  - e) Areas with a Modesto, Riverbank, Turlock Lake/Mehrten Formation geologic condition (in descending order of sensitivity).
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.6: Minimize Cultural Resource Impacts.** The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources whenever possible. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological, tribal cultural resource, historical, or paleontological consultants (in coordination with culturally-affiliated tribes), depending on the type of resource in question.

- a) If archaeological resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR are identified, an assessment of project impacts on these resources as well as detailed measures to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources will be included in an evaluation report. These measures could include project redesign, construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist, avoidance of sites, preservation in place, or data recovery. These measures shall be developed and implemented in coordination with the Placer County Planning Services Division and Native American representatives, as appropriate.
  - b) If historical resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR are identified, an assessment of project impacts on these resources will be included in an evaluation report that also will identify detailed measures to avoid impacts. If avoidance of a significant architectural/built environment resource is not feasible, additional mitigation options include specific design plans for historic districts or plans for alteration or adaptive reuse of a historical resource that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings. If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, a qualified architectural historian shall be retained to thoroughly document the structure and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey or Historic American Engineering Record, including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site-specific and comparative archival research and through oral history collection as appropriate.
  - c) If tribal cultural resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR are identified in the proposed assessment of project impacts, then detailed measures to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources shall be included. These measures could include dedicated conservation easements per SB 18, project alternatives, or redesign, additional construction monitoring by a qualified tribal monitor, avoidance of sites, preservation in place, or data recovery. These measures shall be developed and implemented in coordination with the Placer County Planning Services Division and Native American representatives, as appropriate.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.7: Discovery of Cultural Resources During Construction.** The County shall require all new development to suspend construction activities and contact the County when any cultural resources (e.g., shell, artifacts, architectural remains, or paleontological resources) are discovered. In the event archaeological, tribal cultural, historical, or paleontological resources are discovered, the County shall retain a qualified cultural resource specialist or paleontologist to assess the finds and develop mitigation measures for the protection, recordation, or removal of the cultural resources or paleontological resources. These measures may also include consultation with local Native American communities and the Native American Heritage Commission on the cultural find, if warranted. If the appropriate specialist determines that the find does not meet standards of significance for cultural resources (as defined in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5), construction may proceed. If the appropriate specialist determines that the find does meet the standards of significance for cultural resources, SAP Policy CR-1.6, Minimize Cultural Resource Impacts, shall be implemented.
- ▲ **Policy CR-1.8: Discovery of Burials During Construction.** The County shall require all new development to suspend construction activities in the area of the discovery and contact the County when human remains are discovered. In such cases, County shall contact the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and, if the remains are determined to be Native American, the most likely descendant (MLD). The County and the applicant will coordinate the appropriate treatment and disposition of the remains with the MLD assigned by the NAHC.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### Impact 4.5-1: Change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource

---

UAIC and the Shingle Springs Rancheria responded to letters sent by the County offering consultation under AB 52. Although no specific known TCRs have been identified through consultation, UAIC has identified two areas that may be sensitive for TCRs. Specifically, UAIC has identified an area of sensitivity where localized topography mimics conditions on a nearby but unrelated project site at which UAIC has identified significant TCRs. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**.

---

#### Net SAP Area and PRSP Area

As part of the 2013/2014 legislative session, AB 52 established a new class of resources under CEQA: TCRs. AB 52 requires that lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon written request of a California Native American tribe, begin consultation after the lead agency determines that the application for the project is complete. As detailed above, the County sent letters to the Shingle Springs Rancheria, T'si -Akim Maidu, UAIC, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, and Lone Band of Miwok Indians on March 8, 2017, in compliance with AB 52. Only UAIC and the Shingle Springs Rancheria responded within the 30-day response period as defined in PRC Section 21074. Representatives from the Shingle Springs Rancheria noted that they were not aware of any TCRs in the SAP area and requested only to be provided copies of any cultural reports prepared for the projects which were provided on May 4, 2017. UAIC requested copies of the reports and a site visit. The consultation with UAIC resulted in the conclusion that there are no known specific resources in the SAP area that could be considered TCRs as described under AB 52 and defined in PRC Section 21074.

However, although no specific TCRs have been identified through the AB 52 process, UAIC has identified two locations in the PRSP area as being sensitive for potential TCRs. The specific details of the consultations are confidential pursuant to California law, however, in summary, one area was identified as having the potential for significant cultural finds based on the presence of surface isolates; a second 0.96-acre area was identified based on site conditions similar in nature to a nearby but unrelated project where the Tribe has identified significant resources in addition to surface isolates. These two areas defined by the UAIC are not mapped in this EIR because they are sensitive resources; however, the areas are on record with the County. In addition, after the close of the AB 52 consultation process, the UAIC identified several additional features that they consider to be TCRs (see notes in Table 4.5-1). Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.

#### Other Supporting Infrastructure

##### **Pleasant Grove Retention Facility**

Following the subsequent identification of off-site improvements as a result of project refinement, AB 52 consultation was reopened, and all traditionally and culturally affiliated tribes were offered an opportunity to consult on the off-site improvements, including the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility. Only UAIC responded with a request to consult on select off-site improvement locations. Impacts associated with implementation of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would be the same as those identified above for the SAP area. This impact would be potentially significant. It should be noted that the City of Roseville will be the lead agency responsible for AB 52 consultation as part of the CEQA process for the retention facility.

##### **Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements**

As described for Pleasant Grove Retention Facility, tribes were provided an opportunity to consult on the off-site improvements. Only UAIC responded with a request to consult on select off-site improvement locations. Impacts associated with implementation of other off-site improvements would be the same as those identified above for the SAP area. This impact would be potentially significant. It should be noted that the City of Roseville will be the lead agency responsible for AB 52 consultation for off-site improvements under their jurisdiction.

### **Conclusion**

The project area is in the southwestern portion of the territory occupied by the Valley Nisenan. The NAHC sacred lands search for the PRSP area was negative and no resource has been identified as meeting any of the PRC 5024.1(c) criteria listed above. However, UAIC has identified certain areas as having the potential for TCRs. Therefore, the impact would be **potentially significant**.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a: Identified resource avoidance (PRSP Area)**

Based on UAIC's identification of a 0.96-acre area where on-site topography mimics conditions on a nearby unrelated project site (where the tribe has identified significant TCRs), as well as identification of a potentially indicative surface artifact at this location, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

Prior to recordation of the final large lot subdivision map for the area including the 0.96-acre area, one of the following two actions shall be taken:

1. Subsurface soil testing shall be conducted with UAIC tribal monitors present within the 0.96-acre sensitive area identified by the Tribe to determine that TCRs are absent and therefore that no restrictions or map changes are necessary, or
2. The 0.96-acre sensitive area shall be either:
  - ▲ designated as Open Space on the land use plan; or
  - ▲ restricted on the map and deed to preclude construction of any structures, roadway or utility infrastructure, agricultural cultivation, or other earth-disturbing activities.

If this identified resource will be avoided (and no subsurface testing will be conducted), project construction plans shall demarcate the area through "Environmentally Sensitive Area" notation. The demarcations shall be reviewed and approved by UAIC before finalization to ensure they correctly identify the location of the TCRs.

Before each phase of construction, including staging of equipment, silt fence installation, and clearing and grubbing, the construction contractor shall install protective fencing at the perimeter of the Environmentally Sensitive Area as shown on the plans and as verified by UAIC. Installation of the fencing shall be monitored by a UAIC monitor. The fencing shall be maintained and repaired as needed and to the satisfaction of the County's Development Review Committee and UAIC for the duration of the construction activity.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b: Inadvertent discoveries (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)**

If potential Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural resources, including midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic rock (nonnative), or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone, are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must immediately stop in the area. Work shall cease within 100 feet of the find regardless of whether the construction is being actively monitored by a cultural resources specialist, professional archaeologist, or representative from UAIC. Following discovery, a professional archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the deposit, and the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, the Department of Museums, and Native American representatives from UAIC shall make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment, as appropriate.

If Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural deposits or isolates found to be ineligible for inclusion in the CRHR are identified within the SAP area, UAIC shall be notified. Culturally appropriate treatment and disposition shall be determined following coordination with UAIC. Culturally appropriate treatment may involve processing materials in a lab for reburial, minimizing handling of cultural objects, leaving objects in place within the landscape, and returning objects to a location within the project area where they will not be

subject to future impacts. UAIC does not consider curation of TCRs to be appropriate or respectful and request that materials not be permanently curated, unless requested by the tribe.

If articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, the County coroner and NAHC shall be contacted immediately. Upon determination by the County coroner that the find is Native American in origin, the NAHC will assign the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials.

Following a review of the find and consultation with the Native American tribe and appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements or special conditions that provide for protection of the site and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. Work in the area of the cultural resource discovery may proceed only after authorization is granted by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency following coordination with tribal representatives and cultural resource experts, as appropriate.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1c: Tribal monitoring (PRSP Area)**

An area within the PRSP area has been identified by UAIC as having the potential for significant cultural finds based on the presence of multiple surface isolates. Before commencement of earth-disturbing activities in the PRSP area, a tribal site monitor from UAIC shall be contacted. The monitor shall identify a site boundary and demarcate an “Environmentally Sensitive Area.” In this area, the project proponent and/or its construction contractor(s) shall accommodate Native American monitors or their representatives on the construction site during ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation clearing, grubbing, and stripping or other earth-moving/disturbing activities, such as grading or excavation. Native American monitors or their representatives will have the authority to request that work be temporarily stopped, diverted, or slowed if sites or objects of significance are identified within 100 feet of the direct impact area. Only a Native American monitor or representative shall recommend appropriate treatment and final disposition of TCRs.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1d: Tribal cultural resource awareness training (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)**

Before initiation of construction in the areas defined by UAIC as potentially sensitive, all construction crew members, consultants, and other personnel involved in project implementation shall receive project-specific TCR awareness training. The training shall be conducted in coordination with qualified cultural resource specialists and representatives from UAIC. The training will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate, respectful treatment of any find of significance to UAIC.

As a component of the training, a brochure will be distributed to all personnel associated with project implementation. At a minimum, the brochure shall discuss the following topics in clear and straightforward language:

- ▲ field indicators of potential archaeological or cultural resources (e.g., what to look for; for example: archaeological artifacts, exotic or nonnative rock, unusually large amounts of shell or bone, significant soil color variation);
- ▲ regulations governing archaeological resources and TCRs;
- ▲ consequences of disregarding or violating laws protecting archaeological or TCRs; and
- ▲ steps to take if a worker encounters a possible resource.

The training shall include project-specific guidance for on-site personnel, including agreed upon protocols for resource avoidance, when to stop work, and whom to contact if potential archaeological or TCRs are identified.

The training shall also address directing work to stop and contacting the County coroner and the NAHC immediately if potential human remains are identified. NAHC will assign an MLD if the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American in origin.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1e: Site visit after ground disturbance (Net SAP Area)**

The project proponent shall notify the CEQA lead agency a minimum of 7 days before initiation of ground disturbance to allow the agency time to notify culturally affiliated tribes. Tribal representatives from culturally affiliated tribes shall be allowed access to the project site within the first 5 days of ground-breaking activity to inspect soil piles, trenches, or other disturbed areas.

If potential Native American prehistoric, historic, archaeological, or cultural resources, including midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, exotic rock (nonnative), or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone, are identified during this initial inspection following ground disturbance, the following actions shall be taken:

- ▲ Work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the project proponent shall immediately notify the CEQA lead agency representative. The project proponent shall coordinate any subsequent investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist approved by the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency and a tribal representative from the culturally affiliated tribe(s). The archaeologist shall coordinate with the culturally affiliated tribe(s) to allow for proper management recommendations if potential impacts on the resources are found by the CEQA lead agency representative to be significant.
- ▲ A site meeting of construction personnel shall be held to afford the tribal representative the opportunity to provide TCR awareness information.
- ▲ A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the CEQA lead agency representative by the qualified archaeologist. Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources or TCRs could include resource avoidance, preservation in place, reburial on-site, or other measures deemed acceptable by the project proponent, the County, and the tribal representative from the culturally affiliated tribe(s).
- ▲ The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the CEQA lead agency representative staff to be necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects on the TCR, including the use of a Native American monitor whenever work is occurring within 100 feet of the find.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1f: Lead agency notification (Net SAP Area and PRSP Area)**

A minimum of 7 days before beginning earthwork or other soil-disturbing activities, the project proponent shall notify the CEQA lead agency representative of the proposed earthwork start date to provide the CEQA lead agency representative adequate time to contact UAIC regarding TCR concerns.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1g: Woodcreek Water Treatment Plant (Other Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements)**

Although identified as a possible off-site improvement, it is highly unlikely that any improvements related to the SAP project, including the PRSP, will ever occur at this recycled water facility. This facility is located in the City of Roseville and is outside County jurisdiction. In the unlikely event that the County's project requires work at this location, the County will coordinate with City of Roseville regarding consultation with UAIC.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-1h: Pleasant Grove Retention Facility (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility)**

This is a proposed regional retention facility that will be constructed on City of Roseville–owned land and may be operated in accordance with a joint operations agreement developed by the participating jurisdictions. The City has already prepared a programmatic CEQA document for the project and will be the CEQA lead agency for the project-level (construction) CEQA analysis. City staff also will prepare the engineering improvement plans. When the project-level CEQA analysis occurs, the City of Roseville will be the lead agency responsible for AB 52

consultation. During consultation for the off-site improvements, the City agreed to allow UAIC to participate, on a voluntary basis, in any subsequent pedestrian surveys that may be conducted in support of the cultural resource and tribal cultural resource sections of its future CEQA document.

### **Significance after Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a through 4.5-1h would provide for worker education training, provide the opportunity to avoid and protect TCRs, and otherwise ensure that resources are treated appropriately, in accordance with the Tribe's wishes. The impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation.

### **Impact 4.5-2: Change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource**

Four archaeological sites and two multicomponent sites are known within the Net SAP area (outside the PRSP area), but the significance of these sites in the SAP has not yet been evaluated. Regarding the PRSP, based on pedestrian surveys and evaluation of identified archaeological sites, no archaeological resources eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR are known within the PRSP area. Implementation of the SAP, including PRSP, would result in development on properties that could contain known archaeological resources. The ground disturbance from construction activities associated with the SAP and PRSP could disturb, disrupt, or destroy unknown archaeological resources, which could cause a substantial change in the significance of a previously undiscovered unique archaeological resource as defined in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of archaeological resources; however, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and a portion of the Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements would not be subject to these policies. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

### **Net SAP Area**

A 2015 NCIC records search revealed that most of the net SAP area has been previously surveyed and that it includes four archaeological sites along with two multicomponent sites (containing both archaeological and historic components). Because of the programmatic nature of the net SAP area analysis, a pedestrian survey for archaeological resources was not conducted for the net SAP area, and the presence of these six sites has not been verified; it is also not known whether these sites have been evaluated for CRHR or NRHP eligibility.

Archival research indicated that there are no ethnographic village sites in the net SAP area, but that Native American occupation of the area typically occurred along watercourses. Geoarchaeological investigations for the SAP area indicate that the area generally exhibits a low sensitivity for the presence of buried deposits of cultural resources. However, ground-disturbing activities could result in discovery of or damage to previously undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the survey of areas with a moderate to high degree of sensitivity for cultural resources, the evaluation of archaeological resources for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR, that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources whenever possible, and requires the suspension of construction activities when cultural resources are discovered and the retention qualified cultural resources specialist to assess the finds and develop mitigation measures for the protection, recordation, or removal of the cultural resources. This impact would be less-than-significant.

### **PRSP Area**

The results of the 2015 pedestrian survey indicated eight archaeological sites in the PRSP area. These sites are a combination of 19th-century domestic artifacts and historic-era and modern refuse, abandoned irrigation wells, remains of fence lines and water conveyance systems, collapsed open-aired barn foundation, possible house foundations, a concrete slab, cellar pits, and a single prehistoric lithic scatter. As detailed above under "Methods and Approach," these sites do not meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR and therefore are not significant for the purposes of CEQA. The November 2017 records search and pedestrian survey revealed no archaeological sites or features within the PRSP-related infrastructure areas outside the PRSP area, but within the SAP area.

During the pedestrian survey for this site, five STPs (at sites P-31-1405 [CA-PLA-1086] [combined with P-31-1406 (CA-PLA-1087H)], P-31-1424 [CA-PLA-1104], PR-007, PR-010, and PR-011) were hand-excavated to target locations within the sites that had the potential to exhibit buried archaeological deposits. None of the materials recovered from the STPs were temporally diagnostic. Diagnostics are artifacts or some other aspect of a site that is known to be associated with a particular period and that provides context to the cultural materials. This means that the area is considered to have a low sensitivity for archaeological resources. Nonetheless, construction-related ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of the PRSP could encounter previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials. These activities could cause a substantial change in the significance of a previously undiscovered unique archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The project proponent would be required to implement SAP Policy CR-1.7 which requires the suspension of construction activities when cultural resources are discovered and the retention of qualified cultural resources specialist to assess the finds and develop specific measures for the protection, recordation, or removal of the cultural resources. This impact would be less-than-significant.

### **Other Supporting Infrastructure**

#### **Pleasant Grove Retention Facility**

Surveys conducted in 2002, which also included an NCIC records search, revealed no archaeological sites or remains. One archaeological site, originally recorded in 1960, was not relocated during the survey. An updated records search for the currently proposed 267-acre south retention basin was performed in November 2017 and revealed no additional sites. A pedestrian survey for archaeological resources was not conducted for the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility site. Ground-disturbing activities could result in discovery of or damage to previously undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Because the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to SAP Policies that minimize impacts to these resources, this impact would be potentially significant.

#### **Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements**

A November 2017 records search revealed three sites mapped within the off-site transportation and utility improvement areas; however, none of the sites are archaeological. Archaeologists conducted an intensive-level pedestrian survey within these areas; no prehistoric or historic-era archaeological sites were identified. Nonetheless, ground-disturbing activities could result in discovery of or damage to previously undiscovered archaeological resources as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Because these offsite improvements would not be subject to SAP policies, this impact would be potentially significant.

### **Conclusion**

Construction of development associated with the project could result in disturbance to, disruption of, or destruction of previously undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites and materials if resources are present within future project sites. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of archaeological resources, which would reduce potential impact to a less-than-significant level. However, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements would not be subject to these policies. If archaeological sites and materials within these areas were to represent “unique archaeological resources” as defined by CEQA in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and PRC Section 21083.2(g), any substantial change to or destruction of these resources would be a **potentially significant** impact.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5-2: Require archaeological resource survey for areas outside the SAP (Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements)**

The County shall coordinate with the City of Roseville for the preparation of a cultural resource evaluation report for the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and off-site transportation and utility improvements, before grading, excavation, or other earthmoving activities begin. The evaluation should include preparing archaeological and historical survey reports. Any identified archaeological and historical sites (including

structures 45 years of age or older) and materials should be evaluated and recorded on standard DPR 523-series forms in accordance with NRHP/CRHR criteria. The evaluation report should be completed by a qualified archaeologist, architectural historian, or historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, as appropriate, and submitted to the City of Roseville. Project contractors and construction managers should follow the recommendations identified in the report.

#### **Significance after Mitigation**

With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-2 actions would be taken to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat unique archaeological resources appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. However, the County cannot require the City of Roseville to implement this mitigation measure; therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

#### **Impact 4.5-3: Accidental discovery of human remains**

---

Although unlikely based on research, construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of the SAP could unearth previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains if they are present. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052, PRC Section 5097, and SAP Policy CR-1.7 would minimize project-related effects on human remains. However, without project-specific mitigation, this impact could be **potentially significant**.

---

#### **Net SAP Area**

Based on documentary research, no evidence suggests that any prehistoric- or historic-era, marked or unmarked human interments are present within the net SAP area. Grave sites and Native American remains can be located outside dedicated cemeteries or burial sites. Ground-disturbing construction activities could uncover previously unknown human remains, which could be archaeologically or culturally significant. Construction within the net SAP area would involve vegetation removal, grading, and excavation for residential, commercial and employment, parks and recreation, and public facilities uses. These activities would result in soil disturbance; therefore, the potential exists for previously undiscovered human remains to be discovered.

California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097.

If human remains are discovered during construction activities, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the project proponent shall notify the Placer County coroner and the NAHC immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the NAHC to be Native American, the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following the coroner's findings, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated MLD shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in PRC Section 5097.94. In addition, SAP Policy CR-1.8 requires the notification of the County Coroner and coordinating the appropriate treatment and disposition of remains with the MLD assigned by NAHC. However, without project-specific mitigation, this impact could be potentially significant.

#### **PRSP Area**

Impacts associated with implementation of the PRSP would be the same as identified above for the net SAP area because of compliance with existing regulations and proposed SAP policies. However, without project-specific mitigation, this impact could be potentially significant.

## Other Supporting Infrastructure

### **Pleasant Grove Retention Facility**

Impacts associated with implementation of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would be the same as identified above for the SAP because of compliance with existing regulations. This impact would be less than significant.

### **Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements**

Impacts associated with implementation of other off-site improvements would be the same as identified above for the SAP because construction activities would be required to comply with the procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and PRC Section 5097. This impact would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052, PRC Section 5097, and SAP Policy CR-1.8 would provide an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered. However, without project-specific mitigation, this impact could be **potentially significant**.

## **Mitigation Measures**

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b.

## Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1b establishes the required protocol in the case that articulated or disarticulated human remains are discovered during construction activities, including immediately contacting the County coroner and NAHC. If the County coroner determines the find is Native American in origin, the NAHC will assign the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who will work with the project proponent to define appropriate treatment and disposition of the burials. Because this mitigation measure requires adherence to proper protocols in the event that human remains are discovered, the impact would be **less than significant** after mitigation.

## **Impact 4.5-4: Change in the significance of a historic resource**

---

The survey and evaluation of the PRSP area concluded that it does not contain any historic resources. Construction activities in the net SAP area could occur on properties that contain unrecorded historic sites or result in adverse physical effects on previously identified historic resources. Damage to or destruction of a building or structure that is a designated historic resource, is eligible for listing as a historic resource, or has not yet been evaluated could result in the change in its historical significance. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources; however, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to these policies. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

---

## Net SAP Area

Historical resources include standing buildings (e.g., houses, barns, cabins) and structures (e.g., dams, bridges, water conveyance systems, foundation pads). A 2015 NCIC records search revealed that most of the net SAP area has been previously surveyed and that it includes nine historical sites and features along with two multicomponent sites (containing both archaeological and historic components). Because of the programmatic nature of the analysis of the net SAP area, a pedestrian survey for historical resources was not conducted for the net SAP area, and the presence of these 11 historical sites and features has not been verified; it is also not known whether these sites and features have been evaluated for CRHR or NRHP eligibility.

Development projects could damage or destroy a structure or property that is a designated historic resource, is eligible for listing as a historic resource, or has not yet been evaluated. Projects that include the introduction of new visual elements, such as new structures or roadway segments, or that involve visual alterations have the potential to indirectly affect historic architectural resources by creating visual

incompatibility in the surrounding environment. Several SAP Policies reduce these impacts. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 call for the identification and protection of historic resources. Policies CR-1.1 and CR-1.5 require the survey of areas with a moderate to high degree of sensitivity for cultural resources and the evaluation of historic resources for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR; Policy CR-1.6 requires that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources whenever possible; Policy CR-1.7 requires the suspension of construction activities when cultural resources are discovered and the retention qualified cultural resources specialist to assess the finds and develop mitigation measures for the protection, recordation, or removal of the cultural resources.

Nevertheless, because avoidance of potential impacts to significant cultural resources may not always be possible, development of the SAP area could result in damage to or destruction of a building or structure that is a designated historic resource, eligible for listing as a historic resource, or a potential historic resource that has not yet been evaluated. This could result in the change in its historical significance; therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.

#### **PRSP Area**

The records search and survey prepared for the PRSP area revealed three historic sites in the PRSP area: P-31-816 (CA-PLA-690H), a portion of Fiddymont Road (P-31-1422 [CA-PLA-1102H]), and a segment of the PG&E Rio Oso-Hurley and Rio Oso-Tesla Transmission Line. As described above under “Methods and Approach,” these sites have been evaluated and do not appear to meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR and therefore are not considered to be significant for the purposes of CEQA. In addition, the pedestrian survey did not reveal any additional historic sites. Therefore, the PRSP area does not contain any historic resources. This impact would be less than significant.

#### **Other Supporting Infrastructure**

##### **Pleasant Grove Retention Facility**

A historic resources analysis of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility was conducted in 2002; the analysis evaluated all buildings and other structures within the Pleasant Grove property that were 50 years old or older at the time. None of the buildings or structures evaluated, including a dairy barn, a windmill, two residences, and a rice processing plant, were determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR; therefore, none are significant for the purposes of CEQA.

As currently designed, the Pleasant Grove Retention facility would avoid the barn and residences. However, because the historic structure analysis is more than 15 years old, other buildings and structures on the property may have reached 50 years of age and need to be evaluated for eligibility. Implementation of the Pleasant Grove Retention facility could result in damage to or destruction of a building or other structure that has not yet been evaluated for historical significance. Because the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to SAP Policies, this impact would be potentially significant.

##### **Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements**

A November 2017 records search revealed three historic-era sites within the off-site areas: P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H), P-31-554 (CA-PLA-428H), and P-31-1450 (CA-PLA-1123H). As described above under “Methods and Approach,” P-31-1422 (CA-PLA-1102H) was determined not eligible for listing in the CRHR and NRHP under all four significance criteria, and P-31-554 (CA-PLA-428H) and P-31-1450 (CA-PLA-1123H) lack integrity and not appear to meet the criteria for the NRHP or the CRHR. Consequently, these sites are not considered to be significant for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, the Other Off-Site Improvement areas do not contain any historic resources, and this impact would be less than significant.

#### **Conclusion**

Construction activities related to the implementation of the SAP could occur on properties that contain unrecorded historic sites or result in adverse physical effects on historic resources. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 require the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic resources; however, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to these policies. Damage to or destruction of a building or other structure that is a designated historic resource, is eligible for listing as a historic resource,

or has not yet been evaluated could result in the change in its historical significance as defined in Section 15064.5. Therefore, the impact on historical resources would be **potentially significant**.

## Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2.

### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-2 would reduce, to the extent feasible, potentially significant impacts on historic resources at the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility because actions would be taken to record, evaluate, avoid, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. However, if significant historic structures are removed or are substantially altered such that they no longer meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the CRHR or NRHP, the mitigation measures would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, and the impact would remain significant. Additionally, the County cannot require the City of Roseville to implement this mitigation measure; therefore, the impact remains **significant and unavoidable**.

## CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative context for the cultural resources analysis considers a broad regional system of which the resources are a part. The cumulative context for historical resources is the Sacramento Valley, where common patterns of historic-era settlement have occurred over roughly the past two centuries. The cumulative context for archaeological resources, human remains, and TCRs is the former territory occupied by the Penutian-speaking Nisenan. The territory extended from the area surrounding the current City of Oroville on the north to a few miles south of the American River on the south. The Sacramento River bounded the territory on the west, and in the east, it extended to a general area located within a few miles of Lake Tahoe.

### **Cumulative Impact 4.5-5: Cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources**

Because all significant cultural resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, meaning there are a limited number of significant cultural resources, all adverse effects erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one resource could affect the value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on a single project or parcel boundary.

The historic lands of the Nisenan people have been affected by development since Spanish explorer Gabriel Moraga crossed Nisenan territory in 1808. The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in Coloma in 1848 was the catalyst that caused a dramatic alteration of Native American cultural patterns as a flood of Euro-Americans entered the region. These changes are highlighted by the development of cities and towns in Sacramento County (established in 1850) and Placer County (formed in 1851). These cities and towns were associated with expanding business opportunities related to gold mining, agriculture, or the expansion of the railroad. Development of the Nisenan lands continued with residential growth which increased after World War I and then greatly intensified after World War II. These activities have resulted in an existing significant adverse effect on resources that would likely have been considered TCRs. Cumulative development in the region, including projects described in Table 5-2, could result in ongoing substantial adverse changes in the significance of TCRs, resulting from urban development and conversion of natural lands, which would constitute a potentially significant cumulative impact to these resources.

Although no specific TCRs have been identified within the SAP area, including the PRSP area, AB 52 consultation with UAIC identified two areas that are potentially sensitive for TCRs based on their characteristics. In addition, subsequent to resolution of AB 52 consultation, UAIC identified resources the tribe considers to be TCRs (see notes in Table 4.5-1). However, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a through 4.5-1h would provide for worker education training, provide the opportunity to avoid and protect TCRs, and otherwise ensure that any discovered TCRs are treated appropriately, in accordance with the

Tribe's wishes. Because there are no known TCRs in the project area and because mitigation measures would be implemented to minimize impacts to any discovered TCRs, the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact described above, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

#### **Cumulative Impact 4.5-6: Cumulative impacts on archaeological resources**

Because all significant cultural resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, meaning there are a limited number of significant cultural resources, all adverse effects erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one significant archaeological site could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on a single project or parcel boundary.

Proper planning and appropriate mitigation can help to capture and preserve knowledge of such resources and can provide opportunities for increasing our understanding of the past environmental conditions and cultures by recording data about sites discovered and preserving artifacts found. Federal, state, and local laws are also in place, as discussed above, that protect these resources in most instances. Even so, it is not always feasible to protect these resources, particularly when preservation in place would make projects infeasible, and for this reason the cumulative effects of past and present projects in the Sacramento Valley, including the projects listed in Table 4.0-2 "Cumulative Project List," could result in a potentially significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources. Without SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7, implementation of the SAP has the potential to cause a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources that are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes. With implementation of the policies, adverse effects on known archaeological resources and potentially newly discovered archaeological resources would be avoided. The Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and the off-site transportation and utility improvements would not be subject to these policies and the County cannot require the City of Roseville to implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2. However, it is reasonable to assume the City of Roseville would take similar actions to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat unique archaeological resources appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant loss of archaeological resources, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

#### **Cumulative Impact 4.5-7: Cumulative impacts on human remains**

Although no evidence suggests that any prehistoric- or historic-era, marked or unmarked human interments are present within or in the immediate vicinity of the SAP area and the off-site improvement areas, the SAP, in combination with other development in the region, including the projects listed in Table 4.0-2 "Cumulative Project List," could contribute to the disturbance of human remains because of project-related construction activities. However, compliance with California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052, PRC Section 5097, and SAP Policy CR-1.7 and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1b would ensure that the treatment and disposition of the remains occur in a manner consistent with NAHC guidance. Thus, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on human remains would not be considerable, and the impact would be **less than significant**.

#### **Cumulative Impact 4.5-8: Cumulative impacts on historic resources**

Many of the buildings and other structures constructed during the early days of development in the Sacramento Valley are no longer present or have been substantially altered for conversion to other uses. Therefore, the cumulative loss of historic resources in the Sacramento Valley is considered significant.

If it were to affect any historic resources, the project, in combination with other development in the region, including the projects listed in Table 4.0-2 "Cumulative Project List," could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, thus resulting in a cumulatively significant impact. However, no known historical resources are located within the boundaries of the SAP. However, although

unlikely, buildout of the SAP and construction of the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility could potentially destroy or damage historic cultural resources that have not yet been identified or evaluated. SAP Policies CR-1.1, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 would reduce project-specific impacts to the extent feasible by requiring project-specific surveys and actions to record, evaluate, avoid, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations; however, if project activities resulted in destruction or damage to an historic resource, the project-specific impact would remain significant after mitigation. In addition, the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility would not be subject to these policies and the County cannot require the City of Roseville to implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2. This would be a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact and the project's impact is **significant and unavoidable**.