

## 3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

### 3.6.1 INTRODUCTION

Cultural resources include historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, deposits, and features; historic and prehistoric districts; built environment resources including but not necessarily limited to buildings, structures, and objects; and traditional cultural properties and sacred sites, including cemeteries, human remains, and features or sites associated with significant events or practices in the traditional culture of an ethnic group. This section describes work undertaken to identify any cultural resources that may be present within the project area; to evaluate the significance of each identified resource in order to identify those which appear to qualify as historic properties under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA); and to assess the potential direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on these resources (including potential visual effects on the setting). This section also assesses the potential for undiscovered resources (such as buried archaeological deposits or human remains) to be present within the project site, and identifies measures to avoid significant effects to any such resources that might be present and could be affected by the Proposed Action.

The information provided in this section was derived from a series of archaeological and historical surveys of the project site or portions of the project site undertaken between 2001 and 2009, and historical architectural evaluations and archaeological test excavations undertaken during the same period to evaluate the significance of the identified resources. In addition, this section reports the results of a geoarchaeological assessment of the project area and of subsurface probing undertaken to determine whether buried archaeological deposits might be present along creek corridors within the project site. In the course of archaeological assessment of the project site, consultants also contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a search of its Sacred Lands Files, to determine whether there are recorded Sacred Sites (traditional resources of concern to the Native American community) within the project area; and a series of letters were sent to local Native American contacts identified by the NAHC, and to local historical societies, to elicit any concerns about potential effects of the Proposed Action and on-site alternatives on traditional cultural properties, historical resources or historic properties. Methods and results of this work are summarized in this section and are presented in detail in the reports listed at the end of this section (Cultural Resources Unlimited 2001; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2006; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2006, rev 2007; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2007; Peak & Associates 2006; JRP Historical Consulting 2007; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2009; Cogstone 2010; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2010; ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2011, Windmiller, et al., 2005, and Wohlgemuth 2008). Documentation of archaeological records search inquiries and Native American consultation inquiry letters are included, as relevant, in the cited reports.

All archaeological work was undertaken and this section was prepared under the direct supervision of archaeologists who meet the Secretary of the Interiors Professional Qualification Standards. Historic architectural assessments were undertaken by qualified architectural historians and historians who also meet the Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards.

### 3.6.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

#### 3.6.2.1 Study Area and Project Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The Proposed Action consists of the implementation of a specific plan that would develop the project site with a mixed-use, mixed-density community. Development of the project site under the Specific Plan would include extensive residential and commercial development and associated infrastructure, and parks and other open space, to be carried out over anticipated period of about 15 to 30 years, depending upon market conditions. The Specific Plan is a land use plan that designates the general character and location of types of development within the project site, but does not include detailed development plans such as proposed building footprints or exact extent and depth of excavation or other ground disturbance that might be required for the various components of development. Development details, such as specific building footprints, excavation depths, and pipeline routes will be developed as individual developments are brought forward, during each phase of Specific Plan implementation. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) of the Proposed Action therefore must be assumed to include the entire extent of the project site, including those areas designated under the Specific Plan for preservation as undeveloped open space. Even these open space areas, located primarily in the corridors along Curry and Federico Creeks (described below), would be subject to substantial ground disturbance as the Specific Plan is implemented, through the development of proposed pedestrian pathways, storm water outfalls, and bioswales adjacent to the streams. In addition, the Specific Plan proposes that about 45 acres of wetland mitigation area be constructed in the floodplains of Federico and Curry Creeks, which could result in fairly extensive ground disturbance in these areas. Thus, it must be assumed the entire project site would potentially be subject to subsurface disturbance.

The project site consists of gently rolling terrain with elevations that range from approximately 75 feet to 125 feet (23 to 38 meters) above mean sea level. The existing average slope across the site from east to west is approximately 0.5 of one percent. Limited cuts and fills will be necessary to construct the project. Grading for building pads, recreational facilities, roads, and infrastructure will require average cuts and fills over the site of approximately 1.0 to 2.0+ feet (0.3 to 0.6 meter). Limited portions of the site will have cuts and fills up to approximately 6.0+ feet (1.8 meters). Backbone utilities within the roads will have trenches that range in depth from 3.0 to 25.0+ feet (0.9 to 78.6 meters) from future finished grade. For purposes of analysis in this EIS, it is assumed that in most cases the depth of excavation on the site (the vertical APE) would be less than 6 feet (1.8 meters) below ground surface. In this area the likelihood of encountering archaeological deposits below hardpan—which generally is encountered at about 3 feet (0.9 meters) depth - is slight, due to the age of deeper deposits.

The Proposed Action also would include some off-site improvements, as detailed in the Project Description (**Chapter 2.0, Proposed Action and Alternatives**, of this EIS). These would include construction of underground utility lines in Westbrook Boulevard, which runs north-south through the project site and extend north of the project site about 0.25 mile (0.4 kilometer) to Pleasant Grove Boulevard; widening of Baseline Road along the southern margin of the project site, and for about 1,000 feet (305 meters) east and west of the project site; widening of Fiddymont Road, which runs along

the eastern boundary of the project site; and improvements to Watt Road for about 1,000 feet (305 meters) south of the project site. The width of the APE along Westbrook Boulevard is about 750 feet (229 meters); along Baseline Road it is about 375 feet (114 meters) south of the existing road pavement; and along Watt Avenue is about 750 feet (229 meters).

The project site is located in the City of Roseville in Placer County near the eastern margin of the Sacramento Valley. The project site consists of gently rolling topography vegetated primarily in open non-native grasslands. Curry Creek, a perennial watercourse that traverses the southern and western portion of the project site, is vegetated with willows, cottonwoods and a few oaks. There is a stand of (non-native) eucalyptus trees on the southwestern part of the site. The site also includes the courses of two seasonal intermittent streams, and scattered vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands. The majority of the project site is undeveloped and historically has been used primarily for dry farming and cattle grazing operations, with associated rural residences.

### **3.6.2.2 Regional Prehistory, Ethnography and History**

#### ***Regional Prehistory, Ethnography and Prehistoric and Contact Period Archaeology***

The cultural chronology described below is derived from data summaries for the project site provided in ECORP summary technical archaeological report (2006, rev. 2007: pp 6-10). This report was prepared in support of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report.

#### **Early Occupation of Central California**

Central California was occupied by at least 10,000 years ago, but archaeological evidence of this earliest occupation is sparse. The earliest California residents probably hunted late-Pleistocene big game. Evidence of early occupation in central California, commonly in the form of buried archaeological deposits, is most often found near the shores of the large pluvial lakes that were present in the Great Basin and the southern San Joaquin Valley. No such pluvial features were present prehistorically in the project area. A single, deeply buried deposit on the bank of Arcade Creek, north of Sacramento, which contained grinding tools and large, stemmed projectile points, represents the earliest known occupation in the general project region, with an estimated occupation date between about 6,000 and 3,000 B.C.

The earliest prehistoric culture that is well represented in the central California archaeological record in the general region of the Proposed Action is evidenced by sites of the Windmill Tradition, dating from about 3,500 B.C. to 1,000 B.C. in the Sacramento Valley, in particular the Sacramento Delta region. Assemblages from these sites include well finished projectile points; an array of shell beads and ornaments; milling stone, mortars and pestles; fishing implements; well finished "charmstones," often found in graves (and that may have served as net weights, spindle whorls, or for hunting, magic, or other unknown ritual functions); and distinctive burial patterns that included extended burials with heads oriented to the west and the extensive use of red ochre. The archaeological assemblage suggests a diverse subsistence practice that included hunting of deer and other game, salmon fishing and use of both hard seeds and of acorns. The Windmill culture may be ancestral to the Penutian-speaking Nisenan, the ethnographic occupants of the project area. There are no known Windmill sites in the project vicinity.

### Later Prehistoric Occupations

The Consumes Tradition (1700 B.C. to A.D. 500) appears to be an outgrowth of the Windmill Tradition. After about 1,000 B.C.; archaeological sites in the Delta region indicate an increased subsistence focus on acorns and salmon. Like the Windmill people, the Cosumnes people continued to occupy knolls and similar high spots above the floodplain of the Sacramento River and the terraces of the Sacramento tributaries. Populations increased and villages became more numerous, and there is an increase in milling tools and specialized equipment for hunting and fishing in archaeological deposits. Trade goods such as seashell and obsidian become more common as burial associations, which suggests an increase in inter-regional trade. Burial styles became more varied, with the addition of flexed interments along with the extended ones of the Windmill period. Projectile points found embedded in the bones of excavated skeletons suggest that warfare was on the rise, possibly as a result of increased competition over available resources and trade.

The Hotchkiss Tradition, which succeeds the Cosumnes Tradition, appeared around 500 A.D. in archaeological deposits in the project region, and persisted into historic times. Subsistence during this time focused on acorns and salmon, and also included the use of deer, waterfowl, hard seeds, and a range of other plant and animal resources. Archaeologically, the Hotchkiss Tradition is represented by numerous large village sites on the lower Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries, and throughout the Delta region. The number and density of archaeological sites suggests that population continued to increase. Trade goods continue to increase. Increased diversity in the number and variety of grave goods has been suggested to indicate social stratification. The artifact inventory includes large numbers and a wide variety of bone tools, but fewer milling tools and polished charmstones. Ground stone pipes become abundant and fired and unfired clay objects appear. Shell beads provide fine chronological stratification during this period.

Palumbo (1966) studied 32 prehistoric archaeological sites in the Dry Creek drainage, including four within a mile of the project site.

### Project Area Ethnography

The project site is within the southwestern part of the territory of the Nisenan, or Southern Maidu cultural group. The Valley Nisenan lived in large sedentary or semi-sedentary villages along the Sacramento River. The Nisenan—both the Valley Nisenan, and the Southern and Northern Hill Nisenan, who lived in the Sierra foothills, to the east—used the grassy plains between the river and the Sierra foothills, including the project site, mainly for foraging. Politically, the Nisenan traditionally were divided into tribelets, each of which occupied a primary village or villages, and several associated outlying hamlets. Each village included family dwellings, acorn granaries, a sweathouse, and a dancehouse. Hunting and foraging practices were varied and a wide range of resources were used, although acorns probably were the primary staple. The Nisenan participated in an extensive trade network through which good from throughout California and beyond made their way into the material inventory. Important among the goods obtained in trade were obsidian for projectile points, and marine

shell beads. Some elements of traditional occupation apparently continued in the project area into the 1860s (cf. EIP Associates 2004: 4.8-2, as reported in ECORP 2007: 9).

### ***Regional History and Historic Built Environment***

Spanish explorers entered the Central Valley by about 1769 but did not establish any settlements there. The first substantial European incursions into the region were triggered by the discovery of gold in the Sierra foothills in 1848, at which time the City of Sacramento was laid out and a major population influx into the region began. During the gold rush, numerous claims were worked along the American River, 5 miles east of the project site, but there was little activity on the project site as the streams running through the project site did not cross gold-bearing deposits. The Roseville area provided some agricultural support of the burgeoning gold rush population, but thin soils and a paucity of water supported only marginal farming and ranching in the project area. There was some settlement of these more marginal areas by the 1860s, however. The project vicinity was used for grazing and dry farming of crops such as wheat and hay. The historic archaeological record for this area would be expected to include late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century residences, farm and ranch support buildings, and ancillary features such as privy pits, wells, windmills, cisterns, fence lines and corrals.

The development of regional and interstate railroads was very important in the history of Roseville as early as 1855. Railroad development spurred other economic activity, particularly after the Southern Pacific Railroad reached Roseville in 1887 and, after the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, established freight yards there. The Sacramento Northern Railroad ran parallel with Baseline Road, south of the project site. This was an electric interurban line, established around 1905 to provide service between Sacramento and Chico and later extended into the San Francisco Bay area. The line carried passengers until about 1940, and after that carried only freight. Its electrical power was replaced by diesel engines in the 1950s. After this time, the line operated as a series of branch lines, most only sporadically or seasonally, and some segments were removed entirely (Groff 2008). South of Baseline Road, in the project vicinity, the railroad has been removed. Although traces of the berm can be found, most of its remnants have been substantially altered by past grading (cf. Windmiller et al. 2005). The railroad alignment lies outside of the project APE.

Other important industries in this part of the Sacramento Valley have included granite and gravel extraction and the development of large-scale reclamation and irrigation projects. However, there is no evidence of mineral extraction activities or large-scale reclamation or irrigation activities within or adjacent to the project site or the off-site alternative site.

The Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), a federal agency, constructed an extensive network of high voltage power lines throughout the Sacramento Valley, starting in the 1930s, to carry hydroelectric power generated at the Northern California dams of the Central Valley Project throughout the region. The Elverta-Roseville line, constructed in 1955, runs across the project site. The WAPA facilities are continuously maintained and upgraded to modern standards.

Many roadways in the Sacramento Valley follow routes established as early as the 1850s. Baseline Road, which runs along the southern edge of the project site, appears on the 1892 and 1929 GLO Plats but, on

these maps, the roadway extends westward from Roseville only to Fiddymment Road, at the southeastern corner of the project site (cf. Windmiller et al. 2005). Baseline Road now continues along the southern boundary of the project site and is a modern paved road. Fiddymment Road also is a historic road route, although it also has been fully modernized. There are no mapped historic roads within the APE for the Proposed Action, but two historic road segments intersect the south side of Baseline Road, within the APE for off-site improvements.

### **3.6.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK – APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES**

#### **3.6.3.1 Federal**

##### ***National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106***

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) establishes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and defines federal criteria for determining the historical significance of archaeological sites, historic buildings and other resources. Under Section 106 of the NHPA the lead federal lead agency is required to identify the area of potential effects for its undertaking (the Proposed Action here); to identify any potential historic properties within the area of potential effects; to apply the National Register criteria of significance to determine whether any of the identified properties qualify as historic properties (that is, cultural resources that meet the significance criteria that determine their eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]); and determine whether the undertaking's effects on eligible historic properties would be adverse. The effort to identify potential historic properties must include not only archival research and archaeological and architectural surveys, but also outreach to the public and efforts to include potentially interested parties, such as Native American and other ethnic groups, and historical societies, which may have information about the presence of potential historic properties.

To be determined eligible for the NRHP, a potential historic property must meet one of four historical significance criteria (listed below), and also must possess sufficient deposition, architectural, or historic integrity to retain the ability to convey the resource's historic significance. Resources determined to meet these criteria are eligible for listing in the NRHP and are termed historic properties. A resource may be eligible at the local, state, or national level of significance.

A property is eligible for the NRHP if it possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and it:

- (a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- (b) Is associated with the lives of a person or persons significance in our past;
- (c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic value, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory of history.

A resource that lacks historic integrity or does not meet one of the NRHP criteria of eligibility is not considered a historic property, and effects to such a resource are not considered significant under the NHPA. However, Section 106 requires the federal lead agency to assess the significance of the effects of its actions upon those resources that are determined to be historic properties. Section 106 also establishes a consultation process under which the federal lead agency may consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to take these effects into account in federal decision making regarding approval of the undertaking. A process also is established for mitigating significant effects on historic properties.

### ***US Army Corps of Engineers Responsibility for Section 106 relative to Clean Water Act Section 404***

A project that requires a federal permit, such as a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit to address potential effects to wetlands, is considered a federal undertaking under Section 106 of the NHPA (as described above). In considering whether to issue a 404 permit, the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), as the federal lead agency under Section 106 of the NHPA, has a responsibility to take into account the effects of the proposed action on historic properties.

The USACE complies with the NHPA through implementing procedures set forth at 33 CFR 325, Appendix C and the Interim Guidance (33 CFR 325). The USACE drafted Appendix C in 1981 (with revisions in 1990) as the historic properties review procedure for USACE permits. A copy of these regulations can be found at <http://www.usace.army.mil/cw/cecwo/reg/33cfr325.htm>.

#### **3.6.3.2 State**

##### ***California Environmental Quality Act***

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15064.5, 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. This subsection defines cultural resources as including both historical and archaeological properties, establishes the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), sets forth criteria for establishing the significance of historical resources, and finds that cultural resources that meet the criteria of eligibility for the CRHR are significant historical resources. The criteria for eligibility of resources to the CRHR closely mirror the NRHP criteria listed above.

##### ***California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code 5097.98***

Under the California Health and Safety Code, the intentional disturbance, mutilation, or removal of interred human remains is a misdemeanor. The code requires that, upon discovery of human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery, the County Coroner must be notified and further ground disturbance must cease until the County Coroner makes a report determining whether the find represents a crime scene or a Native American burial. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be those of a Native American, he must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. Public Resources Code 5097.98 sets forth procedures by which the NAHC may identify a Most Likely

Descendant, who may inspect the remains and consult with the landowner to provide for the respectful treatment and/or reinterment of the remains.

### 3.6.3.3 Local

In addition to cultural resources as recognized by Section 106 of the NRHP and CEQA, the City of Roseville's General Plan contains the following policies to address cultural resources:

**Policy OD-1:** When items of historical, cultural, or archaeological significance are discovered within the City, a qualified archaeologist or historian shall be called to evaluate the find and to recommend a proper action.

**Policy OD-2:** Significant archaeological sites shall, when feasible, be incorporated into open space areas.

**Policy OD-3:** Subject to appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, artifacts which are discovered and subsequently determined to be "removable," shall be offered for dedication to Maidu Park Native American Interpretive Center.

**Policy OD-5:** Establish standards for the designation, improvement, and protection of buildings, landmarks and sites of cultural and historic character.

## 3.6.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

### 3.6.4.1 Significance Thresholds

Under the NHPA, the federal Lead Agency is required to take into account the effects of its undertakings upon historic properties. If historic properties are present within the project Area of Potential Effects, the Lead Agency must determine whether its actions would adversely affect the significance of the historic property.

Under federal regulations, a project has an effect on an historic property when the undertaking could alter the characteristics of the property that may qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP. An undertaking may be considered to have an adverse effect on an historic property when it may diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to,

- physical destruction, alteration, or removal of all or part of the property;
- change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;
- introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;
- neglect of a property resulting in its deterioration; or
- the transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of federal ownership (36 CFR 800.9).



### 3.6.4.2 Analysis Methodology

Under the NHPA, identification of cultural resources impacts is a three-step process, as described under **Regulatory Setting** above: (1) Identification; (2) Assessment of resource integrity and significance; and (3) Effects assessment. This subsection describes the methods through which the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternative on cultural resources were assessed, and results of this process.

#### *Identification and Assessment of Potential Historic Properties within the Project Area of Potential Effects*

##### **Records Searches**

Records searches were conducted for various portions of the property at the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento in August 2005, April 2006, October 2006, and July 2009. The purpose of the record searches was to determine the extent of previous surveys within a 0.5-mile (1,600 meter) radius of the project site, and whether previously documented historic or historic archaeological sites, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties exist within this area. In addition to the official records and maps of archaeological sites and surveys in Placer County, the following historic references were reviewed:

- The National Register of Historic Places;
- California Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates);
- California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates);
- Gold Districts of California (1979);
- California Gold Camps (1975);
- California Place Names (1969);
- Survey of Surveys (Historic and Architectural Resources) (1989);
- Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory (1999);
- Caltrans Local Bridge Survey (1989);
- Caltrans State Bridge Survey (1987); and
- Historic Spots in California (1990).

Records searches indicated that 10 previous archaeological surveys had been conducted in or within 0.5 mile (0.8 kilometer) of the project site, covering approximately 60 percent of the total area within 0.5 mile (0.8 kilometer) of the project site. Several additional surveys had covered portions of the APEs for proposed off-site improvements. No prehistoric archaeological sites were identified within the project area in these previous studies. Twelve historic period resources had been identified: none of these have been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the NRHP.

### **Native American Consultation and Public Involvement**

In conjunction with each of the surveys listed above, consultants contacted the NAHC to conduct searches of their Sacred Lands Files for Sacred Sites and/or Traditional Cultural Properties in California. Records searched with NAHC indicated that no sacred lands or traditional cultural properties have been identified in the project APE. The NAHC supplied a list of appropriate Native American tribal and cultural group contacts for the project site. As part of each resource identification effort, letters were written to each identified Native American contact, inquiring about any concerns for the project site with respect to potential traditional cultural properties, burial sites and/or archaeological sites. Each letter was followed up by phone. No written responses were received.

In phone contacts in 2010 in conjunction with a resurvey of a 460-acre (186 hectares) parcel within the project area, two Native American contacts responded by phone. One Native American contact indicated a general concern about the potential for discovery of burials during construction; another contact requested that all appropriate agencies be notified about the project. The President of the Board of the Roseville Historical Society indicated that she had no knowledge of historical resources within the 460-acre (186 hectares) parcel. No other responses or comments have been received to date.

### **Archaeological Surveys**

The entire project site was surveyed for cultural resources in a series of archaeological and historic architectural surveys of various portions of the project site between 2001 and 2010. Archaeologists with ECORP Consulting, Inc. conducted a series of surveys in August 2005 through July 2006, November 2006, April 2007, July 2009, and September 2010. Cultural Resources Unlimited surveyed a portion of the project area in 2001, and Foothill Associates surveyed another portion of the property in 2005. Systematic intensive archaeological surveys within the past 10 years have covered the entire project area at transect intervals of no greater than 30 meters (98) feet. Where surface visibility was limited, the soil was scraped to create surface exposures at 50 m (164 feet) intervals. Twenty-one cultural resources, all of the historic period, were identified. Each of these resources is described below.

With respect to proposed off-site improvements, the extension of Westbrook Boulevard between the project site and Pleasant Grove Boulevard was surveyed by URS in 2002 and ECORP in 2005. The APE also includes a 50-foot-wide (15-meter-wide) corridor within the eastern project boundary for the widening of Fiddymment Road to add one travel lane. This part of the APE was included within the project site APE, with surveys that are reported above. With respect to the proposed widening of Baseline Road, the APE for the north side of the road between the southeast and the southwest corners of the project site was included within the project site APE and was included in the surveys listed above. The APE for the south side of the road, including the area of improvements to Watt Avenue, was surveyed by Wohlgeomuth (2008) and previously by Windmiller (2005). Results of those surveys are reported below. In addition, ECORP carried out subsurface probing along Curry Creek in 2010 (ECORP 2011), at the request of the USACE, in an effort to further assess the potential for buried archaeological deposits. The results of that assessment also are described below.

### **Built Environment Resource Identification and Assessment**

Standing structures of the historic period (that is, 50 years of age or older) were identified at one site within the project area and one site within an off-site improvement APE. JRP Historical Consultants (JRP) inventoried and assessed the integrity and historical significance of the standing structures at the site within the project site (JRP 2007) and Wohlgemuth (2005) assessed the significance of the site within the Baseline Road off-site improvement area. Results of these assessments are included in the discussion below. JRP also assessed the historical significance of a Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) transmission line that runs through the project area, which has been recorded with primary resource number P-31-3280. Built in 1952, this line is slightly older than 50 years. Results of this assessment are presented below.

### **Archaeological Testing and Significance Assessment**

ECORP (2006) carried out historic archival research to provide historic context and assess the eligibility of the recorded sites under NRHP criteria A, B, and C (association with important events or persons, or work of a master). They also conducted archaeological test excavations at several historic sites identified within the survey area to evaluate whether any of these sites include archaeological materials that would support eligibility to the NRHP under Criterion D (potential to yield data important to history) and retain archaeological integrity.

### **Results of Cultural Resources Identification and Assessment**

Records searches and the site surveys listed above resulted in the identification of 21 cultural resources within the project area, including both the project site itself and the area for proposed off-site improvements. These include: three sites that include building foundations, structures or groups of structures; four trash deposits, three minimal trash scatters that have not been formally recorded; one electrical transmission line; two historic road alignments; one fence line; and seven isolate features or artifacts, all dating from the historic period. Each of these resources is described below. Included in each description is a discussion of any archaeological testing conducted to define horizontal and vertical boundaries of the site and to assess historical significance and integrity, and the conclusions of these assessments with respect to whether the resource qualifies as an historic property under NRHP Criteria.

#### ***Cultural Resources within the Project APE***

The following 17 cultural resources were identified within the - APE for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan:

**CA-PLA-1897H (P-31-2703; EC-05-18).** This site is a ranch complex of mixed age, organized around a circular access drive. The complex includes one standing barn, remnants of a second barn, two single-family residences; modern farm equipment, barns, and sheds; a stock pond and water pumps; and an archaeological deposit that may represent an earlier ranch complex. ECORP recorded the site and conducted archaeological testing to assess archaeological integrity and potential to yield important information. JRP conducted archival research and assessed the historical significance of standing structures.

Dwelling 1 is a single-family Minimal Traditional style residence with a side gable roof that has been extended to provide a covered porch along one length of the residence. The structure is clad in wood-channel siding and has a composite shingle roof and metal casement windows with wood trim. Based on aerial photographs and the US Geological Survey (USGS) Quad Maps and Placer County Assessor's records, this dwelling was constructed on the site around 1950.

Dwelling 2 is a single-family residence with the characteristics of hip-roof cottages. The building is clad in ship-lap siding. The hip roof is covered by composite shingles, with hip dormers on the north and south ends. A shed roof has been added on the south side, supported by wooden posts and sheltering a full porch and the front door. Based on the style and massing of this building, this porch appears to be a later addition or replacement. A second shed roof covers another enclosed addition on the north side of the building. The dwelling has sliding aluminum replacement windows with wood trim and wood louvers in the dormers and clearly has been substantially altered since the time of its construction. Based on style and materials, the cottage dates to about 1910. Aerial photos and USGS maps suggest that this dwelling was moved to this site after 1958 and before 1981.

Barn 1 is a front-gable rectangular building. The roof is clad in corrugated metal with open eaves. A shed-roof extension has been added to the north side of the barn. Barn 1 was constructed between 1949 and 1958. Barn 2 is a modern front gable building. It replaced a large barn visible in the 1958 aerial of the site, and it rests on a small portion of the large concrete foundation of the older barn.

JRP (2007) evaluated the significance of this property under NRHP criteria A, B, and C. They concluded that the property's historic integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association has been compromised by the relocation of Dwelling 2 and the demolition of the earlier large barn. The property does not appear to have important associations with a historical event or trend. Construction of the existing complex between 1950 and 1981 and its use as a farmstead and motorcycle repair shop does not appear significant to the development of agriculture or industry in Placer County and it therefore does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A. Under Criterion B, the property does not appear to have important or direct associations with individuals who individually made significant contributions to an identifiable class, profession, or social or ethnic group. Under Criterion C, all four buildings are modest examples of their types, are of common design, and do not appear to be important examples of a type, period, region or method of construction, nor do they appear to represent the work of a master or possess high artistic value.

Land records indicate that the land where CA-PLA-1897H is located was first purchased in 1874 by J.B. Hicken, a sheep rancher with extensive holding in the Roseville area. W.L. Weyant purchased the 80-acre parcel and adjacent lands around 1885. According to tax records, the Weyant family built a house in the adjacent Section 33 and lived there until around 1896, but did not develop the property that included the CA-PLA-1897H site in adjacent Section 34. However, a 1910 USGS map shows a structure in the vicinity of CA-PLA-1897H and no structures in adjacent Section 34. The history of this parcel is therefore unclear.

ECORP (2006) conducted archaeological testing to assess whether subsurface materials were present at CA-PLA-1897H that might make the site eligible for the NRHP under Criteria D. The site did not include a surface artifact scatter. Sixty linear feet of backhoe trenches were excavated to a 5 foot depth. Backhoe trenches excavated around the standing 1950s buildings did not yield any cultural material. A trench excavated at the location of the house shown on the 1910 map yielded sparse domestic artifacts including bottle glass and ceramics. Some of which were dateable to 1880-1920, but most were not diagnostic as to period. The artifacts did not come from a concentrated deposit, such as a privy or a refuse pit, but were dispersed throughout the backhoe trench. The trench stratigraphy and ground surface indicated that the area had been disturbed previously by grading, possibly by demolition of the house shown on the 1910 USGS map.

Based on this testing, only sparse and disturbed historic material is present at the site. The minimal material recovered has little potential to yield information important to history, particularly given the apparent absence of historical documentary records for late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century development at this site. EC-05-18 therefore does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D, or under any of the other NRHP criteria discussed above, and does not qualify as a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1898H (P-31-2703; EC-05-19).** This site is a historic refuse dump with two loci, one of which includes the remains of a 1930s car and car parts. ECORP conducted a systematic surface collection of all materials on the surface, excluding only modern debris. Collected artifacts included automotive parts, glass bottles and jars, fragments of ceramic bowls, dishes, and related domestic debris, including children's items. Much of the collected material was not definitive as to age; items that could be dated ranged primarily from the 1930s to the 1950s.

ECORP excavated four surface transect units in the refuse scatters. These encountered hardpan at depths of 25 to 40 centimeters (cm) (10 to 16 inches [in]), where excavation was terminated. These excavations yielded only chronologically non-diagnostic window and bottle glass and nails.

Due to the lack of historical associations, CA-PLA-1898H does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A or B. The site also does not include any features of artistic merit nor is it an important example of its type, and it therefore is not eligible under Criterion C. Finally, based on the absence of historical associations and the paucity of dateable or otherwise diagnostic material, the site is not eligible under NRHP Criterion D. CA-PLA-1898H therefore does not qualify as a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1988H (P-31-2874; EC-06-74).** This site consists of a house foundation constructed of poured concrete with wood and particle board. All surface features above the foundation appear to have burned in a fire. The foundation of a modern day barn is located northeast of the house foundation. The house foundation includes particle board, which was not in widespread use until the 1960s. Therefore, this site was likely not occupied until the 1960s. It is therefore less than 50 years old. On that basis, and in the absence of historical associations, the site is not eligible for the NRHP and does not qualify as a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1989H (P-31-2875; EC-06-76).** This site consists of three concentrations of historic refuse in a manmade ditch. Two of the loci consist of bottle glass fragments, miscellaneous metal scraps, cans and ceramic fragments. The third concentration is a pile of broken concrete from a building foundation.

ECORP conducted a systematic surface collection of the site and excavated six surface transect units to depths of 20 cm to 40 cm (8-in to 16-in). Only two of the subsurface units yielded cultural material. The dumps contain domestic refuse that dates from the 1920s to the 1960s, primarily jars and bottles for food, medicine, beverages, and cosmetics. Two episodes of dumping may be indicated: one in the 1930s and a second in the 1960s.

This site is one of three dumps of domestic refuse located along a tributary of Curry Creek in Sections 26 and 35 and it cannot be associated definitively with a specific individual or family. While the material found at this site dates to approximately the same period as the nearby Evans occupation, there is no information or definitive material tie to confirm this speculation. The site lacks historical associations, contains no significant features and in the absence of historical associations, appears to have little potential to yield information important to history. EC-05-76 is therefore not eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A, B, C, or D and does not qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-2873 (EC-06-77).** This site consists of a windmill foundation, comprised of a concrete base with metal pump mounted in the center and metal posts protruding from each corner. Pieces of metal blades are scattered in close proximity. The windmill may have been installed and used by the Evans brothers, who farmed this parcel in the 1920s. The windmill structure is not present today. In the absence of a structure and of any material associations, the site lacks historical integrity and historic associations and has no potential to yield information beyond its recorded location. P-31-2873 therefore is not eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A, B, C, or D and does not qualify as a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1899H (P-31-1255; EC-05-20; not relocated in 2010).** This site is a historic refuse dump in a drainage area. ECORP carried out a systematic surface collection of the site and excavated three surface transect units to hardpan, at 10 cm to 50 cm (4-in to 20-in). One of the surface transect units yielded non-diagnostic bottle glass and the other units were culturally sterile below the surface. Artifacts collected on the surface included scrap metal, glass bleach bottles, glass food and beverage containers, and fragments of decorated ceramic and glass plates and bowls, all of which would appear to be domestic refuse

This site is one of three dumps of domestic refuse located in the general vicinity. It cannot be associated with a specific individual, family, or event. All three dumps contain material that dates from the 1920s to the 1960s, and primarily 1930s and 1940s. It is possible that one or all of the dumps might have been associated with the houses occupied by the Evans brothers or their children, but there is no information on dumps in the historical records, nor is there material in the site that would definitively indicate a tie with any particular household. In the absence of historic associations, the site does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A, B, or C. All of the surface material from the site was collected and no diagnostic material was recovered below the surface. P-31-1255 therefore does not appear to retain any information potential and is not eligible under Criterion D. The site therefore does not qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-3280.** JRP (2007) recorded and assessed the WAPA transmission line that runs across the project site. The transmission line was constructed around 1952, and is therefore more than 50 years old. The line was constructed as part of a larger line that carried power between the Elverta and Roseville substations. There is nothing to indicate that this line represents or supports any pioneering advancements in the field of electrical transmission, nor does the line appear to be associated with persons known to have made important advancements in the field of high voltage electrical transmission. The transmission line therefore does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A or B. The towers are modern examples of standard design, do not appear to be the first of their kind, and represent a kind of junction line common to the area, and are therefore not eligible under Criterion C. Neither the alignment nor the towers themselves have the potential to yield historical data (Criterion D) that have not already been preserved by recordation of the alignment route and tower configuration. This resource therefore is not eligible to the National Register under any of the NRHP criteria and does not appear to qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-4344 (SV-001).** This resource, reported in ECORP 2010, is a short segment of a 1.25-inch-diameter (3.18-centimeter-diameter) iron pipe that emerges vertically from the ground, coupled in a "T" at its upper end with a short exposed segment of horizontal pipe. The pipe segments were exposed in grading for a firebreak. The feature was interpreted as a possible historic-period irrigation line or a water line associated with a standing windmill located to the west, just outside the project area.

Archival research did not reveal any information associating this pipeline with important persons or events in the region and it therefore does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A or B. Irrigation and other water distribution features of this type are common throughout the region. The pipeline does not possess any unusual or unique features and is not eligible under Criterion C. The information about the feature's location and design has been recorded and it appears to have no further potential to yield information important to history and therefore is not eligible under Criterion D. This resource therefore does not appear to qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-4345 (SV-002).** This resource consists of an approximately 200-foot-long (61-meter-long) segment of historic fence line that runs parallel with, and 20 feet (6 meters) west of, Fiddymment Road. The remnants of the fence consist of four burnt wooden posts, each 2 to 3 feet (0.6 to 0.9 meter) high, loosely connected with two strands of barbed wire. Cut nails in the fence posts suggest an antiquity of as much as 100 years, since wire nails were introduced around 1910.

Archival research did not reveal any information associating this fence line with important persons or events in the region and it therefore does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A or B. Fence lines of this type are common throughout the region, where they often parallel roadways. The fence line does not possess any unusual or unique features and is not eligible under Criterion C. Although the feature almost certainly is older than 50 years, its location and design have been recorded and it appears to have no further potential to yield information important to history. SV-002 therefore is not eligible under Criterion D. This resource therefore does not appear to qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-4346 (SV-003).** This is a circular pit, 12 feet in diameter. Depth appears to be about 4 feet, but accurate measurement was difficult because the pit was partially filled with water. The feature is interpreted as a livestock pond. Its small size suggests that it could have been hand dug.

Archival research did not reveal any information associating this pit with any specific agricultural or grazing operation, or with important persons or events in the region. It therefore does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A or B. Stock ponds of this type are common in dry grazing regions such as the project area. The pit does not possess any significant artistic, architectural or design features that would suggest that it is eligible under Criterion C. The feature's location and measurements have been recorded and it appears to have no further potential to yield information important to history. SV-003 therefore is not eligible under Criterion D. This resource therefore does not appear to qualify as a historic property.

**P-31-2876 (ISO #1):** This find is an isolate piece of probable farm equipment, with a steel frame, surmounted by wooden beams mounted on an axle with four rubber-tired wheels and a motor. The frame bears several stamped makers marks and numbers. The function of the piece of equipment could not be determined, but it is assumed to be agricultural. The presence of motor and rubber-tired wheels suggests that the equipment postdates about 1910, and it in fact may be much more recent. As an isolate, the find appears to have little potential to yield important historic data and it does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

**P-31-2877 (ISO #2):** This find consists of a generator and well pump mounted on a concrete block. The pump panel bears maker's marks and numbers for "Johnson Gear MFG Co., LTD, Berkeley, CA," a company no longer listed in Berkeley. This pump presumably served an irrigation or stock-watering well. As an isolate, the find has limited information potential and does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

**P-31-2878 (ISO #3) (not relocated at field check in 2010):** This find consists of a single red brick, with evidence of charring. It was found in association with a scatter of modern debris, including a tire, jars, and a food smoker, near the bank of a tributary of Curry Creek. In this context, the find does not appear likely to be associated with a structure and most likely represents casual trash discarded in the modern era. Therefore, this isolate is not eligible to the NRHP.

**P-31-3739 (IO-09-37):** The find consists of a single deteriorated rectangular metal canister, about 9 inches square and 13 inches (33 centimeters) tall, with a friction-type lid, as might be used to contain dry goods like gun powder or flour. The artifact was found near the bank of a tributary of Curry Creek. As an isolate, the artifact has little potential to provide information important to history and it does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

**SV-004 (ECORP 2011; not formally recorded; no primary number assigned):** This site consists of a deposit of historic refuse of unspecified date and type, found within the channel of Curry Creek. ECORP (2010) suggests that the material found here may have been redeposited from the previously recorded CA-PLA-1899H. That site, which was apparently similar in content to SV-004, was previously recorded as located a short distance upstream, but could not be relocated during the 2010 survey. If redeposited, SV-004 would undoubtedly lack integrity and would not be eligible to the NRHP. The site was not formally



recorded and evaluated but, in the absence of historic association with other more intact features, the site does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

**SV-005 (ECORP 2011; not formally recorded; no primary number assigned):** This site was described as similar to and similarly located to SV-004. The site was not formally recorded and evaluated but, like SV-004 and for the same reasons, it does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

**SV-006 (ECORP 2011; not formally recorded; no primary number assigned):** SV-006 was also noted to be a refuse deposit, but no age or content of materials was noted. The deposit is located outside of the high water line of Curry Creek and therefore likely represents dumping, rather than redeposition. Recent tire tracks suggest modern dumping. The site was not formally recorded and evaluated but, in the absence of associations with a historic occupation or features, the site does not appear to be eligible to the NRHP.

#### *Cultural Resource Sites within the APE of Off-Site Improvements*

The following four sites have been recorded within the APE for off-site improvements (Baseline Road):

**P-31-003311:** This potential resource was recorded as Watt-Center Joint Road, a historic rural road that ran along a north-south alignment south of Baseline Road (Wohlgemuth 2008). This alignment, the north end of which may lie within the APE for widening of Baseline Road, was recorded as a potential historic property, but was not evaluated. As the route of a mapped historic road without archaeological features, this resource is unlikely to exhibit qualities, characteristics, or associations that would make it eligible for the NRHP.

**P-31-003312:** This potential resource was recorded as the historic alignment of Walerga Road, an historic rural road that ran along a north-south alignment south of Baseline Road (Wohlgemuth 2008), extending Fiddymment Road southward. This alignment, the north end of which may lie within the APE for widening of Baseline Road, was recorded as a potential historic property, but was not evaluated. As the route of a mapped historic road without archaeological features, this resource is unlikely to exhibit qualities, characteristics, or associations that would make it eligible for the NRHP.

**P-31-001137:** This is a small, unornamented one-story building that housed equipment used to assist instrument landings at McClellan Air Force Base. As summarized in Windmiller (2005: 26-27), McClellan Air Force Base, located in Sacramento County, in the North Highlands area of northwest Sacramento, was originally established in 1935. Development at the site ramped up with the onset of World War II. The site was renamed McClellan Field in 1939 and McClellan Air Force Base in 1947. The property on which P-31-001137 is located was acquired by the US Air Force in 1952 as the increasing demands of aviation necessitated development of aviation instrument landing system (ILS) equipment sites that could be dedicated to military air traffic. The instrument shelter structure was built at the site in 1955. Its instrumentation operated until 1978, by which time the equipment had become obsolete. The Air Force dismantled the equipment and sold the property in 1988. McClellan Air Force Base was decommissioned in 2001. The ILS structure no longer shows evidence of its historic-period function and there are no related features in the vicinity that would suggest that this could be an element of a historic district. The

structure was evaluated as not eligible to the NRHP (cf. Wohlgemuth 2008: 39; Windmiller 2005: 102). The structure is within the alignment of the proposed Baseline Road widening.

**CA-PLA-945H (P-31-001135):** This site is a small historic-period refuse scatter within the APE for the Baseline Road widening (Wohlgemuth 2008). The site was recorded in 1999 as including a variety of ceramics and glass bottle fragments, but resurvey in 2008 recorded only one glass bottle fragment and one earthenware fragment. Windmiller (2005) assessed the site as not eligible to the California Register of Historical Resources. On the basis of Windmiller's description of the site, which suggests that the deposit has lost its historic integrity through agricultural disturbance, the site appears unlikely to be eligible for the NRHP.

### **Conclusions: Identified Historic Properties**

On the basis of the description and assessments presented above, none of the cultural resources identified within the project site or the area of off-site improvements appear to qualify as a historic property. Therefore, there are no known historic properties in the APE of the proposed undertaking.

### **Efforts to Identify Potential Buried Archaeological Deposits**

Although further south in the Sacramento area and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, archaeological deposits have been found buried under 10 feet or more of alluvium, geoarchaeological study of the project area (Cogstone 2010) indicates that the project vicinity probably has not been subject to deep and regular flooding or other significant alluvial deposition such as might have buried archaeological deposits. Cogstone's geoarchaeological assessment of geological records and of soil exposures within the project site, particularly in creek channels, indicates that project area soils consist entirely of late Pleistocene sediments-Riverbank Formation deposits, deposited 300,000 to 100,000 years before present, with Turlock Formation deposits, 700,000 to 500,000 before present in the southeast corner of the project site. Sandstone baserock and hardpan on the project site are overlain by a thin (20 cm [8 in] to less than 1 m [3.3 feet] thick) topsoil of decomposed Pleistocene sedimentary soils. Except for the shallow alluvium overlying the hardpan soils, the soil present on the site predates the entry of humans into California by hundreds of thousands of years, and the project site, in general, does not appear to have been subject to significant later alluvial deposition that might have buried later archaeological deposits, with the possible exception of areas along the banks of Curry Creek. Curry Creek has a wide bed with a highly meandering course. Cogstone's inspection of the bank cuts along the creek did not identify any evidence of buried archaeological deposits. On the basis of geoarchaeological assessment, the potential for deeply buried prehistoric deposits to be present within the Specific Plan area appears to be slight. However, if prehistoric deposits were present in the soils overlying the hardpan along the banks of Curry Creek, it is possible that these may have been buried by alluvium deposited as the result of meandering and flooding of Curry Creek.

ECORP conducted limited auger borings along Curry Creek in August, 2010 to verify Cogstone's geoarchaeological conclusions regarding the presence or likelihood for buried prehistoric archaeological deposits along the banks of Curry Creek within the project area. Auger testing focused on older, unmodified portions of the creek banks (ECORP 2010 and 2011). A total of 10 10-cm (4-inches) diameter

auger probes were bored at distance of 2 to 10 meters [6.6 to 32.8 feet]) from the banks of Curry Creek to hardpan, which was encountered at depths ranging between 18 and 125 cm (7 and 49 inches) below surface. None of the probes encountered any buried cultural materials or deposits. While this tends to confirm that alluvial soils on the site of an age that potentially could contain or cover archaeological deposits are very shallow, and that the potential to encounter substantial buried archaeological deposits during construction likely is low, it is nonetheless possible that shallow cultural deposits might be present in the alluvium that overlies the hardpan.

#### Assessment of Effects

Twenty-one potential historic properties were identified within the APE. As detailed above, none of these resources appear to meet any of the criteria of eligibility for listing on the NRHP. The USACE has therefore determined (subject to concurrence by the SHPO) that the Proposed Action would have no effect on historic properties. The Proposed Action and on-site alternatives nonetheless have the potential to affect undiscovered cultural resources that could be discovered during construction and that could qualify as historic properties. This issue is discussed below.

### 3.6.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Impact CR-1 Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction

**Proposed Action** The Proposed Action would result in **significant** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

No historic properties have been identified in the project APE, including both the horizontal and vertical areas of potential effect, and geoarchaeological data suggest that the potential for buried prehistoric deposits to be present on the project site is low, including the areas near Curry Creek. However, it is possible that past meanders of the creek or undocumented flood events might have resulted in burial of prehistoric or historic archaeological features or deposits along Curry Creek that have not been discovered through the archaeological investigations reported here. The Proposed Action preserves an open space corridor along Curry Creek and Federico Creek where no buildings would be constructed. However ground disturbing activities associated with the construction of trails, stormwater outfalls, and wetland mitigation areas would occur in these areas and culverts and bridges would also be built where needed to provide circulation and drainage on the site. If a NRHP-eligible buried archaeological deposit or feature, or human remains—either in an archaeological context or in isolation—were discovered during construction, disturbance or destruction of the deposit or the remains would constitute a **significant** effect to an historic property. **Mitigation Measure CR-1a** is proposed to avoid or reduce an inadvertent significant effect on previously unknown historic properties encountered

during construction in any portion of the site to **less than significant**.

Furthermore, the USACE has determined that while **Mitigation Measure CR-1a** would reduce the potential to damage or destroy buried cultural resources, there is still the potential that prehistoric archaeological materials, in particular, could be encountered as the result of project-related excavation within the Curry Creek or Federico Creek corridors. If such resources were encountered during construction, they might not be recognized as such by construction workers and, if work did not stop, could be damaged or destroyed. In this case, the **significant** effect would not be fully mitigated.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b**, also listed below, would be implemented for any work activities within the Curry Creek and Federico Creek corridors. This mitigation measure requires archaeological monitoring of excavations within the shallow (18 to 125 cm [7 to 49 inches) deposits overlying hardpan soils along Curry and Federico creeks. With the incorporation of this measure, the significant effect on unanticipated historic properties found during construction would be reduced to **less than significant**.

**No Action**

The No Action Alternative would result in **significant** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

Under the No Action Alternative, no project work would be carried out within the waters of the United States on the project site. Under this alternative, there would be no ground disturbance at all along Curry Creek or Federico Creek. Since this is the area within the project site that has the highest potential for previously undiscovered archaeological deposits to be present, under this alternative the potential to encounter previously undiscovered buried cultural resources would be small. The requirements of the NHPA with regard to eligibility of resources to the NRHP and involvement of the federal lead agency in effects determination and mitigation also would not apply. However, there would still be some potential for undiscovered buried archaeological deposits to be present and to be impacted by ground disturbance elsewhere within the project site. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on undiscovered historic properties or human remains would be **significant** under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation for unanticipated archaeological discoveries (**Mitigation Measure CR-1a**) is proposed that would reduce this effect to **less than significant**.

**Alts. 1, 2, 3  
(On Site)**

All of the on-site alternatives would result in **significant** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

All of the on-site alternatives have the potential to encounter unanticipated buried

cultural deposits. However, the total area of ground disturbance on the site would be reduced and the amount of ground disturbance along Curry Creek (the most sensitive area for potential buried prehistoric deposits) and Federico Creek would also be reduced. Nonetheless, there would be some potential to encounter buried prehistoric deposits, potentially along stream channels. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on undiscovered historic properties or human remains would be **significant** under all of the on-site alternatives. **Mitigation Measures CR-1a** and **CR-1b** are proposed that would reduce this effect to **less than significant**.

**Alt. 4  
(Off Site)**

Alternative 4 would result in **significant** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

Alternative 4 site is geographically and historically similar to the project site. Curry Creek and two intermittent creeks traverse the alternative site, and it includes a scattering of buildings and building clusters that probably represent historic and modern ranch sites and ranch structures similar to those recorded at the project site.

An archaeological records search of the alternative site was carried out at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System in January 2011. About 10 percent of the alternative site area has been subject to past archaeological surveys, and these surveys resulted in recordation of eight cultural resources within the alternative site boundaries, all of the historic period. Recorded resources include one bridge, five houses (dating from ca. 1908 to the modern era, some with associated ranch-related structures), and two modern roads on historic alignments. The bridge was determined not eligible to the NRHP. Three of the houses were also recommended as not eligible. No eligibility assessment was made of the other two houses or of the two roads, but records suggest that none of these sites are likely to meet NRHP eligibility criteria.

The USGS topographic quadrangle maps that include the alternative site and off-site improvements associated with Alternative 4 show a number of additional structures or buildings that have not been recorded or assessed. It is possible that some of the structures indicated, which likely represent ranch complexes, may retain historic integrity or are otherwise significant, or might have associated historic archaeological deposits that could be eligible to the NRHP based on data potential. However, based on geographic and historical similarity with and proximity to the project site, it is likely that much of the historic development in this area is similar to that of the (nearby) project site, consisting primarily of Post WWII Minimal Tradition ranch houses or earlier ranch complexes substantially altered by subsequent decades of use. It is very likely that archaeological deposits of the historic period are present, given the substantial number of structures and vacated structures that are indicated on the

topographic maps. The survey coverage of the alternative site has not been sufficient to make a meaningful assessment of the potential for subsurface archaeological deposits of the prehistoric period.

Due to lack of access, a pedestrian survey of the Alternative 4 site or the alignments of the off-site improvements could not be performed. However, as the Alternative 4 site and off-site improvements have topographic settings and geologic history that is similar to that of the project site, the potential for buried archaeological deposits of the prehistoric period within the alternative site and along the alignments of the off-site improvements is likely similar to that of the project site. As at the project site, there is some potential for buried prehistoric deposits to be present along the creeks that cross the project site. There is a somewhat greater potential to encounter buried archaeological deposits where the creeks are crossed by the proposed off-site improvements. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, the effect on undiscovered historic properties or human remains would be **significant** under the off-site alternative. **Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b** therefore would apply to this site and would reduce this effect to **less than significant**.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1a**

#### **Discovery of Cultural Resources during Construction** *(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)*

*Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, any amount of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains, be encountered during any subsurface development activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet (30 feet) of the find. The City of Roseville Planning and Public Works staff and the USACE staff shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City of Roseville and the USACE shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with qualified archaeologists as needed, to assess the resource (i.e., whether it is a historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a historic property) and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant or adverse. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout to avoid significant (adverse) effects, data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City and USACE staff, in consultation with the archaeologists and California State Historic Preservation Officer, as appropriate, to avoid or minimize significant (adverse) effects to the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 or the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.*

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b****Archaeological Monitoring during Excavation within Creek Corridor**  
**(Applicability - Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 4)**

*For each project that entails grading or excavation within the Curry Creek or Federico Creek corridor (that is, the protected corridor that extends about 1,300 feet (396 meters) from each side of Curry and Federico Creeks), a qualified archaeologist will monitor all excavation within these corridors, from the surface to the depth at which basal hardpan is encountered. If archaeological materials are encountered, excavation and grading will stop and the procedures set forth in Mitigation Measure CR-1a above shall be implemented.*

**3.6.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS**

All of the effects would be reduced to **less than significant** by the proposed mitigation. There would be no residual significant effects for the Proposed Action and any of the alternatives.

**3.6.7 REFERENCES**

- City of Roseville. 2010. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. Chapter 4.09, Cultural Resources.
- Derr, Elanor H. 2001. "Baseline/Fiddymont Property Assessment, Roseville, Placer County, CA, Cultural Resources Survey." Rancho Cordova: Cultural Resources Unlimited. Prepared for Mourier Land Investment Corporation.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2011. "Cultural Resource Studies for Sierra Vista Specific Plan". Letter report to James Robb, USACE, Sacramento, from Lisa Westwood, ECORP.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2010. "Confidential Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, Sierra Vista Specific (Mourier & DF Properties), Placer County, CA, Project No. 2005-147.2." Rocklin, CA. Prepared for Sierra Vista Owner's Group, Roseville, by Stephen Pappas and Lisa Westwood, RPA.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2009. "Confidential Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan – Conley Property, Placer County, CA, Project No. 2009-090" Rocklin, CA. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2007. "Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan – Chab Property, Placer County, CA, Project No. 2005-147." Rocklin, CA. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2007 "Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Placer County, CA." Rocklin, CA. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville. Revised October 2007.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2006 "Draft Test Program Results and Evaluation for Archaeological Sites in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project APE, Placer County, CA." Rocklin, CA. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.

- Groff, Garth G. 2008 "Brief History of the Sacramento Northern." <http://people.virginia.edu/~ggg9y/history.html>.
- JRP Historical Consulting, LLC. 2007. "Draft Historical Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, Sierra Vista Project, Placer County, CA." Davis, CA. Prepared for URS Corporation, San Francisco.
- Peak, Melinda A. 2006. "Determination of Eligibility and Effect for EC-05-18, A Historic Period Resources within the Sierra Vista Property, County of Placer, CA." El Dorado Hills: Peak and Associates, Inc. Prepared for ECORP Consulting, Rocklin.
- Windmiller, Ric (Consulting Archaeologist), Donald Napoli, San Osanna, and Carol Roland. 2005. "Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Updated Cultural Resources Study, Placer County, California." Elk Grove, CA. Prepared for Quad Knopf.
- Wohlgemuth, Eric et al. 2008. "Volume 1: Report. Cultural Resources Survey for the PG&E Line 407 Project, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo Counties, California." Sacramento, CA. Prepared for Pacific Gas and Electric Company.