
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 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 historic 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 (URS 2002; Jensen 2006; ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2007a; ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2007b; ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2011). 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 Interior's 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 the Westbrook project that would develop the project site with a moderate-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density community. Development of the project site would include extensive residential and commercial development and associated infrastructure, and parks and other open space, anticipated to be built over a period of about 20 years, depending upon market conditions. The Specific Plan for the Westbrook project 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 the area designated under the Specific Plan for preservation as undeveloped open space. Even the open space area, located in the northwestern corner of the project site (described below), would be subject to ground disturbance associated with the construction of created wetlands and a floodplain expansion area to provide storm water detention capacity. 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 meter) depth - is slight, due to the age of deeper deposits.

The Proposed Action includes one off-site improvement, as detailed in the Project Description (**Chapter 2.0**) of this EIS which would involve widening a bioswale located along the property line of the Westbrook project and the adjacent WestPark property.

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. There is a small stand of trees on the northwestern corner of the site that would be set aside as open space. In addition, there is another small stand of trees in the southeastern area of the

project site. The site also includes scattered vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands. The majority of the project site is undeveloped and has been used primarily for dry farming and grazing.

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 (SVSP) 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 which 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 Cosumnes 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 suggest 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 dance house. 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 goods 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 19th and 20th 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 20th 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. Although no WAPA facilities are located within the project site, a City of Roseville electrical easement crosses the site in a north-south direction.

Many roadways in the Sacramento Valley follow routes established as early as the 1850s. There are no mapped historic roads within the APE for the Proposed Action.

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

3.6.3.1 Federal Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies

National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106

The 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 (which is the issuance of a DA permit for the development of the project site under the Proposed Action; 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:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
2. Is associated with the lives of a person or persons of significance in our past;
3. 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
4. Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or 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, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) 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.

USACE 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 U.S. 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 undertaking 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 the 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 Laws, Regulations, Plans, and Policies

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 section 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.

The CEQA process for this project was completed by the City of Roseville in June 2012.

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 USACE as 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 USACE 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 of the Proposed Action or an alternative 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;
- the transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of federal ownership (36 CFR 800.9)

With respect to cumulative impacts, those effects of the Proposed Action or an alternative would be significant if they would:

- result in a cumulative unmitigated loss of significant prehistoric and historic resources.

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 section 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 August 2010. 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 NRHP;
- 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 cultural resources surveys had been conducted within 0.5 mile (0.8 kilometer) of the project site. Eleven archeological sites have been recorded within 0.5 mile (0.8 km) of the project area. No prehistoric archaeological sites were identified within the project area in these previous studies. One historic period resource has been identified within the site but has not been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Native American Consultation

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.

During follow up phone calls in September 2010, 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 United Auburn Indian Community provided a letter in November 2010 which requested copies of completed reports and future reports for the project. 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 the project site between 2001 and 2010. URS conducted a survey of a portion of the project site in 2001 using 20-meter-wide transects. One cultural resource was identified by URS during the survey which was described as a concrete foundation and several pieces of farm machinery and equipment.

In 2005 and 2006, Peter M. Jensen conducted a survey in the western portion of the project site, using transects ranging from 20 meters to 30 meters wide. He did not record any cultural resources in the area he surveyed.

Archaeologists with ECORP Consulting, Inc., (ECORP) conducted a series of surveys in August 2005, July 2006, and August 2010. ECORP surveyed the entire project site in 2005 and rerecorded the site previously identified by URS. The July 2006 work by ECORP involved testing of the previously recorded cultural resource site, and the 2010 work involved a field check of the same site to observe the condition it was in.

Archaeological Testing and Significance Assessment

ECORP (2007a and 2010) 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 an archaeological test excavation at the historic site identified within the survey area to evaluate whether the site includes 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 two cultural resources within the project area. The first resource is a ranch complex consisting of a structure foundation, windmill foundation, a well hole, and various types of farm equipment. The other is an isolated rice harvester. The resources are further described below, including a discussion of the archaeological testing conducted to define horizontal and vertical boundaries of the resources and to assess historical significance and integrity, and the conclusions of these assessments with respect to whether the resources qualify as an historic property under NRHP criteria.

Cultural Resources within the Project APE

The following cultural resources were identified within the APE for the Westbrook project:

CA-PLA-1900-H (P-31-2681; EC-05-17): This site is a farmstead with two loci, Locus A and Locus B, which consisted of a house and barn. The farmstead was constructed and occupied by Richard Tubbs as early as 1877. In 1920 or 1921 the land was purchased by the Evans Brothers.

Locus A is situated on a knoll and includes a fence and a stand of trees around the perimeter as well as a dirt road encircling the knoll top. There are no physical remains of a house, only indications from the

fence and road that there was a farmhouse present. This locus consists of three features; Feature 1 is a structure foundation including a foundation wall and concrete pad on the south slope of the knoll, Feature 2 is a concrete windmill foundation, and Feature 3 is a well hole with scattered broken bricks. In addition, there is a variety of farm equipment on the north side of the knoll. The farm equipment discovered at Locus A included a harvester and a hay tiller/combine, marked with the names "Rumely" and "Advanced Rumely." The Rumely equipment may date from pre-1915, and the Advance-Rumely equipment dates from 1915 to 1931.

Locus B is located to the south of Locus A and includes nine concrete footings as well as several pieces of sheet metal on site. The footings appear to have been moved downhill from Locus A.

ECORP conducted a systematic surface collection of all materials on the surface at the site, excluding only modern debris. Collected artifacts included a ceramic plate fragment, glass beverage bottles, a beverage can, and building material. Much of the collected material could not more specifically dated other than twentieth century, however one item indicated 1930s or earlier and another indicated 1935 to 1960s.

ECORP excavated five linear trenches in the vicinity of Feature 1, three of which yielded historic age artifacts. Trench depths ranged from 3 to 5 feet where sterile soil was encountered. Most of the collected material came from two privies, in trenches 1 and 5, and a small amount of material came from a possible former house location in trench 4. Both privies yielded a mix of material from the occupation of the farm complex by Tubbs and the Evans Brothers. The trenches contained beverage bottles, ceramic plate fragments, an animal bone, electrical equipment, a saw blade, a mule shoe, and a cartridge. The age of the material ranged from before 1880 to the 1950s. However, the material was not diagnostic as to age.

Research conducted by ECORP for this project indicates that the Tubbs and Evans occupation was neither associated with important events in history nor represent important persons in history. As such, the site is not eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. The remains of the structure on the site at Locus A do not represent the work of a master and are not architecturally distinctive. Therefore, the site is not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. The surface items collected at the site appear to date to the Evans Brothers occupation of the site. The subsurface testing yielded a mix of material from the Tubbs and Evans occupations. The amount of material dateable from the period prior to 1920, to the Tubbs occupation, is too small to provide adequate information regarding the history of the site. Therefore, EC-05-17 is not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D.

SB-008: This resource is an isolated piece of farm equipment. Generally, isolates are not considered historic properties. In addition, archival research failed to yield any information regarding this particular resource to suggest that it is associated with important persons or events in history. The isolate is not distinctive, either architecturally or in its engineering, and does not exemplify the work of a master. There is no potential for the isolate to yield important information in history, beyond what has already been determined. Therefore, SB-008 is not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, B, C, or D.

Cultural Resource Sites within the APE of Off-Site Improvements

There were no cultural resources identified within the off-site APE for the Westbrook project.

Conclusions: Identified Historic Properties

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

Identification and Assessment of Potential Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects of the Off-Site Alternative

A records search was conducted for the alternate site at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System in June 2012. The purpose of the record search was to determine the extent of previous surveys within a 0.5-mile (1,600-meter) radius of the alternative site, and whether previously documented historic or historic archaeological sites, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties exist within this area. The search indicated that the site has no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites and two historic-period resources. The historic-period resources include historic debris and a well. Eligibility has not been determined. There are no recorded state or federal historic properties within the project site. The records search indicated that survey coverage of the site is sufficient to conclude that no further archival searches or field studies by a cultural resource professional is required at this time. Furthermore, an archaeological survey of the alternative site could not be conducted due to lack of access.

3.6.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Two potential historic resources were identified within the APE. As detailed above, neither of the resources appears 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, on-site alternatives, and Off-Site Alternative 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.

Impact CR-1 Potential to damage undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction

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

The APE for the No Action Alternative is the same as the APE of the Proposed Action. As stated above, no historic properties have been identified in the project APE. The development of the No Action Alternative would therefore have no effect on any known historic properties. Furthermore, the potential for buried prehistoric deposits to be present on the project site is low. This is because subsurface auger testing conducted along Curry Creek about 0.2 mile south of the Westbrook project site did

not yield any subsurface cultural resources. Due to the lack of buried prehistoric deposits along the nearby creek banks and the similarity of the landform within the project site to the area where subsurface testing was conducted, the project site is generally not expected to contain buried prehistoric resources. However, previously unknown prehistoric resources could still be encountered during grading and excavation on the site and inadvertently destroyed. 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 would avoid or reduce an inadvertent significant **direct** effect on previously unknown historic properties encountered during construction in any portion of the site to a **less than significant** level.

Indirect effects on archaeological and historic resources that can result from land development projects include increased vandalism of archaeological sites or unauthorized collection of artifacts, resulting from improved or newly introduced access. However, **no indirect** effects would occur because there are no known archaeological or historic resource sites on the project site that could be affected by vandalism or unauthorized collection.

**Proposed
Action, Alts. 1
through 5**

The Proposed Action and on-site alternatives may result in **direct significant** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce **potential direct** effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

As with the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action and on-site alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 5) would not significantly affect any known historic properties as none are present within the project site. However, grading and excavation associated with the development of the site under the Proposed Action and the on-site alternatives have the potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits. The total area of ground disturbance on the site for the Proposed Action would be greater than the No Action Alternative. Therefore, there would be a greater chance of encountering buried cultural deposits. The total area of ground disturbance for the on-site alternatives would be more similar to the No Action Alternative, and therefore the potential to encounter buried cultural deposits would also be similar to the No Action Alternative.

Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, the **direct** effect on undiscovered historic properties or human remains would be **potentially significant** under the Proposed Action and on-site alternatives. **Mitigation Measure CR-1a** would reduce this

potential direct effect to **less than significant**.

For the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no indirect** effects would occur under the Proposed Action or Alternatives 1 through 5.

Off-Site Alt.

The Off-Site Alternative may result in **significant direct** effects to undiscovered historic properties or human remains during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce **potential direct** effects to undiscovered resources to **less than significant**.

The alternative site is geographically and historically similar to the project site. The Pleasant Grove Creek traverses the southeastern corner of the alternative site.

The potential for buried archaeological deposits of the prehistoric period or historic cultural resources within the alternative site is similar to that of the project site. There is some potential for buried prehistoric deposits to be present along the creek that crosses the southeastern corner of the alternative site. However, the creek corridor lies in an area that would be preserved as open space and would not be disturbed.

Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, the **direct** effect on undiscovered historic properties or human remains would be **potentially significant** under the Off-Site Alternative. **Mitigation Measure CR-1a** would reduce this **potential direct** effect to **less than significant**.

As noted earlier, the records search conducted for this alternative indicated that the site contains two historic-period resources which include historic debris and a well. The two historic-period resources have not been evaluated for eligibility to the NRHP. In the absence of such a determination it is conservatively assumed for this Draft EIS that these resources are eligible and the removal of these resources would constitute a **potentially significant** effect. **Mitigation Measure CR-1b** will be implemented to reduce the **potentially significant direct** effect to **less than significant**.

For the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no indirect** effects would occur under the Off-Site Alternative.

**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 the 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: Evaluation of Historic Resources for Eligibility and Appropriate Processing Under Section 106 (Applicability – Off-Site Alternative)

The USACE shall satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA for the Off-Site Alternative by preparing a Programmatic Agreement (PA) which requires the following measures:

- For each development phase and associated federal permits and authorizations, the USACE, as the federal Section 106 lead (or the USACE designee) shall prepare an APE map and shall consult with the SHPO on the APE.
- Once the SHPO, the USACE, and other consulting parties agree on the project-specific APE, the USACE or the Applicant (or designee, as directed by the USACE) shall perform an inventory of cultural resources in the phase-specific APE consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Identification (48 Federal Register [FR] 44720-23) and submit this inventory to the SHPO and any other relevant consulting parties for review as required under the PA. The same document shall evaluate identified resources for listing on the NRHP per NRHP criteria and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Evaluation (48 FR 44723-26).
- Once the inventory is complete, the USACE (or designee, as directed by the USACE) shall prepare a Finding of Effect (FOE) to assess the effect of the buildout of the individual development phase upon identified historic properties by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5(a) (1). If the FOE identifies adverse effects, the Applicant shall prepare treatment measures and protocols to minimize these impacts to the extent possible. These treatment measures shall be appended to the PA in a treatment plan prepared for the specific project development phase. Treatment measures may include, but are not limited to, avoidance and preservation in places where possible. Where avoidance is not possible or feasible, treatment shall consist of either: (1) recovery of a suitable sample of material from archaeological sites that have the potential to contribute to research, or (2) documentation of historic resources to capture their significance and relationship to important historical themes. Documentation of historical resources shall be performed according to the Historic American Building Survey or Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) specifications or an equivalent standard when existing architecture or engineered features are subject to adverse effects. Where appropriate, treatment plans may specify the preparation and circulation of interpretive brochures, narrative descriptions, and photographic documentation for the general public.

3.6.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

All of the **potential direct** 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 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative Impact CR-1 Damage to Historic Properties or Human Remains

No Action Alt., Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5 Loss of cultural resources in the project area due to previous ground disturbing activities is unquantifiable. However, previous activities that include mining, agriculture, urban development, and infrastructure have likely resulted in the destruction of cultural resources in the western Placer County area, in particular prior to the passage of laws and regulations that include the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 1966 which protects eligible cultural resources, The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and CEQA. Since the enactment of these laws, the cumulative loss of cultural resources has been substantially reduced but some loss of cultural resources still continues as a result of human activities.

Further development in the region could result in the damage or destruction of known archaeological and historical resources, as well as any existing undiscovered subsurface artifacts. The vicinity of Roseville is known to include both prehistoric and historic cultural resources. Although no evidence of prehistoric resources was discovered during field surveys of the project site, archaeological sites are located in the vicinity. Historic resources and prehistoric sites have been recorded within the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area and the West Roseville Specific Plan area and could occur elsewhere in southwestern Placer County.

As noted above, numerous laws, regulations, and statutes, at both the federal and state levels, seek to protect cultural resources. These would apply to all new development within the study area. In addition, the Roseville General Plan provides local policies for the protection of cultural resources from unnecessary impacts. These policies include inventory and evaluation processes and require consultation with qualified archaeologists in the event that previously undiscovered cultural materials are accidentally exposed. As discussed in **Impact CR-1**, no known historic resources or archaeological resources are present on the project site that could be affected by the proposed development. However, previously unknown archaeological resources could be encountered during site grading and excavation. By ensuring that cultural resources discovered within the project site are properly recorded and handled, **Mitigation Measure CR-1a** would reduce the contribution from the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 to the cumulative cultural resource impact to **less than significant**.

Off-Site Alt. The cumulative contribution of the Off-Site Alternative to cumulative effects on cultural resources would be similar to that of the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5. As discussed in **Impact CR-1**, no known archaeological resources are present on the alternative site that could be affected by the proposed development. However, previously unknown archaeological resources could be encountered during site grading and excavation and historic-period resources could also be affected. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5, the implementation of **Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b** would reduce the contribution of the alternative to the cumulative impact to **less than significant**.

3.6.8 REFERENCES

- City of Roseville. 2010. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. Chapter 4.09, Cultural Resources.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2007a. "Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Placer County, CA." Rocklin, California. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville. Revised October 2007.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2007b. "Test Program Results and Evaluation for Cultural Resources Archaeological Sites in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project APE, Placer County, CA." Rocklin, California. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc., 2011. "Cultural Resources Compliance for the Westbrook Property, USACE ID#TBD, ECORP Project No. 2011-011." Rocklin, California. Prepared for Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.
- Egherman R. and B. Hatoff. 2002. "Roseville Energy Facility, Cultural Resources, Appendix J-1 of Application for Certification." URS.
- Groff, Garth G. 2008 "Brief History of the Sacramento Northern." <http://people.virginia.edu/~ggg9y/history.html>.
- Jensen, Sean Michael. 2006. "Archaeological Inventory Survey, Proposed Regional University School Development Project, c.2,400 acres near Roseville, Placer County, California."
- 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, California. Prepared for Quad Knopf.