

---

## 3.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 3.6.1 INTRODUCTION

Cultural resources include: historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, deposits and features; historic and prehistoric districts; and built environment resources, including, but not necessarily limited to, buildings, structures, and objects. They also include 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. The term “historic property” is used in this section to denote properties or sites identified as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). To avoid confusion, the term “participating parcel” is used instead of participating properties to denote the properties for which DA applications have been received by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). This section describes work undertaken to: identify any cultural resources that may be present within the project area and its vicinity; 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 assess the potential direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on these resources, including potential visual effects on the setting of significant cultural resources. This section also assesses the potential for undiscovered resources, such as buried archaeological deposits or human remains, to be present within the project area and identifies measures to avoid adverse effects to any such resources that could be affected by the Proposed Action or the alternatives.

The information presented in this section is derived from a series of literature reviews, records searches, and archaeological and historical surveys of the project area or portions of the project area undertaken in support of cultural resources assessment for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP), in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2005 (Windmiller *et al.* 2005). That cultural resources assessment was updated by further cultural resources technical work in 2009 in support of Clean Water Act Section 404 permit applications and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

In the course of archaeological assessment of the Proposed Action, consultants 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. In addition, consultants contacted local Native American individuals and groups identified by the NAHC, and local historical societies, to solicit any concerns about potential effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives on traditional cultural properties, historical resources, or historic properties. Further updates of records searches and Native American consultations were undertaken in 2012 (Windmiller *et al.* 2012).

The cultural resources studies conducted through 2009, and updated with a new records search and site visits in 2012, provide some baseline information on cultural resources on the 22 land parcels within the PVSP area that are currently participating in the 404 permit application process, which together comprise 3,744 acres (1,515 hectares) of the 5,230 acres (2,116 hectares) covered by the PVSP. The

“non-participating” parcels (the remaining 1,486 acres [601 hectares] of the PVSP area) have not been subjected to comprehensive cultural resources inventories, as access for archaeological survey was not granted in most cases. On this account, no determination can be made at this time as to whether historic properties are present on these parcels, or the effects of the Proposed Action on any historic properties that might be present. Similarly, as summarized in Windmiller’s 2009 and 2012 reports, although the locations of all of the proposed on- and off-site infrastructure elements associated with the proposed PVSP have been subjected to records searches and to some level of archaeological inventory, in most cases archaeological survey was limited to existing road rights-of-way because of access constraints for adjacent private properties, and did not encompass the entire Area of Potential Effects (APE) for infrastructure elements. Therefore, as discussed below, the measures to complete the identification, evaluation of significance, and resolution of adverse effect (mitigation of significant impacts) to significant cultural resources will be stipulated through the development and execution of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with a programmatic Historic Property Management Plan (HPMP).

Methods and results of cultural resources inventory and assessment are summarized in this section and are presented in detail in the reports listed at the end of this section (Windmiller *et al.* 2005, 2009, and 2012; Wohlgemuth 2008; ECORP 2010). Results of archaeological records search inquiries and Native American consultation efforts (updated in 2012) are summarized below.

This section, and all archaeological work described herein was conducted by or under the direct supervision of archaeologists who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology. Architectural history assessments were undertaken by qualified architectural historians and historians who also meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior’s Professional 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 area with a mixed use, mixed density community. The PVSP proposes extensive residential and commercial development, parks and other open space, and associated infrastructure. It is anticipated that the Specific Plan would be implemented over a period of about 30 to 40 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 area, 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.

As noted in **Chapter 1.0**, the proposed federal action is the issuance of permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act by the USACE. As this action would enable the development of the PVSP project area, for ease of reference the entire development project is called the “Proposed Action” in this EIS. It must be assumed that the entire Specific Plan area would potentially be subject to subsurface disturbance under

the PVSP, although further permitting and environmental analysis would be required before some of the non-participating parcels would be able to develop. For purposes of analysis under Section 106 of the NHPA, for historic properties, the APE of the Proposed Action has been defined as coinciding with the boundaries of the 22 participating parcels in the Specific Plan area plus related infrastructure improvements, such as sewer and water line connections and roadways, described below.

The viewshed of the Specific Plan area consists of a mixed-use rural residential development on the northwestern and southwestern corners of the Specific Plan area, scattered rural residences north and south of the middle of the plan area, and new residential subdivisions on the southeast and northeast. The oldest concentration of buildings within the PVSP vicinity is in the community of Riego, which includes about 180 substantial buildings, only about 20 of which date to 1950 or earlier. Because this community is outside of the plan area and does not include a substantial concentration of older buildings, the effect of PVSP development on the viewshed is not anticipated to be adverse, and the APE therefore has not been extended to include additional viewshed areas outside of the 22 participating parcels.

The Proposed Action also would include some off-site improvements, as detailed in the Project Description (**Chapter 2.0** of this EIS). These would include widening of Baseline Road along the northern margin of the project area and for distances of about 1,000 feet (305 meters) east and west of the project area; improvements to Watt Avenue for about 1,000 feet (305 meters) south of the project area; expansion of several intersections; and installation of underground utilities along several roadway corridors. The horizontal APE for infrastructure improvements included in USACE Section 404 permit applications consists of the construction rights-of-way of each of the infrastructure elements detailed in **Chapter 2.0** of this EIS. Generally, the construction rights-of-way consist of a corridor about 200 feet (61 meters) wide along each affected roadway or utility alignment. Therefore, for linear infrastructure elements, the APE includes the footprint of each proposed infrastructure element, plus a 200-foot-wide (61-meter-wide) corridor along each linear facility alignment.

The Specific Plan area consists of gently rolling terrain with elevations that range from approximately 40 feet (12 meters) to 100 feet (30 meters) above median sea level. The existing average slope across the project area from east to west is approximately 0.5 percent. Therefore, limited cuts and fills would be necessary to construct the project. Grading for building pads, recreational facilities, roads, and infrastructure would require average cuts and fills over the site of approximately 1.0 to 2.0+ feet (30 to 61+ centimeters). Limited portions of the APE would have cuts and fills up to approximately 6.0+ feet (1.8+ meters). Backbone utilities within the roads would have trenches that range in depth from 3.0 to 25.0+ feet (0.9 to 7.6+ 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 project area (the vertical APE) would be less than 6 feet (1.8 meters) below ground surface. With respect to the infrastructure improvements, the maximum vertical APE along could be as much as 9 feet (2.7 meters), to accommodate deep utility trenching as needed; however, subsurface excavation along utility corridors generally would extend to no more than 6 feet (1.8 meters) below surface.

The Specific Plan area is located west of Roseville, in Placer County near the eastern margin of the Sacramento Valley. The Specific Plan area consists of gently rolling topography vegetated primarily in

open non-native grasslands. Curry Creek, a perennial watercourse, traverses the northern portion of the project site, and Dry Creek, another perennial, runs along the southwestern margin of the site. There is dense riparian vegetation in some areas along these creeks including willows, cottonwoods and a few oaks. There is a stand of (non-native) eucalyptus trees on the southeastern part of the site. The site also includes the several intermittent stream courses, and scattered vernal pools, ponds and other seasonal wetlands. The majority of the Specific Plan area is undeveloped and historically has been used primarily for dry farming and cattle grazing operations, with associated rural residences, although some areas have been graded and diked for rice cultivation. The western area of the site, where there are two large areas comprising the non-participating parcels, is characterized by substantial semi-rural residential development, most postdating the 1950s.

For the purpose of compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the horizontal APE is hereby defined as the 5,230-acre (2117-hectare) specific plan area plus approximately 235 acres (95 hectares) of infrastructure improvements. The vertical APE extends from approximately 35 feet (11 meters) above the surface (for the construction of structures) and 6 feet (1.8 meters) below the surface, to allow for the deep installation of buried utilities and infrastructure. The APE, as defined herein, is set forth in the USACE's request for consultation to the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), dated October 22, 2012.

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

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

The cultural chronology described below draws upon data summaries for the project area provided in Windmiller's cultural resources inventory and evaluation report (Windmiller 2009: pp 15-30), prepared in support of Section 404 permitting for the PVSP, and on the cultural resources overview (ECORP 2007: pp 6-10) prepared in support of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR, which addresses a proposed project adjacent to the north of the Specific Plan area.

#### **Early Prehistoric Occupation**

Central California was occupied 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; however, Windmiller reports that stone tools found along the eastern margin of the Sacramento Valley may date to as early as 5,000 to 10,000 BC. 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 BC.

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 Windmiller Tradition, dating from about 3,500 BC to 1,000 BC 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 BC to AD 500) appears to be an outgrowth of the Windmill Tradition. After about 1,000 BC; 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 shell ornaments and beads and obsidian became 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.

Assemblages associated with the Hotchkiss Tradition, which succeeds the Cosumnes Tradition, appeared around AD 500 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.” Groundstone pipes become abundant, and fired and unfired clay objects appear. Shell beads provide fine chronological stratification during this period.

### **Local Prehistoric Archaeology**

Palumbo (1966) studied 32 prehistoric archaeological sites along Dry Creek between Roseville, on the east, and the American Basin on the west. Four of the sites studied by Palumbo are located within the PVSP area: CA-PLA-46, -47, -80 and -82. She concluded that these and 24 other sites she studied in the drainage represented temporary/seasonal camps, while four other sites, none of which is on the PVSP

project area, appear to represent permanent villages. Palumbo noted that site density apparently was greater in the upper (eastern) part of the Dry Creek drainage than in its lower reaches.

Archaeological evidence suggests that sedentary villages were established in the western Sierra by around AD 1. Utian populations appear to have occupied the Sacramento Delta and the hills on the eastern and western sides of the Sacramento Valley as much as 2,000 years prior to this time. The Berkeley Pattern, a cultural florescence sometimes referred to as the Middle Horizon, apparently grew out of cultural interchange or fusion between Utian speakers and the Hokan and Yukian speakers resident around San Francisco Bay. Palumbo suggested that large stemmed projectile points found at Dry Creek sites may represent a Late Period cultural trait that persisted from Middle Horizon times. These dating inferences are somewhat speculative, however, as there has been little substantive archaeological investigation in the project vicinity during the past several decades, and no absolute dating of any of the Dry Creek sites.

### **Project Area Ethnography**

At the time of Spanish contact (ca. AD 1800), the Specific Plan area was within the southwestern part of the territory of the Nisenan, or Southern Maidu cultural group. The Dry Creek drainage lies at the ecotone (edge area) between the Valley and the Foothill Nisenan territories. Archaeological and linguistic evidence suggests that the Valley Nisenan arrived in the central Sacramento Valley around AD 500 to 600, and used the region at increasing intensity after around AD 1200 and into the contact period. Interregional trade also expanded greatly during this time.

Settlement patterns appear to have varied between foothill and the valley Nisenan. The foothill Nisenan were mobile hunter-gatherers who did not focus on year-round “permanent” villages. Instead, each tribelet, a loosely organized political unit, used dozens of small camps, with a few larger villages as tribelet centers. In contrast, the Valley Nisenan lived in large sedentary or semi-sedentary villages along the major river courses, including the American, Yuba, and Sacramento Rivers. The Nisenan — both the Valley Nisenan, and the Southern and Northern Foothill Nisenan, who lived in the Sierra foothills, to the east — used the grassy plains between the river and the Sierra foothills, probably including the Specific Plan area, mainly for foraging. Hunting and foraging practices were varied and a wide range of resources were used. Woodlands yielded acorns, a primary staple. In the grasslands, hard seeds were gathered, and hunters pursued rabbits and deer. Rivers, streams and marshes were exploited for fish and waterfowl. The Nisenan also participated in an extensive trade network through which goods were traded throughout California and beyond. Obsidian for projectile points and marine shell beads were important trade commodities, for which the Nisenan may have served as “middlemen.”

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

Spanish explorers entered the Central Valley by about 1769 but did not establish any settlements there. In 1833, a great epidemic, possibly malaria, killed as much as 75 percent of the aboriginal population of central California.

The first substantial non-native population 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 Specific Plan area. However, the streams running through the Specific Plan area were not exploited because they did not cross gold-bearing deposits; for this reason, the Roseville area did not experience the population boom that occurred in Sacramento and extended into the Sierra foothills. 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. During this period, much of the land that makes up the Specific Plan area was given by the United States government to the (new) State of California, or to the railroads. There was some private settlement of these areas by the 1860s, however. The project vicinity was used primarily for grazing and dry farming of crops such as wheat and hay. The historic archaeological record for this area would be expected to include a relatively sparse scattering of 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 the Roseville area 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, an electric interurban line (the route of which forms part of the western boundary of the Specific Plan area) was established around 1905 to provide service between Sacramento and Chico and was later extended into the San Francisco Bay area. The line carried passengers until about 1940, and freight into 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). The railroad alignment lies along the western margin of Parcels 23 and 24 in the project APE. Although traces of the berm can be found, most of its remnants have been substantially altered by past grading (Windmiller *et al.* 2005). 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 Specific Plan area.

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 western end of the Specific Plan area (Parcels 23 and 24). The WAPA facilities are continuously maintained and upgraded to modern standards and do not retain historic characteristics.

Many roadways in the Sacramento Valley follow routes established as early as the 1850s. Baseline Road, which runs along the northern edge of the Specific Plan area, appears on the 1892 and 1929 GLO Plats but, on these maps, the roadway extends westward from Roseville only to Fiddymont Road, at the northeastern corner of the Specific Plan area (Windmiller *et al.* 2005). Baseline Road now continues along

the northern boundary of the Specific Plan area and is a modern paved road. Several roads that cross or extend into the Specific Plan area north to south run along historic road routes, but all have been fully modernized and exhibit no historic characteristics except for the routes themselves.

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

#### **3.6.3.1 Federal**

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

The NHPA established the NRHP, and defined federal criteria for determining the historical significance of archaeological sites, historic buildings and other resources. Under Section 106 of the NHPA, the lead federal agency is required to define the APE for its undertaking (equivalent to the boundaries of “the Proposed Action” here); to identify any potential historic properties within the APE; 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 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. These may include 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 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 meets one or more of the following criteria and possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association:

- (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 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 must consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to take these effects into account in federal decision prior to the undertaking. A process is also established for resolving adverse 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 the Waters of the U.S., is considered a federal undertaking under Section 106 of the NHPA. In considering whether or not to issue a Section 404 permit, the USACE, as the federal lead agency under Section 106 of the NHPA, has a responsibility to take into account the direct and indirect effects the undertaking will have on historic properties.

The USACE complies with the NHPA through implementing procedures set forth at 33 CFR Part 325, Appendix C, and the Interim Guidance (33 CFR Part 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 *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a 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.

For the purposes of CEQA review, the *State CEQA Guidelines* define “historical resources” to include any resource that (1) is listed in or has been determined eligible for listing in the CRHR by the State Historical Resources Commission; (2) is included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code 5020.1(k); (3) has been identified as significant in a historical resources survey, as defined in Public Resources Code 5024.1(g); or (4) is determined to be historically significant by the CEQA lead agency [14 Cal. Code Regs, § 15064.5(a)]. In determining whether something qualifies as a historical resource, the CEQA lead agency usually applies the CRHR eligibility criteria.

The criteria for eligibility of resources to the CRHR closely mirror the NRHP and are found at Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 4852(b). In addition, the resource must retain integrity. Like the NRHP, integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association [14 Cal. Code Regs § 4852(c)].

Although the significance criteria for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR are similar, a resource may meet the criteria for the CRHR but not the NRHP. In such a case, a significant cultural resource could be an “historical resource” but not an “historic property.” However, any resource that meets the NRHP

eligibility criteria and retains integrity is automatically eligible for inclusion in the CRHR. Evaluations of significance relative to the CRHR were addressed separately in the EIR.

### ***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 Native American 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**

##### ***Placer County General Plan***

In addition to cultural resources as recognized by Section 106 of the NHPA and CEQA, the Placer County General Plan contains the following policies to address cultural resources:

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Policy 5.D.1.</b> | The County shall assist the citizens of Placer County in becoming active guardians of their community's cultural resources.   |
| <b>Policy 5.D.2.</b> | The County shall solicit the cooperation of the owners of cultural and paleontological resources, encourage those owners to treat these resources as assets rather than liabilities, and encourage the support of the general public for the preservation and enhancement of these resources. |
| <b>Policy 5.D.3.</b> | The County shall solicit the views of the Native American Heritage Commission and/or the local Native American community in cases where development may result in disturbance to sites containing evidence of Native American activity and/or to sites of cultural importance.                |
| <b>Policy 5.D.4.</b> | The County shall coordinate with the cities and municipal advisory councils in the County to promote the preservation and maintenance of Placer County's paleontological and archaeological resources.  |
| <b>Policy 5.D.5.</b> | The County shall use, where feasible, incentive programs to assist private property owners in preserving and enhancing cultural resources.  |

- Policy 5.D.6.** The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a Countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.
- Policy 5.D.7.** The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.
- Policy 5.D.8:** The County shall, within its power, maintain confidentiality regarding the locations of archaeological sites in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts.
- Policy 5.D.9.** The County shall use the State Historic Building Code to encourage the preservation of historic structures.
- Policy 5.D.10.** The County will use existing legislation and propose local legislation for the identification and protection of cultural resources and their contributing environment.
- Policy 5.D.11.** The County shall support the registration of cultural resources in appropriate landmark designations (i.e., National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, or Local Landmark). The County shall assist private citizens seeking these designations for their property.
- Policy 5.D.12.** The County shall consider acquisition programs as a means of preserving significant cultural resources that are not suitable for private development. Organizations that could provide assistance in this area include, but are not limited to, the Archaeological Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy, and the Placer Land Trust.

### ***Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Implementation Policy 9.1***

Policy 9.1 of the PVSP Implementation Plan requires “subsequent conformity review,” which includes the requirement that prior to any activity that may result in ground disturbance, and before a grading permit may be issued, the proposed project area must be inspected by a qualified archaeologist to determine whether any Native American cultural places are present. If such a site is identified, the archaeologist is to recommend to the County potentially feasible mitigation measures that would preserve the integrity of the site or minimize impacts to it. These may include recommendations for avoidance, preservation, and/or enhancement of the site through an open space or habitat easement, or other measures consistent with the PVSP policies and land use assumptions. The County will then consult with the appropriate Native American group and the applicant to assess the feasibility of the recommendations and determine what measures will apply.

#### **3.6.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

##### **3.6.4.1 Significance Thresholds**

Under the NHPA, the federal Lead Agency, in this case, the USACE, is required to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties. If historic properties are present within the project APE, the Lead Agency must determine whether its actions would adversely affect the significance of the historic properties and take steps to resolve any adverse effects.

Under federal regulations, a project has an effect on a 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 a 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 Methods**

Under the NHPA, identification of cultural resource 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 alternatives on cultural resources were assessed, and results of this process.

A number of cultural resources surveys for archaeological and architectural resources were carried out at varying levels of intensity and completeness for various portions of the project area. These previous

studies were conducted between 1965 and 2012, and provide the baseline cultural context and potential for historic properties and/or historical resources within the project area. These include:

- Palumbo, 1965: site recording along Dry Creek for Master's Thesis research
- Peak and Associates, 1979: survey of the transmission line route that crosses properties 12A, 13, 14, and 19
- Peak and Associates, 1982: survey of property 2
- Far Western Anthropological Research Group, 1986: survey of the transmission line right of way, including areas not surveyed by Peak and Associates in 1979
- Foothill Archaeological Services, 1988: inspection of property 19
- Derr, 1991
- Windmiller, 1999-2000: inspection of properties 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 21
- Windmiller, 2001: inspection of properties 12A and 12B
- Peak and Associates, 2004: inspection of property 8
- Windmiller, 2005: inspection of properties 1A, 1B, 3, 5C, 6, 23, and 24
- Far Western Anthropological Research Group, 2006: inspection of portions of property 7 during a PG&E corridor survey
- Windmiller, 2009 and 2012: revisits to previously documented sites (not all sites were revisited due to lack of access rights)

The previous studies included various records searches, literature reviews, Native American consultation efforts, and either pedestrian or vehicular survey. Some efforts included archaeological excavation and site recording. Methods and coverage varied between researchers, and are summarized below.

### Records Searches

Several records searches for the Specific Plan area and associated off-site infrastructure improvements were conducted at the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento in 1999, 2005, and 2008. Record searches for the off-site infrastructure improvements APE in Sutter County were conducted in 2005, 2008, and 2012 at the Northeast Information Center, California State University, Chico. As required by USACE regulations, the complete records search was repeated in 2012 in support of this EIS (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). The purpose of the record searches was to determine the extent and findings of previous cultural resources inventories and assessments within the project area and vicinity. In addition to the official records and maps of archaeological sites and surveys in Placer and Sutter counties, the following historic references were reviewed:

- The NRHP;
- California Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates);
- California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates);

- Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory (1999);
- Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory (1987, 2000, 2006); and
- Historic Spots in California (1990).

As of 2009, archaeological and historic built environment surveys had been completed of all of the 22 participating parcels within the Specific Plan area, and a number of these areas were examined more than once. Identified resources were reinspected in 2012, as required by USACE regulations. Several additional surveys covered the portions of the APE for proposed off-site improvements, for which property access permissions were available or were not required. Cultural resources identified within the APE, and the USACE's assessment as to whether each previously recorded resource meets NRHP criteria to qualify as a historic property, are detailed in subsequent sections below.

### **Native American Consultation**

In conjunction with each of the prior cultural resources inventories for the Proposed Action, consultants (on behalf of the USACE) contacted the NAHC first in 1999 to conduct searches of their Sacred Lands Files for Sacred Sites and/or Traditional Cultural Properties in California. In each case, the NAHC indicated that no sacred lands or traditional cultural properties have been identified in the project APE. The NAHC also supplied a list of appropriate Native American tribal and cultural group contacts for the Specific Plan area. As part of each resource identification effort, letters were written to each identified Native American contact, inquiring about any concerns for the Specific Plan area with respect to potential traditional cultural properties, burial sites, and/or archaeological sites. Each letter was followed up with a phone call.

In 2009, consultants contacted 15 Native American groups or individuals by mail and phone. Five of the contacts responded. Two had no specific comments regarding cultural resources that could be affected by the PVSP; one indicated that he would like to visit the project area, but that it was outside his group's traditional territory; two respondents expressed concerns about potential to affect Native American cultural resources and requested copies of archaeological technical reports and site records, and that a tribal monitor be funded by the project to be present during future cultural resources studies and during ground breaking activities.

In 2012, the consultants again contacted the NAHC to request a Sacred Lands File search and an updated list of Native American contacts for Placer and Sutter counties. The search did not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the project vicinity. The NAHC provided a list of eight Native American contacts (**Table 3.6-1, Native American Organizations and Individuals Contacted in 2012**). The consultants contacted each organization or individual by letter and phone, described the project, and asked for any information on known or suspected sites of Native American importance. Four of the contacts responded. One requested information on how to formally request Consulting Party status with the USACE and one requested that the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians be included as a Consulting Party for the project under NHPA Section 106. One respondent asked that, if any Native American human remains or grave goods are found, they be treated in accordance with California law. The United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) requested to receive any

archaeological reports on the project so that the Tribe could determine whether the proposed project could affect cultural resources of importance. The Tribe also requested to receive project environmental documents so that the Tribe may comment. The Tribe stated that the Tribe's Preservation Committee has identified cultural resources in the project area and requested a project area visit to confirm the location of such sites (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). As a result, the USACE contacted the UAIC on June 14, 2012, and received another request to review relevant cultural resources reports. The UAIC also requested a coordination meeting. The USACE met with representatives of the UAIC on September 21, 2012 and provided them with the requested materials. Consultation is ongoing.

**Table 3.6-1  
Native American Organizations and Individuals Contacted in 2012**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mr. Nicholas Fonseca Chairperson	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians Shingle Springs
Mr. John Tayaba Formerly, Vice Chair	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians Shingle Springs
Mr. Daniel Fonseca Director of Cultural Resources	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians Shingle Springs
Mr. David Keyser Chairperson	United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria Auburn
Mr. Marcos Guerrero, R.P.A. Tribal Preservation Committee	United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria Auburn
Mr. Gregory S. Baker Tribal Administrator	United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria Auburn
Ms. Rose Enos Auburn	None
Ms. April Wallace Moore Colfax	None

*Source: Windmiller et al. 2012.*

### Archaeological Surveys

Results of previous cultural resources records searches, inventories, and evaluations between 1965 and 2009 are summarized in a technical report published in 2009 (Windmiller *et al.* 2009). Records of cultural resource sites identified within the PVSP participating parcels were updated in 2012, as detailed in an updated report by Windmiller (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). Archaeological surveys within the past 10 years have covered the entire area of the 22 participating parcels at varying transect intervals. Surface visibility within these parcels ranged from poor to good, with some areas obscured by agricultural crops or other vegetation. Nearly the entire ground surface in the project area has been disturbed to some extent by cultivation. In most areas, survey was confined to surface examination. However, terrace areas along

creeks and stream banks were considered likely to be sensitive for the presence of prehistoric archaeological resources. In these areas, archaeologists periodically scraped the ground surface in an effort to identify obscured deposits. Details regarding survey coverage and time spent in the survey of each participating parcel are provided in Windmiller's 2009 technical report. In 2009 and again in 2012, Windmiller field-verified and updated the location and condition of each identified resource for which access permissions could be obtained. Each is described below.

Proposed infrastructure improvement locations are described in detail and mapped in **Chapter 2.0** of this EIS. Proposed off-site improvement routes/locations were subjected to archaeological inspections either in 2005 or in 2008 (Windmiller *et al.* 2009), as summarized in **Table 3.6-2, Cultural Resources Assessment of Proposed Infrastructure Improvement Locations**, below. For some of the proposed off-site improvement locations, archaeological surveys were confined to existing roadway rights-of-way (ROW), as access permission for survey of the entire APE had not been granted. In other cases, all or part of the proposed improvement location lies within one or more of the participating parcels and could be inspected completely.

**Table 3.6-2  
Cultural Resources Assessment of Proposed Infrastructure Improvement Locations**

Proposed Improvement	Survey Coverage	Survey Limitations
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>		
Riego/E. Natomas	Levee and some adjacent field margins (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Confined to levee in part of area; access limitations
Baseline Road/Pleasant Grove Road (north)	Inspected both sides of Pleasant Grove Road and portions of Baseline Road (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	No access outside of existing ROW; Baseline Road inspection limited by road hazard
Baseline Road/Pleasant Grove Road (south)	Inspected both sides of Pleasant Grove Road and portions of Baseline Road (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	No access outside of existing ROWs; Baseline Road inspection limited by road hazard
Baseline Road/Elder Street	Inspected along Elder Street (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Baseline Road hazardous; Elder Street residential yards fenced
Baseline Road/Locust Street	Completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Limited ground visibility Baseline E of Locust
Baseline Road/Newton Street	Completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	W side of Newton fenced
Baseline Road/Brewer Road	Completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Dry grass obscured ground surface in many locations
<b>Road Widening</b>		
Baseline Road	Most of extent inspected within 200-foot ROW (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Some access limitations and ground visibility generally poor
Watt Avenue	Most of extent inspected within 200-foot ROW (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Very limited visibility some areas

Proposed Improvement	Survey Coverage	Survey Limitations
Dyer Road widening and extension	Completely inspected; all within PVSP participating parcels (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Ground visibility poor
<b>Road Construction</b>		
18 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Completely inspected; entirely within a participating parcel (Windmiller et al. 2009; 2012)	Ground visibility moderate
16 <sup>th</sup> Street	Completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	One non-participating property adjoins, but adjacent ROW visible across fence
East Dyer Lane	Almost completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Non-participating property adjoins small part of alignment
<b>Utilities</b>		
Potable Water Line Option A	Completely inspected (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Precise alignment not marked; may vary slightly
Recycled Water Line	Bare ground areas inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Most within built environment with no visibility
Six Recycled and Potable Water Tank Locations	Completely inspected: all within PVSP areas (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Ground visibility moderate
Force Main, Watt Avenue to Dry Creek WWTP	Most inspected (Windmiller et al. 2005, 2012)	Some limitations due to active construction
Gravity Sewer Line, E Dyer Lane to Watt Avenue/PFE Road lift station	Northern portion within PVSP area inspected (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	No access permission for alignment off-site south of Dry Creek or for lift station site
Force Main TL from lift station to existing force main east of Walerga Road	Not inspected; records search only	No access permissions
Force Main from western extension of Dyer Road to proposed lift station at Locust Road	Inspected as part of PVSP survey; entirely within participating area (Windmiller et al. 2009, 2012)	Ground visibility moderate

### Built Environment Resource Identification and Assessment

Participating parcels within the project area were subjected to an architectural history assessment in 1999-2000 with a focus on buildings and structures more than 50 years of age (Windmiller *et al.* 2000). A preliminary architectural overview was conducted of the remainder of the project area at that time, as well. Likely locations of historic-period buildings and structures within the project area were identified based on historic maps and other data, and sites where potential historic structures were identified through archival research were inspected on the ground. In 2005, an architectural historian formally recorded and evaluated each of the identified historic structures located on participating parcels (Windmiller *et al.* 2005). Each historic structure was revisited, and site records updated in 2008, and again in 2012 (Windmiller *et al.* 2009, 2012).

For historic architectural resources, all infrastructure improvement locations within PVSP participating parcels, within public ROW, or on properties for which access had been granted were inspected on the ground. In addition, buildings and a cemetery within the linear corridors for proposed infrastructure improvements were identified from aerial photos. All buildings and structures so identified were visited by an architectural historian, and buildings and structures older than 45 years were fully documented.

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

The Specific Plan area is located west of Roseville, in Placer County near the eastern margin of the Sacramento Valley. The Specific Plan area consists of gently rolling topography vegetated primarily in open non-native grasslands. Curry Creek, a perennial watercourse, traverses the northern portion of the project area, and Dry Creek, another perennial, runs along the southwestern margin of the plan area. There is dense riparian vegetation in some areas along these creeks including willows, cottonwoods and a few oaks. There is a stand of (non-native) eucalyptus trees on the southeastern part of the site. The site also includes the several intermittent stream courses, and scattered vernal pools, ponds and other seasonal wetlands. The majority of the Specific Plan area is undeveloped and historically has been used primarily for dry farming and cattle grazing operations, with associated rural residences, although some areas have been graded and diked for rice cultivation. The western area of the site, where there are two large areas comprising the non-participating parcels, is characterized by substantial semi-rural residential development, most postdating the 1950s. Given the natural environment of the Specific Plan area, there exists a potential for undocumented archaeological resources, which may be buried by alluvium.

Based on a geoarchaeological assessment (Cogstone 2010) of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area, which is located immediately to the north of the PVSP, recent alluvium in this area typically is only about 3 feet (0.9 meter) deep, and is underlain by hardpan of an age that substantially predates human occupancy of the region. The potential for deeply buried cultural deposits therefore is slight: thus, the potential for archaeological deposits that are not evident on or near the surface is relatively low. Although further south in the Sacramento area and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, archaeological deposits have been found buried under 10 feet (3 meters) or more of alluvium, geoarchaeological study indicates that the project vicinity overall probably has not been subject to deep and regular flooding or other significant alluvial deposition such as might have buried archaeological deposits, although Dry Creek, the largest water course in the vicinity, likely has flooded and meandered to some extent in the past. Cogstone's geoarchaeological assessment of geological records and of soil exposures in the project vicinity, particularly in creek channels just north of the PVSP site, indicate that project area soils consist entirely of late Pleistocene sediments — Riverbank Formation deposits, deposited 300,000 to 100,000 years before present, and Turlock Formation deposits, dating to 700,000 to 500,000 before present. Sandstone base rock and hardpan in the vicinity are overlain by a thin (20 cm to less than 1 m thick [8 inches to less than 3.3 feet thick]) topsoil of decomposed Pleistocene sedimentary soils. Except for the shallow alluvium overlying the hardpan soils, the soil present in the vicinity predates the entry of humans into California by hundreds of thousands of years, and significant later alluvial deposition that might have buried later archaeological deposits has been limited in extent. On the basis of geoarchaeological assessment, the potential for naturally buried prehistoric deposits to be present within the PVSP area appears to be low.

Archaeological data on prehistoric archaeological sites in the project area suggests that many of the prehistoric sites, most of which cluster along Dry Creek, may have been surficial or shallow deposits. Archaeological testing has been limited to a very few locations on the site. Many locations recorded in the 1960s could not be revisited in 2009. However, a few of the sites that were revisited did not yield any cultural material or evidence of culturally modified soils which tends to support the impression that the sites in this area typically were shallow, with little buildup of cultural soils.

It must be assumed that the project area holds some potential for buried prehistoric deposits, most particularly along the banks of Dry Creek (where, in fact, one site was recorded to lie within deposits exposed by flood erosion). The corridors of Dry Creek (which runs along the southeastern boundary of the PVSP site and within the APEs of some off-site improvements) and its major tributaries (primarily in the eastern part of the project area) should be considered to be sensitive for the potential presence of buried prehistoric cultural deposits.

### **Results of Previous Cultural Resources Identification and Evaluation**

Records searches and the surveys listed above resulted in the identification of 45 cultural resources within the APE. These include 11 archaeological sites, five isolated finds, one historic-period residence, and one historic-period structure within the 22 PVSP participating parcels. Nineteen additional prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and eight additional historic-period residences were identified within or immediately adjacent to the APE for infrastructure elements. It is possible that further study of portions of the PVSP, through implementation of the PA, will result in the identification of additional resources.

Some of the resources identified within the participating parcels are also within the infrastructure APE, and some resources are within the APE for more than one infrastructure element. The text that follows describes each resource in more detail and discusses 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 a historic property under NRHP criteria.

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

**Table 3.6-3** presents a summary of the 45 previously recorded cultural resources within the APE.

**Table 3.6-3  
Cultural Resources Inventory and Eligibility for Previously Recorded Resources Within the APE**

<b>Site Designation</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Eligible for the NRHP?</b>
<b>Specific Plan APE</b>		
5606 Straight Road	1950s residence	No
8875 Watt Avenue	1930s ranch complex	No
CA-PLA-46	Prehistoric bedrock mortars and stone tools	To be determined
CA-PLA-47	Prehistoric midden site	Yes
CA-PLA-69	Buried prehistoric archaeological deposit	Yes
CA-PLA-80	Prehistoric lithic scatter	To be determined
CA-PLA-82	Prehistoric deposit with groundstone, chipped stone, and formal stone tools	Yes
CA-PLA-944H	Early 20 <sup>th</sup> century barn foundation	To be determined
CA-PLA-945H (P-31-1135)	19 <sup>th</sup> century trash scatter	No
CA-PLA-946H	Sacramento Northern Railroad Grade	No
CA-PLA-947H	Concrete reservoir	No
CA-PLA-948	Prehistoric scatter of stone tools	Yes
PV-ISO-01	Mid-20 <sup>th</sup> century pipe scatter	No
PV-ISO-02	Early 20 <sup>th</sup> century road grader	No
DR-5	Isolated prehistoric pestle and mano	To be determined
P-31-1137	1955 McClellan Air Force Base Outer Runway Beacon Shed	No
P-31-2901	Isolated prehistoric mano	No
P-31-3303	Historic Elder Road	No
P-31-3307 and P-31-3311	Historic Pallady Road/Watt Avenue	No
P-31-3310	Isolated prehistoric obsidian biface fragment	No
Spinelli-1	Archaeological remnants of a 20 <sup>th</sup> century farm complex	No
Spinelli-2	Remnants of a 20 <sup>th</sup> century outbuilding	No
<b>Infrastructure Improvements APE</b>		
CA-PLA-1986H	1926 residence at 4300 PFE Road	To be determined
CA-PLA-1998	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-PLA-67	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-PLA-75	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-PLA-76	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-PLA-77	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-PLA-81	Prehistoric campsite	To be determined
CA-SUT-87H (CA-PLA-946H)	Sacramento Northern Railroad Grade	No
CA-SUT-85H / CA-SAC-463H	Natomas East Main Drainage Canal Levee and Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape	Yes

Site Designation	Description	Eligible for the NRHP?
P-31-2603	Late 19 <sup>th</sup> – early 20 <sup>th</sup> century Union Cemetery*	No
P-31-2604	House at 8640 Watt Avenue	No
P-31-2606	House at 8720 Watt Avenue	No
P-31-2607	House at 8724 Watt Avenue	No
P-31-2608	House at 8718 Watt Avenue	No
P-31-3302	1910 House on Baseline Road	No
P-31-3305	1950s Stolenberg Farm	No
P-31-3306	Historic Brewer Road	No
P-31-3308	Historic County Acres Road	No
P-31-3309	Eagle Hotel Site	To be determined
P-31-3312	Historic Walerga Road	No
P-51-141	Historic Locust Road	No
Bridge #19C0084	Watt Avenue at Dry Creek Bridge	No

\* Although not historically significant, the cemetery includes human remains, which are protected from disturbance by state law.

**5606 Straight Road: Residence.** This residence, which dates to ca. 1950s, is a Minimal Traditional style, one-story, wood frame house with wood siding and a cross-gable roof. The structure was documented in 1999-2000 and the record updated in 2009 (Windmiller *et al.* 2009, 2012). The house is set well back from the road and is surrounded by trees. Several associated outbuildings are also present. As assessed by Windmiller *et al.* (2009), this property is not associated with any significant event or persons, nor does it exhibit architecturally distinguished characteristics. The residence is of a type that is common throughout the area. It, therefore, does not meet NRHP eligibility criteria A, B, or C. Further, the property does not have the potential to yield information important to history (NRHP Criterion D). As a result, this resource is not a historic property.

**8875 Watt Avenue (no primary number assigned): Ranch complex.** This property is a 1930s ranch complex, with a Tudor Revival-style residence and two barns. While the house is architecturally distinctive, it has been very substantially modified, such that its appearance no longer retains historical integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. The barns are not architecturally distinctive. Although the complex is associated with the development of the local farming community in the 1930s, no direct association with important persons or events can be established. The complex therefore does not meet any of the NRHP eligibility criteria and is not a historic property.

**CA-PLA-46: Prehistoric bedrock mortars and groundstone tools.** This site was recorded in 1959 as a scatter of groundstone artifacts found eroding from the banks of an artificial ditch, and associated bedrock mortars. The site could not be relocated when the area was reinspected in 2005 (Windmiller *et al.* 2005), and backhoe trenching of the area in 2007 also failed to relocate the site (LSA Associates 2007, as reported in Windmiller *et al.* 2009, 2012). Because the site was not relocated, it could not be formally assessed; however, if bedrock mortar and associated tools are present, a prehistoric cultural deposit is likely. If relatively intact, the site likely would have the potential to yield data important to prehistory

(NRHP Criterion D), and would be considered a historic property. In the absence of physical evidence, no formal significance assessment can be made at this time. If the site was correctly located on the original record and has not been destroyed, it may have been buried by agricultural activity or flooding. The area must be considered to be archaeologically sensitive.

**CA-PLA-47: Prehistoric midden site.** This site was recorded in 1960 as a dark midden deposit with a surface scatter of projectile points, manos, and metates. Windmiller (Windmiller *et al.* 2009) reported that the site was revisited in 2005 by Peak and Associates, who described the site as a scatter of groundstone tools, flaked stone tools, and obsidian and metavolcanic chipped stone. Peak and Associates conducted shovel testing to determine the boundaries of the site, found intact deposits to 35 to 40 cm below surface, and initiated data recovery excavations, which were not completed. Windmiller conducted test excavations in 2009 and 2012 at this location, but did not observe any artifacts and reported that the midden deposit was not evident. This suggests that the deposit previously observed has either been destroyed or, more likely, obscured by subsequent cultivation. Nonetheless, CA-PLA-47 likely has yielded or has the potential to yield information important to prehistory with respect to chronology, trade, settlement patterns, and ethnicity/boundary domains. Although the site apparently has been at least partially destroyed, and integrity of the deposit may have been impaired by vineyard cultivation over a period of several decades, the site (if present) should be assumed to qualify as a historic property under NRHP Criterion D, and the area should be considered to be archaeological sensitive.

**CA-PLA-69: Buried prehistoric archaeological deposit.** This site consists of a buried cultural deposit and “pockets of rock” in the bank of Dry Creek that was exposed by flood-associated erosion in 1962. Windmiller reports that archaeologists have considered the site to be “very old,” but provides no other detail on materials found at the site (Windmiller *et al.* 2009). Access could not be obtained to revisit the site in 2009 or 2012. If an older deposit is present, it almost certainly would be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for potential to yield chronological data; however, this cannot be determined without further information. If present and intact, the resource would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-80: Prehistoric lithic scatter.** As reported by Windmiller (Windmiller *et al.* 2009), this site was recorded by Palumbo in 1965 as a prehistoric campsite, although no midden was reported. Artifacts noted at that time included a slate projectile point and greenstone lithic tool cores, and Palumbo interpreted these are representing an earlier occupation than many of the other sites she recorded in the Dry Creek vicinity. Peak and Associates revisited the site in 1979 and noted a surface scatter of artifacts. Windmiller *et al.* could not relocate the site during visits in 2009 and 2012, and noted that the area is now the margin of a fallow agricultural field. Windmiller noted that there is no evidence of cultural deposits at the reported location and opined that the site was a “minor archaeological resource” that likely has suffered loss of integrity or been totally destroyed by agricultural activity. In the absence of physical evidence, no evaluation of eligibility to the NRHP could be made. If the site still exists and is indeed a minor archaeological resource, it likely would not meet NRHP criterion D. However, it is located in the same fallow field as CA-PLA-82 (described below), and if it still exists, may have the potential to yield important information about settlement pattern in this area, in conjunction with the nearby CA-PLA-82. Because evidence of the site has not been found in repeated visits to the recorded location, pre-

construction testing does not appear to be warranted, but this area should be considered to be archaeologically sensitive.

**CA-PLA-82: Prehistoric deposit with groundstone, chipped stone and formal tools.** This site was recorded in 1962 as an eroded deposit of “dark ash” over a 2-acre (0.8 hectare) area in an agricultural field. Palumbo revisited the site in 1966 and Peak and Associates inspected it in 1982. Artifacts initially noted included pestles, manos, metates and bowl mortars, cooking stones, paints, and a hand ax. Palumbo noted many broken artifacts due to cultivation, and Peak and Associates found a widely dispersed scatter of ground stone fragments. Windmiller revisited the site in 2009 and 2012 and found no artifacts, but, in 2009, through shovel scraping exposed pockets of pale gray soil in a much smaller area in an abandoned agricultural field. Based on Windmiller’s assessment, the site does not meet NRHP Criteria A, B or C, but is eligible under NRHP Criterion D. This finding is based on the previously reported range of artifacts and deposit size, which suggest the potential to yield information relevant to subsistence, technology, chronology, trade, and other issues of importance to prehistory. As a result, this site is considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-944H: Barn foundation.** This site, initially recorded in 1999-2000, consists of concrete foundations of a barn, pump house, and associated well casing, with no associated artifacts, located in an agricultural field. Windmiller revisited the site in 2005 and 2009 and found the foundations slightly deteriorated, but generally unchanged. Windmiller reports that the property was acquired by George Breining in 1874, but that the barn appears to date to sometime after 1900 based on the construction materials (Windmiller *et al.* 2009). The site does not meet NRHP criteria A and B, as it is not associated with important events in local or regional history and the owner is not mentioned in regional or local histories. As remnant foundations, the site does not exemplify any significant engineering or architectural qualities and therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion C. As an isolated remnant foundation distant from the house, there exists a potential to yield important information (NRHP Criterion D). Subsurface testing to confirm the presence or absence of significant archaeological deposits has not been carried out; if present and significant, then the site would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-945H (P-31-001135): Historic-era trash scatter.** This site was recorded in 1999 as a small scatter of historic artifacts, including fragments of several crockery jars, thick bottle glass, and white improved earthenware, which appear to date prior to 1900. The materials appear to have been uncovered by shallow cultivation across a small swale, which was probably the original dumping location. There was no evidence of associated structures or features. The deposit lies near the route of an unnamed County road that appears on the GLO plat, for which surveys were conducted in 1855 and 1857. Windmiller interpreted the site as a casual dumpsite that represents one or a few episodes of disposal. Resurvey in 2008 (Wohlgemuth 2008) recorded only one glass bottle fragment and one earthenware fragment at the site. While the site is located on the same property as the barn foundation described above, it cannot be associated definitively with any historical occupation of the property, and therefore does not meet NRHP criteria A or B. The site also does not meet NRHP Criterion C. While a trash deposit is important under NRHP Criterion D if it can be linked to specific households or another specific source, or possesses

important data, no such association could be made. Therefore, the site is not eligible under NRHP Criterion D. Therefore, this site is not a historic property.

**CA-PLA-946H: Sacramento Northern Railroad Grade.** This 1.32-mile segment of railroad grade runs along the western margins of both properties and marks the route of the Sacramento Northern Railroad. At one time, the line ran between San Francisco and Chico and was America's longest interurban electric passenger train route. The railroad operated between 1906 and 1940. The historical integrity of this feature has been compromised by removal of rails, ties, and trestles. The installation of high voltage transmission lines on the railroad grade between 2009 and 2012 has further compromised its integrity of setting and feeling (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). The site no longer meets any of NRHP eligibility criteria, and does not constitute a historic property.

**CA-PLA-947H: Concrete reservoir.** This resource consists of the remnant of a concrete-walled reservoir or cistern with an associated well. No historical information is available on the feature and it appears to have no association with significant persons or events. While this type of feature is uncommon in the area, the design does not appear to be innovative. In the absence of apparent historic associations, the reservoir does not have the potential to yield significant historical information. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**CA-PLA-948: Prehistoric scatter of ground and chipped stone and formal tools.** This site consists of a sparse scatter of ground stone and chipped stone artifacts. Palumbo, who recorded the site in 1965, considered it to be characteristic of the small, late prehistoric period campsites she found along the western portion of Dry Creek. Windmiller observed similar materials when he revisited the site in 2009 and 2012. Although the site had already been disturbed by agricultural activity when it was first recorded, the fact that materials persist on the surface suggests that subsurface deposits might be present, which could indicate an occupation of greater time depth. The site appears to have the potential to yield data relevant to local cultural sequence, settlement pattern and subsistence and technology, and therefore is a historic property under NRHP Criterion D.

**Field Number PV-ISO-01 (no primary number assigned): Pipe scatter.** This is a small scatter of pipes constructed of galvanized sheet metal that has been riveted and soldered. Each pipe section is 10 feet (3 meters) long, with a 6 inch (15 centimeters) diameter, and is tapered at one end. This type of piping was common in irrigation in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. No association with important events or persons can be made and the pipes have little information value. Because this isolate fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not considered a historic property.

**Field Number PV-ISO-02 (no primary number assigned): Antique road grader.** This find is a non-motorized road grader with spoked wheels and rubber tires, found in isolation at the edge of an agricultural field. Research indicates that the equipment was manufactured by the Servis Equipment Company, Dallas, Texas. The Servis Equipment Company was incorporated on December 18, 1930. The company designed and manufactured construction equipment such as rollers, packers, and road graders from the middle to late thirties. The first semi-mount, hand-adjustable road grader blade was produced in 1934 and production ceased around 1945. While the manufacture of this piece of equipment can be

demonstrated to date to a short period of time prior to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, it cannot be determined whether the equipment was acquired new prior to use at this site or was brought to its present location at a later time. As an isolated artifact, its association with significant persons or events and its potential to yield information is limited. Because this isolate fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**Field Number DR-5 (no primary number assigned): Isolate pestle and mano.** These isolated artifacts were recorded in 1992 (Syda 1992, as reported in Windmiller *et al.* 2009, 2012), in the general vicinity of the reported location of CA-PLA-46. The artifacts could not be found when the area was resurveyed in 2005 (Windmiller *et al.* 2005). It cannot be determined whether these artifacts are truly isolates, are associated with CA-PLA-46, or represent a separate site. As isolates, the artifacts would not be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, but they may represent a more substantial deposit that, if relocated, could be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D, and if so, would constitute a historic property. In the absence of physical evidence, no formal significance assessment can be made at this time. The area must be considered to be archaeologically sensitive.

**P-31-1137: McClellan Air Force Base Outer Runway Beacon Shed.** 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 (Windmiller *et al.* 2005), McClellan Air Force Base, located in Sacramento County, in the North Highlands area of northwest Sacramento, was originally established in 1935. Development at the airfield ramped up with the onset of World War II. The airfield 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 U.S. 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 ILS 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 and 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 ILS structure shows signs of continued deterioration between 2009 and 2012 (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). Lacking significant associations, architectural distinction, or deposits or features that could contribute further historical information, this structure does not meet any of the NRHP eligibility criteria. Therefore, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-2901: Isolate mano.** A single mano fragment was recorded in 1991 among the rocks near the base of Dry Creek. As an isolated artifact without historic associations, and likely redeposited from its original location, this resource does not meet any of the NRHP eligibility criteria. Therefore, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3303: Elder Road.** The historic route of Elder Road was recorded as a cultural resource based on its location on a 1908 US Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map. Although the modern roadway of Elder Road follows the same route, it bears no physical evidence of the historic roadway that would convey a sense of history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, and does not retain integrity of materials, setting, or association, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3307 (Palladay Road), P-31-3311 (Watt Avenue).** The historic routes of each of these roads were recorded as cultural resources based on location on a 1908 USGS topographic map. In each case, a modern roadway follows the same route, but it bears no physical evidence of the historic roadways that would convey a sense of history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, and does not retain integrity of materials, setting, or association, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3310: Isolate obsidian biface fragment.** This artifact was discovered on the surface of a small swale, with no other associations. As an isolate this resource fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP and is not a historic property.

**Spinelli-1: Residence site (no primary number).** This 20<sup>th</sup> century historic archaeological site consists of concrete slabs, a concrete-lined cellar and concrete foundations of a farmhouse and three outbuildings. Also present are fruit and landscape trees, foundation and brick chimney fragments, sheep wire fencing, metal roofing, wire nails, and window glass. An extant farmhouse and vineyard were noted at this site in 1960, but only foundations remained in 2009. Although the foundations are more than 50 years old, no cultural deposits dating to the same era were noted. The site is on the Spinelli property and presumably represents the Spinelli farm, but this property does not appear to have been associated with significant historic events or persons (NRHP criteria A and B). The foundations do not represent distinguished or innovative architecture, and the site therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion C. In the absence of associated cultural deposits, the potential to yield important information (NRHP Criterion D) appears to be very limited. The site therefore does not appear to qualify as a historic property. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**Spinelli-2: Outbuilding site (no primary number).** This site consists of a bulldozed pile of foundation chunks that clearly have been moved from a nearby location. The 1967 USGS topographic map shows a structure at the original location. The foundation remnants are assumed to represent an outbuilding associated with the Spinelli farm. The site is on the Spinelli property and presumably is associated with the Spinelli farm (Spinelli-1), but this property does not appear to have been associated with significant historic events or persons (NRHP criteria A and B). The foundations do not represent distinguished or innovative architecture, and the site therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion C. In the absence of associated cultural deposits, the potential to yield important information (NRHP Criterion D) appears to be very limited. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1986H: House and Landscaping at 4300 PFE Road.** This property was documented in 2003 as a single-story wood-frame house dating to 1926. The site could not be reinspected in 2009 and 2012 as permission to access the site was not granted, so no further information is available. All structures on the property were razed between 2003 and 2009, so the extant portion of the resource does not retain integrity and is no longer eligible to the NRHP. However, the potential archaeological values of the property could not be assessed due to lack of access. If subsurface deposits (such as a well or privy pit) are present and found to be significant, then the site would be eligible under NRHP Criterion D as an archaeological resource, and would therefore be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-1998: Prehistoric campsite.** This site was recorded by Derr in 1991 as a narrow scatter of ground and flaked stone artifacts along Dry Creek. Based on the narrow distribution of artifacts, Derr suggested that the materials might have been redeposited through agricultural activity. Access permission was not granted to visit this location in 2009 or 2012. As the site's present condition is unknown, it cannot be evaluated for NRHP eligibility at this time. However, if the site is still present, it would potentially be eligible under NRHP Criterion for its potential to yield data on local settlement pattern and special use sites, in conjunction with the study of the other sites in the near vicinity. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-67: Prehistoric campsite.** This site was recorded in 1966 as an extensive surface scatter of groundstone and other artifacts in a plowed field near PFE Road. Access was not granted to revisit the site in 2009 or 2012, so it could not be evaluated. If the materials are still present and integrity has not been further diminished by continuing agriculture, the site likely would be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for potential to yield information important to prehistory with respect to subsistence, technology, and settlement pattern. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-75: Prehistoric campsite.** Palumbo described this site in 1966 as a surface scatter of chipped stone and groundstone artifacts. Windmiller reported that more recent records indicate that the site was subsequently destroyed by residential development, but that the location could not be revisited to confirm this assertion, as access permission was denied (Windmiller *et al.* 2009). If the site has, in fact, been destroyed, then it would not qualify as a historic property under Section 106. However, if the site is still present, it would potentially be eligible under NRHP Criterion D for its potential to yield data on local settlement pattern and special use sites, in conjunction with the study of the other sites in the near vicinity. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-76: Prehistoric campsite.** This site was recorded by Palumbo in 1966 as a surface scatter of groundstone and chipped stone tools and other cultural debris. A revisit of the site in 1991 failed to relocate these materials. Access permission could not be obtained to revisit the site in 2009. However, if the site is still present, as described in 1966, it would be eligible under NRHP Criterion D for its potential to yield data on local settlement pattern and special use sites, in conjunction with the study of the other sites in the near vicinity. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-77: Prehistoric campsite.** Palumbo described this site in 1966 as a small surface scatter of chipped stone materials, groundstone artifacts, and one fragment of red ochre. The site was not precisely located in records searches, and permission to revisit the site was not granted in 2009 or 2012. As present condition is unknown, the site cannot be evaluated for NRHP eligibility at this time. However, if the site is still present, it would potentially be eligible under NRHP Criterion D for its potential to yield data on local settlement pattern and special use sites, in conjunction with the study of the other sites in the near vicinity. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-81: Prehistoric campsite.** Palumbo described this site in 1966 as a surface scatter of chipped stone materials and groundstone tools. Peak and Associates revisited the site in 1982 and described it as a widely dispersed scatter of stone tool fragments. Access permission was not granted to revisit the site in

2009 or 2012. As the site's present condition is unknown, the site cannot be evaluated for NRHP eligibility at this time. However, if still present, it likely would be eligible under NRHP Criterion D for its potential to yield data on local settlement pattern and special use sites, in conjunction with the study of the other sites in the near vicinity. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**CA-PLA-946H/CA-SUT-87H: Sacramento Northern Railroad Grade.** A portion of this resource (CA-PLA-946H) is also identified within the specific plan APE, above. The Sutter County portion of the grade (CA-SUT-87H) that is located within the APE for the intersection improvements has been severely disturbed, and in some places destroyed, by repaving of Baseline Road and other ground-disturbing activities. Due to a loss of integrity, the CA-PLA-946H segment is not eligible for the NRHP. Likewise, the CA-SUT-87H segment is not eligible due to a loss of historical integrity, as it no longer retains the ability to convey its historic function and importance. Therefore, it is not a historic property.

**CA-SUT-85H/CA-SAC-463H: Natomas East Main Drainage Canal Levee and Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape.** Reclamation District 1000 formed in the early 1920s to transform the seasonally inundated, partly swampy land to a vast open agricultural landscape with a large pattern of fields formed by a grid of canals and roads. The District has been determined eligible to the NRHP for its association with the development of the extensive regional reclamation and irrigation system. A portion of the proposed intersection improvement lies within the eastern boundary of the Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape, and encompasses a portion of the East Main drainage canal levee. The canal levee is a contributing element of the Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape; both the levee and the District have been determined eligible to the NRHP for their association with the development of the extensive regional reclamation and irrigation system. As a result, this resource is considered a historic property.

**P-31-2603: Historic Union Cemetery.** This is a small rural cemetery, with dates ranging between about 1870 and 1950, located on a knoll on the east side of Watt Avenue. There is little evidence of planned design or layout, or design embellishment or enhancement, and grave markers generally are simple in form and characteristic of their respective periods. Native oak trees are the primary landscape features. Cemeteries are not generally among resources that would be considered eligible for the NRHP; however, they should be evaluated under the same criteria as other cultural resources as well as additional special considerations. The Union Cemetery is potentially eligible under Criteria A, C, and D, but additional information is needed prior to determining eligibility. If found eligible, it would be considered a historic property.

**P-31-2604: House at 8640 Watt Avenue.** This is a Ranch Style house of the type popular in California in the 1950s and 1960s, similar to hundreds or thousands of such houses built in Sacramento and Placer counties during this time. While many such houses are located in suburban development tracts, this is an isolated example on a semi-rural property. The house does not appear to be associated with any significant events or persons, and is of an undistinguished and common style. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-2606: House at 8720 Watt Avenue.** This is a vernacular-style post-World War II house, constructed of standard building materials of the era, similar to many rural houses in Sacramento and Placer counties. Although it retains its original design characteristics and integrity, it does not exhibit qualities or design or workmanship that would qualify it for listing on the NRHP under Criterion C, nor does it appear to be associated with significant persons or events in local or regional history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-2607: House at 8724 Watt Avenue.** This is a Minimal Traditional-style house, with low gable roof, covered porch, and minimal ornamentation. Windmiller does not provide a construction date, but notes that this was a popular dwelling style in the region before and immediately after World War II, and that the style was a precursor of the California Ranch House (Windmiller *et al.* 2009). The original window frames have been replaced with vinyl frames, and window openings have been altered. As an example of a type common in the region, the house does not possess qualities of design or workmanship that would qualify it for individual listing under NRHP Criterion C, and it is not associated with other similar structures that might comprise a district. No associations with significant events or persons were uncovered. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-2608: House at 8718 Watt Avenue.** This house is an example of the Colonial Revival style, popular throughout the United States between the 1920s and 1950s. Although this house is a good example of its style, it is not sufficiently distinguished in design or execution to merit individual listing on the NRHP under Criterion C. It is located along Watt Avenue among a small row of semi-rural houses from a variety of periods and styles, and thus does not have a district context to which it might contribute. No association with significant persons or events was uncovered. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3302: 1910-era house on southern side of Baseline Road.** This is a small Folk-style house with some Craftsman elements. Due to extensive modification, particularly replacement of windows and doors, there has been significant loss of historical integrity, such that the house does not appear to be eligible under NRHP Criterion C. There is no evidence for association with significant persons or events, and the property does not appear to have the potential to yield significant historical information. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3305: Stolenberg Farm.** The Stolenberg Farm is located adjacent to the Locust Road intersection improvement project. The farm includes a Minimal Traditional-style house and associated outbuildings that date to the 1950s. All have been altered to some degree and a portion of the farm burned in 2009. Since then, the burned buildings appear to have been removed, with newer temporary structures installed and a nursery that has since been constructed (Windmiller *et al.* 2012). The farm is not associated with historically important persons or events in Placer County, and none of the buildings is architecturally exceptional. The complex does not appear to have the potential to yield important historical information. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3306: Brewer Road.** The historic route of Brewer Road was recorded as a cultural resource based on its location on a 1908 USGS topographic map. The modern roadway of Brewer Road follows the same route, but it bears no physical evidence of the historic roadways that would convey a sense of history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, and does not retain integrity of materials, setting, or association, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3308: County Acres Road.** The historic route of this road was recorded as a cultural resource based on location on a 1908 USGS topographic map. A modern roadway follows the same route, but it bears no physical evidence of the historic roadways that would convey a sense of history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, and does not retain integrity of materials, setting, or association, it is not a historic property.

**P-31-3309: Eagle Hotel Site.** This site was recorded by Wohlgemuth (2008) based on the presence of a shallow depression adjacent to Baseline Road, which corresponds approximately with the location of the Eagle Hotel, as shown on 1850s to 1860s General Land Office (GLO) plats. The site could not be revisited in 2009 or 2012 due of lack of access permission. Information about the site is limited; however, in presuming that archaeological deposits are present, the site would potentially be eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to yield information about travelers, settlers, and day-to-day life in this region that may not be available in the historic record.

**P-31-3312: Walerga Road.** This resource was recorded as the historic alignment of Walerga Road, a historic rural road that ran along a north-south alignment south of Baseline Road, extending Fiddymont Road southward. As a route of a mapped historic road without archaeological features, this resource lacks the qualities, characteristics, or associations that would make it eligible for listing in the NRHP. Therefore, it is not considered a historic property.

**P-51-000141: Locust Road.** The historic route of Locust Road was recorded as a cultural resource based on its location on a 1908 USGS topographic map. The modern roadway of Locust Road follows the same route, but it bears no physical evidence of the historic roadways that would convey a sense of history. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, and does not retain integrity of materials, setting, or association, it is not a historic property under Section 106.

**Caltrans Bridge #19C0084: Watt Avenue at Dry Creek Bridge.** This bridge was constructed in 1940 to carry Watt Avenue over Dry Creek. It has been previously evaluated for significance by architectural historians to be a category 5 bridge, which is not eligible for the NRHP. Because this site fails to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP, it is not a historic property under Section 106.

### *Conclusions: Identified Historic Properties*

Based on previous research throughout the APE between the 1960s and present day, the following cultural resources have been identified within the APE, pending concurrence from the California SHPO:

- Five cultural resources that are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and meet the definition of a historic property under Section 106. These include four prehistoric sites and one historic district.

- Twenty-six cultural resources that fail to meet the definition of a historic property under Section 106, and therefore are not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP
- Twelve cultural resources that remain unevaluated for significance

Additional unrecorded cultural resources may also be present within the APE, and if found to be eligible for the NRHP, would constitute additional historic properties.

### ***Phased Identification, Evaluation, and Management of Cultural Resources under Section 106***

Based on the preliminary baseline data alone, the USACE has made the determination that there will be an adverse effect to historic properties (see **Table 3.6-3** for a discussion of potential effects). On October 22, 2012, the USACE initiated consultation with the SHPO on a finding of *Adverse Effect to Historic Properties* and requested concurrence. Consultation is ongoing.

Because intensive cultural resources surveys and evaluations of significance have not been conducted on the entire APE, because the project would involve phased development that has not yet been finalized, and because the project would be subject to a Regional General Permit, USACE has determined that cultural resources would be more appropriately managed under a Programmatic Agreement (PA). The execution of a PA would satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA and would be sufficient for other federal actions to proceed. A draft of the PA is included as **Appendix 3.6**. USACE, under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC Section 1344), may issue permits for subsequent projects within the APE for permit applicants that have submitted or will submit applications to USACE for a Section 404 permit for their respective individual projects within the APE. Such applications may include individual properties, groups of properties, or portions of the infrastructure improvements. The PA will be executed before a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued for this EIS.

The applicants for Section 404 permits within the APE are expected to proceed with development independently of one another with a potential buildout timeframe of 30 to 40 years. Because USACE has determined that projects within the APE may have an adverse effect on historic properties and historical resources that are either included in, or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, USACE, in consultation with the SHPO, has determined that compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA will be achieved through the execution of a PA, pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.14. The PA is currently in development; however, the phased identification, evaluation, and treatment of cultural resources within the APE will occur under the PA in the following manner.

- USACE has defined the APE to include all areas where effects could occur from construction of the individual projects within the specific plan area and its associated infrastructure. Future project design changes may require redefining the APE and the development projects within it. Each Section 404 permit application will have its own project-specific APE designated by USACE and approved by the SHPO. Project-specific APEs are a subset of the larger APE for the plan area. If some of the projects are merged or segregated, a project APE will be defined as the area to which a specific Section 404 permit application applies.

- All applications for project-specific Section 404 permits in the specific plan area will require that the project-specific APE for that permit area be established by USACE and approved by the SHPO. The project-specific APE shall include the area of direct and indirect effect.
- All applications for project-specific Section 404 permits will be required to produce documentation, for USACE and SHPO approval, which shows an updated records search, pedestrian survey that meets the standards specified in the PA, and a full inventory and evaluation of cultural resources within that project-specific APE. If an applicant wishes to deviate from the standards specified in the PA, then a research design and work plan shall be developed and agreed upon by USACE and the SHPO to ensure that the deviation is compliant with Section 106. All evaluations of significance that require archaeological excavation will require preparation and pre-approval of an Evaluation Plan.
- USACE, in consultation with the SHPO, will ensure that determinations of eligibility are made in accordance with the NRHP eligibility criteria set forth in 36 CFR 60.4 for all resources within the APE. All cultural resources determined eligible are Historic Properties as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(l)(1).
- USACE will apply the Criteria of Adverse Effect pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1) to all Historic Properties within the APE that will be affected by the project. Determinations of Effect (DoE) will be made in consultation with the SHPO and other interested parties, which includes Native American tribes.
- USACE, in consultation with the SHPO, shall develop a Historical Properties Management Plan (HPMP) for the entire specific plan area to provide guidance for the resolution of adverse effect to historic properties during consultation for subsequent permit applications. The HPMP will address the range of options and process by which individual projects, which will resolve adverse effects to classes of historic properties. For example, the HPMP may specify that prehistoric village sites determined to be historic properties, be treated through data recovery excavations, public interpretation, placement into conservation easements, or monitoring. Likewise, the HPMP may specify that historic structures be treated through documentation meeting the standards and guidelines of the Historic American Building Survey. The purpose of the HPMP is to establish consensus on the general manner in which adverse effects will be resolved, and to ensure that future Treatment Plans are consistent between projects and appropriate, regardless of the makeup of agency staff, consultants, and project proponents.
- Once project-specific effects on historic properties are known, USACE shall require the development of a project-specific Historic Property Treatment Plan (HPTP) to stipulate the measures by which mitigation will occur. In contrast to the programmatic nature of the HPMP, the project-specific HPTP will specifically identify the historic properties and impacts, and will provide individualized treatments for each resource that are appropriate for the resource and meet the standards of the HPMP.
- USACE will ensure that inventory reports, evaluation plans, evaluation reports, the HPMP, and project-specific treatment plans are submitted to the SHPO, and appropriate Native American tribes and individuals for review and comment. USACE may also request comment by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).
- In consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes, USACE will identify Historic Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance. USACE will seek comments from all potentially interested Native American tribes. The interested public, including Native American

tribes, will be invited to provide input on the identification, evaluation, and proposed treatment of historic properties. Depending on the specific nature of the undertaking, this will be done through letters of notification, public meetings, and site visits.

- Notices to Proceed (NTP) with construction may be issued by USACE for individual development projects, under any of the following conditions: (1) USACE and the SHPO have determined that there are no historic properties affected by the project within the project-specific APE; (2) USACE and the SHPO have determined that there will be No Adverse Effect to Historic Properties within the project-specific APE; or (3) USACE, after consultation with the SHPO and interested parties, has implemented an adequate mitigation program, specified in a subsequent project-specific HPTP, according to the schedule detailed in the PA.
- If potentially NRHP-eligible resources are discovered during construction, ground-disturbing activities will cease until the provisions of 36 CFR 800.13(b) (discoveries without prior planning) are met. USACE will provide the SHPO and the ACHP an opportunity to review and comment on proposed treatment in accordance with the PA.
- The SHPO will consult with the ACHP on the intent to develop and execute the PA as described above. In the event that the ACHP does not join in the consultation, USACE will proceed with the requirements set forth in 36 CFR Section 800.6(b)(1).

### Assessment of Effects

Information on currently identified resources (based on preliminary information to date), the project elements that would affect them, and the nature of anticipated effects of the undertaking, is provided below. **Table 3.6-4** presents a summary of the known cultural resources and historic properties that may be affected by the PVSP and the recommended measures if they cannot be avoided. Additional cultural resources may be identified within any of the parcels and infrastructure elements, following implementation of the PA. Therefore, the information presented in **Table 3.6-4** should be considered preliminary.

**Table 3.6-4**  
**Historic Properties and Potential Historic Properties Potentially Affected by PVSP and Related Infrastructure Improvements**

Historic Properties		
Affected Resource	Potential Impacts	Recommended Measures*
CA-PLA-47	Grading or excavation associated with recreational development; potential for illicit collection associated with increased population	Further testing should be performed to determine if there are intact deposits.
CA-PLA-82	Any grading or excavation in open space; infrastructure grading or excavation	Avoidance or testing/data recovery to be performed.
CA-PLA-948	Grading or excavation associated with development	Avoidance or testing/data recovery to be performed.
CA-SUT-85H/CA-SAC-463H (Natomas East Main Drainage Canal and Levee)	Impact of federal undertakings not adverse due to prior HAER documentation	

Historic Properties		
Affected Resource	Potential Impacts	Recommended Measures*
P-31-3309 (Eagle Hotel site)	Road grading or excavation	Testing should be performed to determine presence/absence of buried materials.
RD 1000 Rural Historic Landscape	Impact of federal undertakings not adverse due to prior HAER documentation	
CA-PLA-46	Grading or excavation associated with development	Monitoring of mapped location should be performed during ground disturbing activities
CA-PLA-80	Grading or excavation associated with development	Monitoring of mapped location should be performed during ground disturbing activities
DR-5	Grading or excavation associated with development; infrastructure grading and excavation	Monitoring of mapped location should be performed during ground disturbing activities
CA-PLA-1998	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If the location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-67	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If the location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-69	Road grading or excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If the location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-75	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If the location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-76	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-77	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.
CA-PLA-81	Infrastructure grading and excavation	Site needs to be revisited prior to construction. If location cannot be avoided, testing is recommended.

\* Measures recommended if resource will be adversely affected by the PVSP.

### 3.6.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Impact CR-1 Possible Destruction of or Damage to Known Prehistoric and Historic-Era Cultural Resources during Construction

**No Action Alternative** Construction activities during project implementation could result in the destruction of or damage to known prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources that are potentially eligible for or listed on the NRHP. Prehistoric archaeological resources that qualify as historic properties have been identified on the project site and within the APEs for several of the off-site infrastructure improvements. Built environment features or potential historic archaeological deposits have been identified within the APEs of the participating parcels and the infrastructure elements.

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would be developed with a smaller community than the Proposed Action as all areas containing waters of the U.S. would be avoided and more area within the site would be preserved as open space. However, with the exception of one archaeological site (CA-PLA-948) which would likely not be affected, all of the other identified historic properties in **Table 3.6-4** above would be affected under the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative could also potentially result in a significant impact on a number of cultural resource sites that could not be fully evaluated for the eligibility to the NRHP due to lack of access.

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 would not apply under this alternative. However, there still would be some potential for impacts to these resources. The effect would be **significant** and would need to be mitigated under state law (California Environmental Quality Act) or pursuant to Section 106 process that would be completed in conjunction with the Section 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act because the No Action Alternative would have the potential to affect federally listed Endangered species (See **Section 3.4, Biological Resources**, in this Draft EIS).

**Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios)** The Proposed Action would result in **significant** effects to known and unanticipated prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources during construction. Proposed mitigation would reduce effects to the resources to a **less than significant** level.

As noted above, prehistoric archaeological resources and built environment features that qualify as historic properties have been identified in three of the participating parcels on the project site, and within the APEs for several of the off-site infrastructure improvements. In addition, there are a number of cultural resource sites that could not be fully evaluated for the NRHP due to lack of access. Residential and other structural construction, trails and roads, recreational facilities, and stormwater outfalls under the Base Plan have the potential to result in **significant** effects to these known and unknown resources on-site, while trenching and grading associated with the construction of off-site infrastructure could adversely affect resources identified within the off-site APE. As the

footprint of development under the Blueprint scenario is substantially the same as the footprint under the Base Plan scenario, the Blueprint scenario will result in the same significant effects as described above for the Base Plan. **Mitigation Measure CR-1** is included in this Draft EIS to disclose the manner in which any significant impacts to potential historic properties will be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

**Alts. 1 through 5** None of the other alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 5) would reduce impacts to any of the identified historic resources. The identified mitigation measures would apply to the development of the project site under Alternatives 1 through 5, along with off-site infrastructure improvements.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1: Prepare, Execute, and Implement a Programmatic Agreement with Programmatic Historic Properties Treatment Plan and Project-Specific Treatment Plans**  
(*Applicability – Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5*)

*For all action alternatives that require federal permitting and authorization, USACE shall satisfy the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA through the development and execution of a PA. The PA shall be prepared and executed (signed) prior to issuance of any federal permit or authorization for any aspect or component of the specific plan project. Preparation of the phase-specific APE and inventory and evaluation of properties within the APE shall be performed prior to any ground-disturbing work in the APE for any federal permitting or authorization of individual development phases. Implementation of treatment measures for identified historic properties may be performed during construction and ground-disturbing work provided that no ground-disturbing work is performed in the vicinity of resources subject to adverse effects and within an appropriate radius of the resource as determined by USACE, prior to completion of all treatment measures. The exact radius in which construction shall not occur shall be determined based upon the nature of the resource the potential for outlying undiscovered elements of that resource.*

---

## **Impact CR-2 Potential to Damage Undiscovered Historic Properties or Human Remains during Construction**

**No Action Alt.** In addition to the historic properties identified in the project APE, there is a potential that other undiscovered resources may be present in the project area. Although geoarchaeological data suggest that the potential for buried prehistoric deposits to be present on the project area is low, 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 Dry Creek or its tributaries, or that other small or subtle archaeological sites are present in other parts of the project area that have not been discovered through the archaeological investigations reported above. If a NRHP-eligible buried archaeological deposit or feature, or human remains—either in an archaeological context or in isolation — is discovered during construction, disturbance or

destruction of the deposit or the remains would constitute a significant effect to a historic property.

Under the No Action Alternative, no project work would be carried out within the waters of the United States on the project area. As a result, there would be limited ground disturbance along Dry Creek or its major tributaries. Since these are the areas within the project area that have 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 low. 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 still would be some potential for undiscovered buried archaeological deposits to be present and to be impacted by ground disturbance elsewhere within the project area. The effect would be **significant**. Mitigation for unanticipated archaeological discoveries (**Mitigation Measure CR-2**) would reduce the effect to a **less than significant** level.

**Proposed  
Action (Base  
Plan and  
Blueprint  
Scenarios)**

Construction of the Proposed Action could inadvertently damage undiscovered historic properties or human remains and result in a **significant** effect during construction.

Proposed mitigation would reduce the potential effects to undiscovered resources to a **less than significant** level.

As noted above, there is a potential that previously undiscovered historic properties or human remains may be present in the project area, especially along Dry Creek or its tributaries. If a NRHP-eligible buried archaeological deposit or feature, or human remains—either in an archaeological context or in isolation—is discovered during construction, disturbance or destruction of the deposit or the remains would constitute an adverse effect to a historic property. **Mitigation Measure CR-2** is proposed to avoid or reduce an inadvertent adverse effect on previously unknown historic properties encountered during construction in any portion of the project area.

Furthermore, the USACE has determined that while **Mitigation Measure CR-2** 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 during project-related excavation within the corridors of Dry Creek and its tributaries. 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.

As the footprint of development under the Blueprint scenario is substantially the same as the footprint under the Base Plan scenario, the Blueprint scenario will not result in greater impacts than those described above for the Base Plan. However, to the extent that the Blueprint Scenario increases the density of development on the project area, opportunities to avoid impacts to historic properties through design modifications could be reduced. However, the same mitigation measures would apply and the effect would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

**Alts. 1 through 5** All of the on-site alternatives, like the No Action Alternative, would reduce the potential to encounter unanticipated buried cultural deposits because the total area of ground disturbance on the site would be reduced and the amount of ground disturbance along Dry Creek (the most sensitive area for potential buried prehistoric deposits) would also be reduced. Nonetheless, there would be some potential to encounter buried prehistoric deposits, potentially along stream channels. The effect would be **significant**. **Mitigation Measure CR-2** would reduce the effect to a **less than significant** level.

**Mitigation Measure CR-2: Discovery of Cultural Resources during Construction**  
(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)

*Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains, be encountered during any subsurface development activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet (30 meters) of the find. The Placer County and the USACE staff shall be immediately notified. At that time, the County 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 an “historical resource” or 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 County 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. Procedures to be followed will be detailed in the HPMP developed in concert with the PA for this project.*

---

**Impact CR-3 Indirect Effects on Cultural Resources from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project**

**No Action Alt., Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), and Alts. 1 through 5** The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) which would be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 would have **no impact** on Native American archaeological resources and unknown effects on historic sites.

The record search indicates that there is one Native American site identified on the basis of an archaeological isolate discovered along the reaches. The discovery of a single artifact does not indicate that the site is highly sensitive. Therefore, the water pipelines would have **no impact** to Native American archaeological resources. Mitigation is not needed.

Each historic site located along or near the proposed pipeline route would need the significance to be individually assessed. Certain sites, specifically linear sites such as canals, railroads, roads, and fences, do not display integrity along the entire length. Therefore, each individual site would need to be evaluated to determine eligibility of the specific segment for the NRHP. The effect to historic sites along or near the proposed water pipeline route is unknown. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2** would ensure that historic resources that may be affected by pipeline construction are properly evaluated and protected, and the impacts are reduced to less than significant. The USACE notes that at this time, the PCWA has not submitted an application to the USACE for a Section 404 permit for the pipeline infrastructure project, and therefore at the present time, USACE does not have a mechanism to impose these mitigation measures on the project.

---

### 3.6.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

All of the effects would be reduced to less than significant by the proposed mitigation, as directed by the PA, HPMP, and subsequent HPTPs. There would be no residual significant effects for the Proposed Action and any of the alternatives.

### 3.6.7 REFERENCES

- Caltrans. 2012. "Historic Significance – Local Agency Bridges, District 03."
- City of Roseville. 2010. "Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report," Chapter 4.09, Cultural Resources.
- Cogstone Paleontology, Archaeology, History. 2010. Email letter report by Sherrie Gust to Jeff Jones, Sierra Vista, regarding geoarchaeological findings for the Sierra Vista Project area, Placer County, California. July 9.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2006. "Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Placer County, California." Rocklin, California: Sierra Vista Specific Plan Owner's Group, Roseville.
- ECORP Consulting, Inc. 2010. "Confidential Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, Sierra Vista Specific (Mourier & DF Properties), Placer County, California, Project No. 2005-147.2." Rocklin, California: Sierra Vista Owner's Group, Roseville, Stephen Pappas and Lisa Westwood, RPA, ECORP Consulting, Inc.
- Groff, Garth G. 2008. "Brief History of the Sacramento Northern."  
<http://people.virginia.edu/~ggg9y/history.html>. Accessed March 6, 2011.
- Windmiller, Ric (Consulting Archaeologist), Donald Napoli, Dan Osanna, and Carol Roland. 2005. "Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Updated Cultural Resources Study, Placer County, California." Elk Grove, California: Quad Knopf.

- Windmiller, Ric (Consulting Archaeologist). 2008. "Proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) for Cultural Resources in Support of Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit Applications for 22 Participating Properties within Placer Vineyards Specific Plan Area, Placer County, California." Dated October 14, 2008, Resubmitted 1-27-09
- Windmiller, Ric (Consulting Archaeologist), Don Napoli, Dan Osanna and Carol Roland-Nawi. 2009. "Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Placer and Sutter Counties, California, Volume 1 of 2: Technical Report and Appendices A-C." Newcastle, California: Placer Vineyards Group.
- Windmiller, Ric (Consulting Archaeologist). 2012. "Placer Vineyards Cultural Resources Study Updates." Auburn, California: Placer Vineyards Group.
- 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: Pacific Gas and Electric Company.