

4.9 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the prehistoric and historic resources that could be damaged or destroyed as a result of development in the project area. Prehistoric resources include sites and artifacts associated with the indigenous, non-Euro-American population, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historic resources consist of structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euro-American settlement of the region.

The information contained in this section was derived from the following sources:

- *City of Roseville General Plan*, as amended through August 2009
- *City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance*, as amended (2006)
- *Placer County General Plan*, 1994 as amended
- *Proposed Sierra Vista Specific Plan, 2009*
- ECORP Consulting Inc., *Cultural Resources Inventory Sierra Vista Specific Plan Placer County* (September 2006)
- ECORP Consulting Inc., *Test Program Results and Evaluation for Cultural Resources in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Project APE* (December 2006)
- ECORP Consulting Inc., *Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan – Chan Property* (November 2007)
- ECORP Consulting Inc., *Cultural Resources Survey Report, Sierra Vista Specific Plan – Conley Property* (August 2009)
- JRP Historical Consulting, LLC, *Historical Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Sierra Vista Project* (January 2007)
- Cultural Resources Unlimited, *Baseline/Fiddymont Property Assessment, Roseville*, (2001).
- Foothill Associates, *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Proposed Regional University Development* (2005).
- *West Roseville Specific Plan FEIR*, February 2004

The documents listed above are available for review during normal business hours at:

City of Roseville Permit Center

311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

No comments related to prehistoric, historic, paleontology resources were submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP).

4.9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The majority of the proposed project site is undeveloped and has historically been used for agricultural or grazing activities.

PREHISTORY BACKGROUND

The Native Americans who occupied the project vicinity at the time of Euro-American contact (circa 1850s) are known as the Nisenan, also referred to as the Southern Maidu. Several ethnographers have studied the Maidu people and generally agree that the Nisenan territory includes the drainages of the Bear, American, Yuba and southern Feather rivers. Their permanent settlements were generally located on ridges separating parallel streams, either on crests, knolls or terraces part way up these ridges.

Politically, the Nisenan were divided into “tribelets”, made up of a primary village and a series of outlying hamlets, presided over by a more or less hereditary chief. Villages typically included family dwellings, acorn granaries, a sweathouse, and a dance house, owned by the chief. The exact location of these villages is hard to determine, but a village site is known to have been located at Maidu Park in Roseville.

The lower foothills and the valley were rich in natural resources and the Maidu took advantage of many available foods. Acorns were important to their diet and were supplemented with seeds, nuts, berries, herbs, and fruit. Virtually every animal was hunted or trapped. The Maidu were nomadic throughout much of the year, moving from place to place following game migration patterns and gathering seasonal plants.

The Nisenan hunting and gathering cycle was altered drastically with the discovery of gold in Coloma in 1848. As miners poured into the Roseville and Auburn areas, the Native Americans were forced out of their winter villages, land was fenced, streams were silted, and food resources became increasingly difficult to procure. The Nisenan survived as best they could, working in mines or on ranches, panning for gold and other activities.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT AREA

The earliest settlers in the general project vicinity probably arrived in the late 1840s, when Placer and Sacramento Counties swarmed with men searching surface deposits for gold. By 1854 the area was sparsely settled and small-scale ranching had begun.

The construction and development of the railroad industry played a significant role in the development of the region, particularly the establishment of the City of Roseville. Roseville eventually developed into a shipping and trading center for agriculture from southern Placer County.

The lands in and around the project area were owned by a few pioneering land owners, such as the Fiddymont family, who settled in this area in 1856. Within the project area, there was little change during the first four decades of the 20th century. Aerial photographs reviewed from 1937 show few buildings in the area. Only one complex within the project site is evident at 6400 Baseline Road. It contained three structures, north of Baseline Road, south of Curry Creek.

James W. Kaseberg, Stephen A. Bountwell and William Dunlap established a large sheep ranch west of Roseville in 1864. Born in Germany, Kaseberg arrived in the United States in 1853. At its peak, Kaseberg's ranch encompassed 50,000 acres, with a herd of 40,000. However, by the 1890s much of the ranch had been sold or divided so that it comprised less than 9,000 acres. A map from the 1890s shows the vast majority of the project area was owned by Kaseberg and was presumably part of his Diamond K Ranch. The southern halves of Section 34 and 35 were owned by Stephen D Weyant or his estate through 1917. Over the next two decades, ownerships of 6400 Baseline Road were passed to the Bell Family, California Land Inc., and Vera M. Prehn. This area appears to have been devoted to dry farming, through at least the early 1940's, with wheat as the primary crop.

Most of the existing buildings located at 6400 Baseline Road were constructed after 1953, when Clyde R and Elizabeth Armour purchased an 80-acre parcel from Vera M. Prehn. The Armours met while working at McClellan Air Force Base during World War II. Clyde made small tractors on his Baseline Road parcel. This business grew into the Armour Manufacturing Co., and eventually became devoted to producing and selling motorcycle parts. Elizabeth continued operating the manufacturing business after the death of her husband in 1965.

RECORDS SEARCH

Records searches were conducted for various portions of the property at the North Central Information Center, California State University, Sacramento in August 2005, April 2006, October 2006 and July 2009. In addition to the official records and maps of archaeological sites and surveys in Placer County, the following historic references were reviewed: *The National Register of Historic Places-Listed properties*; *California Historical Landmarks (1996 and updates)*; *California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates)*; *Gold Districts of California (1979)*; *California Gold Camps (1975)*; *California Place Names (1969)*; *Survey of Surveys (Historic and Architectural Resources) (1989)*; *Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory (1999)*; *Caltrans Local Bridge Survey (1989)*; *Caltrans State Bridge Survey (1987)*; and *Historic Spots in California (1990)*.

The purpose of the record searches was to determine the extent of previous surveys within a one-half mile (1,600 meter) radius of the proposed project location, and whether previously documented historic or historic archaeological sites, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties exist within this area. Records searches indicate that portions of the project area have been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Ten previous surveys have been conducted within one-half mile, and the surveys covered approximately 60 percent of the total area within one-half mile of the project area. No prehistoric archaeological sites and eight resources from the historic period have been recorded within one-half mile of the site. There are no resources within one-half mile that have been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Places (CRHR).

Searches of the Sacred Land File were requested from the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento. The search of the Sacred Land File failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the project area.

CULTURAL RESOURCES IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE PROJECT

The entire project area was surveyed for cultural resources. Fieldwork was conducted from August 2005 through July 2006, November 2006, April 2007 and July 2009, by ECORP Consulting, Inc. Previous surveys were used to augment ECORP's surveys including the *Baseline/Fiddymont Property Assessment (Cultural Resources Unlimited, 2001)* and *Archaeological Inventory Survey: Proposed Regional University Development Project (Foothill Associates, 2005)*.

Records searches and site surveys identified seven potential cultural resources within the project area. The sites consist of a farmstead with standing structures (EC-05-18), farmsteads with no standing structures (EC-05-17 and EC-06-74), a windmill foundation (EC-06-77) and refuse scatters (P-31-1255, EC-05-19 and EC-06-76). Known and potential resources are described below.

1. **EC-05-17.** This site consists of a structure foundation, windmill foundation and various types of farm equipment, as well as brick fragments embedded in the ground. This site also includes a well hole with a cover, approximately one meter below the surface. Broken bricks are scattered around the well. In addition to the remnants of the old house and ranch complex, there is an additional locus 50 meters from the southwest of the site, which consists of nine concrete footings with wood posts. The footings are not in their original location and may have been moved from the main part of the site.

The farmstead (house and barn) was probably constructed and occupied by Richard Tubbs as early as 1877. The Evans Brothers purchased the land that includes the site in 1920 or 1921 and operated as Evans Brothers Farms. The surface items from the site include both domestic items and building materials. About half the items are not dateable, and the rest are from the twentieth century and cannot be more specifically dated. Because the amount of material is limited and cannot be dated, it cannot be determined if it represents the Tubbs or Evans occupations.

2. **EC-05-18.** This site consists of both an archaeological deposit and buildings. The site consists of a ranch complex, which includes an historic age barn, remnants of a dairy barn and two single family residences. In addition to the features recorded, there were modern resources on-site including farm equipment, barns, sheds, a stock pond and water pumps.

The archaeological deposit is from a no longer existing farmstead that may have been occupied by the Weyant family from the 1880s to 1903. Backhoe trenches excavated around the 1950s buildings did not yield any cultural material. A backhoe trench excavated at the location of a house shown on a 1910 map did yield artifacts, some of which were dateable to 1880-1920. However, these artifacts were few in number and most were not diagnostic as to time period. The artifacts did not come from a concentrated deposit, such as a privy or a refuse pit, but were dispersed throughout the

backhoe trench. The trench stratigraphy and ground surface indicated that the area had been disturbed by grading, possibly when the house was demolished.

The parcel is accessible by a gravel driveway running north from Baseline Road. The driveway reaches an open area between buildings and then forms a circle. All of the buildings are clustered around this circular drive. The complex includes over a dozen mature trees.

The buildings include two houses and a barn that date to circa 1950. Dwelling 1 is a single family minimal traditional style residence located on the eastern border of the property and 750 north of Baseline Road. It is a small rectangular structure. Based upon aerial photographs and the USGS Quad Maps and Placer County Assessor's records, this dwelling was constructed on the site around 1950.

Dwelling 2 is a single family residence located southwest of Dwelling 1. The residence bears the characteristics of hip-roofed cottages popular in the 1910s. It was likely moved to this site between 1958 and 1981, because it does not show up on aerial photographs or the USGS maps prior to this time. The hip roof has hip dormers on the north and south ends and is covered by composite shingles. A shed roof has been added on the south side, supported by wood posts and sheltering a full porch and the front door. Based upon the style and massing of this building, it is likely that this is a replacement porch. A second shed roof extends the roof to cover an enclosed addition on the north side of the building. The dwelling has sliding aluminum replacement windows with wood trim and wood louvers in the dormers.

Barn 1 is a front-gable rectangular building. The roof is clad in corrugate metal with open eaves. A shed-roof extension has been added to the north side of the barn. Barn 1 was constructed between 1949 and 1958. Barn 2 is located approximately 960 feet from Baseline Road. It is a modern front gable building. It replaced a large barn visible in the 1958 aerial of the site. It rests on a small portion of the large concrete foundation of the older barn. A small bridge is located over Curry Creek along the eastern edge of this parcel. Between 1981 and 2004, an access road and bridge were added along the eastern edge of this property to provide access to a residence located on the adjacent northern parcel.

3. **EC-05-19.** This site consists of a car (dating to 1930s) and historic debris and includes two loci. Car parts missing from the body frame appear scattered within the site boundaries. Associated artifacts include bottles, spark plugs, bowls and dishes. This site is one of three dumps of domestic refuse located along a tributary of Curry Creek. The dumps contain material that dates from the 1930s to the 1960s. The material may have come with the houses occupied by the Evans brothers or their children. This site did not yield diagnostic material from subsurface investigations.
4. **EC-06-74.** This site consists of a house foundation constructed of poured concrete and wood boards. Also included is an associated concrete porch and yard area. All except for the foundation appears to have burned in a fire. The foundation of a modern day barn is located northeast of the house foundation. The house foundation includes particle board, which was not in widespread use until the 1960s. Therefore, this site was likely not occupied until the 1960s and is less than 50 years old.
5. **EC-06-76.** This site consists of an historic trash scatter in a man-made ditch. There are three concentrations of historic refuse. Two consist of bottle glass fragments, miscellaneous metal scraps, cans and ceramic fragments. The third concentration is a pile of broken concrete from a building foundation.

This site is one of three dumps of domestic refuse located along a tributary of Curry Creek in Sections 26 and 35 and it can not be associated with a specific individual or family. The dumps contain material that dates from the 1930s to the 1960s. The material may have come with the houses occupied by the Evans brothers or their children.

6. **EC-06-77.** This site consists of a windmill foundation consisting of a concrete base with metal pump mounted in the center and metal posts protruding from each corner. Pieces of metal blades are scattered in close proximity. The windmill was likely installed and used by the Evans brothers. The windmill structure is not present today.
7. **P-31-1255.** This site is a previously recorded archaeological site that consists of historic debris located in a drainage area. The artifacts present appear to be the same artifacts listed on the original site record. Artifacts observed included a fragment of glass milk

bottle, ten fragments of decorated plates, five fragments of green bows, jars, and scrap metal.

This site is one of three dumps of domestic refuse located along a tributary of Curry Creek in Sections 26 and 35 and it cannot be associated with a specific individual or family. The dumps contain material that dates from the 1930s to the 1960s. The material may have come with the houses occupied by the Evans brothers or their children. This site did not yield diagnostic material from subsurface investigations.

8. Buildings on the Conley property include an octagon shaped 2-story residence constructed in the 1980s, a modular building and a barn.

No resources were identified on the program-level parcels.

4.9.3 REGULATORY SETTING

The treatment of cultural resources is governed by federal, state and local laws and guidelines. There are specific criteria for determining whether prehistoric and historic sites or objects are significant and/or protected by law. Federal and State significance criteria generally focus on the resource's integrity and uniqueness, its relationship to similar resources and its potential to contribute important information to scholarly research. Some resources that do not meet federal significance criteria may be considered significant by State criteria. The laws and regulation seek to mitigate impacts on significant prehistoric or historic resources. The federal, state and local laws and guidelines for protecting historic resources are summarized below.

FEDERAL

Historical Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as the official federal list of cultural resources that have been nominated by State Offices for their historical significance at the local, state or national level. Properties listed in the NRHP, or "determined eligible" for list, must meet certain criteria for historical significance and possess integrity of form, location, and setting. Under Section 106 of the Act and its implementing regulations, federal agencies are required to consider the effects of their actions, or those they fund or permit, on properties that may be eligible for listing or that are listed in the NRHP. The regulations provided in 36 CFR Part 60.4 describe the criteria to evaluate cultural resources for inclusion in the NRHP. Cultural resources can be significant on the national, state, or local level. Properties may be listed in the NRHP if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and they:

- (A) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- (B) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- (C) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (D) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

These factors are known as “Criteria A, B, C, and D.”

In addition, the resource must be at least 50 years old, except in exceptional circumstances. Eligible properties must meet at least one of the criteria and exhibit integrity, measured by the degree to which the resource retains its historical properties and conveys its historical character, the degree to which the original fabric has been retained, and the reversibility of the changes to the property. Archaeological sites are evaluated under Criterion D, the potential to yield information important in prehistory or history.

The Section 106 review process involves a four-step procedure:

- Initiate the Section 106 process by establishing the undertaking, developing a plan for public involvement, and identifying other consulting parties.
- Identify historic properties by determining the scope of efforts, identifying cultural resources, and evaluating their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP.
- Assess adverse effects by applying the criteria of adverse effect on historic properties (resources that are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP).
- Resolve adverse effects by consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer and other consulting agencies, including the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation if necessary, to develop an agreement that addresses the treatment of historic properties.

The department of the Interior has set forth Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation. These standards and Guidelines are not regulatory and do not set or interpret agency policy. A project that follows the Standards and Guidelines shall be considered mitigated to a less than significant level, according to Section 15064.5 (b) of the California Public Resources Code.

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by several federal and state statutes, most notably by the 1906 Federal Antiquities Act (PL 59-209; 16 United States Code 431 et seq.; 34 Stat. 225), which calls for protection of historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest on federal

lands. Because the proposed project does not include any federal lands, this statutory scheme does not apply.

STATE

Historical and Archaeological Resources and Human Remains

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both “historical resources” and “unique archaeological resources.” Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.1, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on “unique archaeological resources.”

“Historical resource” is a term of art with a defined statutory meaning. (See Public Resources Code, section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5, subdivisions (a) and (b).) The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be “historical resources” for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Public Resources Code, section 5024.1 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, section 4850). Unless a resource listed in a survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource to be potentially eligible for the CRHR.

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the CRHR criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project’s impacts to historical resources (Public Resources Code, section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines,

section 15064.5, subdivision (a)(3)). In general, an historical resource, under this approach, is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- (A) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- (B) Meets any of the following criteria:
 - 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5 (a)(3))

These factors are known as “Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4.” The fact that a resources is not listed or determined to be eligible for listing does not preclude a lead agency from determining that it may be an historical resource. (Pubic Resources Code, section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines, section 15064.5, subdivision (a)(4).)

CEQA also distinguishes between two classes of archaeological resources: archaeological sites that meet the definition of an historical resource, as described above, and “unique archaeological resources.” Under CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21083.2[g]), an archaeological resource is considered “unique” if it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information,

- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type, or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

CEQA states that if a proposed project would result in an impact that might cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an “historical resource,” then an EIR must be prepared and mitigation measures and alternatives must be considered. A “substantial adverse change” in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[b][1]).

The State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15064.5[c]) also provide specific guidance on the treatment of archaeological resources, depending on whether they meet the definition of an “historical resource” or a “unique archaeological resource.” If the site meets the definition of a unique archaeological resource, it must be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2.

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

Senate Bill 18

As of March 1, 2005, Senate Bill 18 (Government Code sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction.

California Senate Bill 297 (1982)

This law addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction; and establishes the Native American Heritage Commission to resolve disputes regarding the disposition of such remains. It has been incorporated into Section 15064.5 (e) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Paleontological Resources

Consideration of paleontological resources is required by CEQA (see Appendix G). Other state requirements for paleontological resource management are found in Public Resources Code Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5, *Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites*. This statute specifies that state agencies may undertake surveys, excavations, or other operations as necessary on state lands to preserve or record paleontological resources. This statute does not apply to the project because none of the property is state-owned.

No state or local agencies have specific jurisdiction over paleontological resources. No state or local agency requires a paleontological collecting permit to allow for the recovery of fossil remains discovered as a result of construction-related earth moving on state or private land in a project site.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

This City of Roseville currently does not have a Historic Preservation ordinance nor does it have a citywide historic resources Inventory. Significant cultural resources are shown on Figure V-4 in the City's General Plan.

The General Plan includes goals and policies for the preservation of cultural resources.

- Goal 1:** Strengthen Roseville's unique identity through the protection of its archaeological, historic, and cultural resources.

- Policy 1:** When items of historical, cultural or archaeological significance are discovered within the City, a qualified archeologist or historian shall be called to evaluate the find and to recommend proper action.
- Policy 2:** When feasible, incorporate significant archaeological sites into open space areas.
- Policy 3:** Subject to approval by the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD), artifacts that are discovered and subsequently determined to be “removable” should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center.
- Policy 5:** Establish standards for the designation, improvement and protection of buildings landmarks and sites of cultural and historic character.

PROFESSIONAL PALEONTOLOGICAL STANDARDS

The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996), a national scientific organization of professional vertebrate paleontologists, has established standard guidelines that outline acceptable professional practices in the conduct of paleontological resource assessments and surveys, monitoring and mitigation, data and fossil recovery, sampling procedures, specimen preparation, analysis, and curation. Most practicing professional paleontologists in the nation adhere to the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology assessment, mitigation, and monitoring requirements, as specifically spelled out in its standard guidelines.

4.9.4 IMPACTS

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

For the purposes of this EIR, a significant impact would occur if development proposed in the project area would do any of the following:

- Create a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or unique archaeological resource, pursuant to section 15064.5 of the state CEQA Guidelines.
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- Disturb any human remains.

IMPACT 4.9-1	DISTURB, DAMAGE OR DESTROY UNIDENTIFIED SUBSURFACE ARCHAEOLOGICAL OR HISTORICAL RESOURCES OR HUMAN REMAINS DURING PROJECT CONSTRUCTION	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines.	
	SVSP	Urban Reserve
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Significant	Significant
Mitigation Measures:	MM 4.9-1 Cease work and consult with qualified archaeologist	WMM 4.8-2 Cultural Resource Handling and Protection
Significance after Mitigation:	Potentially Significant and Unavoidable	Potentially Significant and Unavoidable

Sierra Vista Specific Plan

As discussed in the Environmental Setting section, the field surveys of the Project area did not find evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources. Historic farming practices and use of the site may have disturbed previous resources. However, there is always the potential that subsurface historic or prehistoric resources or human remains could be encountered during grading, excavation, and or construction. Recorded resources are known in the vicinity. For example, a prehistoric site was located near Pleasant Grove Creek, north of the project site, within the WRSP. There could be subsurface historic or prehistoric resources within the SVSP that were not identified in previous surveys. If such resources are encountered during construction either onsite or offsite associated with the SVSP activities, they could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of integrity. This would be considered a potentially **significant** impact.

If evidence of historic or prehistoric artifacts or sites or human remains is uncovered during project development, Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 requires that all work cease within 100 feet of the find so that artifacts or remains are not damaged by equipment. MM 4.9-1 reduces impacts to unknown cultural resources that qualify as either historical resources or unique archaeological resources and human remains by requiring avoidance where feasible or appropriate study, handling and recordation of such resources. MM 4.9-1 also calls for following the procedures established in the

Health and Safety Code with regard to human remains. Because it is possible, however, that unearthed cultural resources might qualify as “historical resources” or unique archeological resources that cannot feasibly be avoided, with the result that there could be “substantial adverse change in the significance” of such resources, or that human remains may inadvertently be destroyed, the impact is **potentially significant and unavoidable**.

Urban Reserve

No known historic or pre-historic resources are located in the Urban Reserve area. No farmsteads or residences are known to occur on these parcels. However, there is always the potential that subsurface historic or prehistoric or human remains could be encountered during grading, excavation, and or construction associated with future development. Recorded resources are known in the vicinity. Development of the Urban Reserve would likely have a potential to disturb cultural resources, because the area could contain historic and/or prehistoric archaeological resources, or human remains, in areas that were used for ranching or farming. This is considered a potentially **significant impact**.

Previously adopted WMM 4.8-2, identified in the WRSP EIR, would continue to apply to the Urban Reserve area and requires that specific plans or other development proposals include policies or conditions that require proper handling of any subsurface cultural resources unearth during project construction. Because it is possible, however, that unearthed cultural resources might qualify as “historical resources” or unique archeological resources that cannot feasibly be avoided, with the result that there could be “substantial adverse change in the significance” of such resources, or that human remains may inadvertently be destroyed, the impact is **potentially significant and unavoidable**.

IMPACT 4.9-2	REMOVAL OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT PROPERTIES AND/OR LOSS OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF SUCH RESOURCES	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines; Department of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation CEQA Sections 21803.2 (b)-(f)	
	SVSP	Urban Reserve
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Mitigation Measures:	None Required	None Required
Significance after Mitigation:	Less Than Significant	No Impact

Sierra Vista Specific Plan

For the SVSP parcels, there are no resources previously determined eligible or listed on the CRHR, there are no resources included in a local register of historic resources, and no resources identified as significant in a qualified historical resources survey. An archaeological test program and historical research were completed in order to provide information with which to evaluate the sites using eligibility criteria. In conducting this program and research, the City sought to determine whether various sites might be eligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR under the fourth criterion for eligibility (Criterion D for the NRHP, Criterion 4 for the CRHR): the fact that a resource has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

On the project-level parcels, sites EC-05-17, EC-05-19, EC-06-74, EC-06-76, P-31-1255 and the subsurface deposits of EC-05-18 appear not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D and not eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 4. Site EC-06-77 appears not eligible for the NRHP under any criterion and not eligible for the CRHR under any criterion because the windmill is no longer standing and the foundation itself has not retained historic integrity.

In addition to subsurface deposits, EC-05-18 contains architectural resources (building, structures or objects) built before 1964 that are located at 6400 Baseline Road. The structures of EC-05-18 were evaluated using the CRHR and NRHP eligibility criteria. (*JRP Historical Consulting 2007, ECORP 2006*). The structural components of EC-05-18 do not appear to meet the criteria based on historic integrity, design, setting materials or workmanship. Although one of the dwellings at the site appears to have been constructed in the early 1900s, its historic significance was compromised when it was relocated to its current location on the site. Under Criterion 1, the property does not appear to have important associations with an historical event or trend, at either the local, regional, or national level.

Construction of the complex at EC-05-18 occurred between 1950 and 1981 and its use as a farmstead and motorcycle parts shop do not appear significant to the development of agriculture or industry in Placer County. The residences and farm complex are of common design and do not appear to be important examples of a type, period, region, or method of construction. Under Criterion 4, the property does not appear to have yielded or appears likely to yield information important to prehistory or history.

The SVSP would involve removal of existing buildings, structures and related foundations and debris to facilitate construction of the project. Because these existing buildings, structures, related foundations and debris do not appear to qualify as “historical resources” within the meaning of CEQA, their removal would result in impacts that are **less than significant**.

The WAPA transmission electrical lines were constructed around 1952 as part of a larger line that carried power between Elverta and Roseville power stations. The lines, known as the Roseville-Elverta/Roseville-Fiddymont 230 kV power line, are owned and operated by the Western Area Power Authority (WAPA) and were constructed during the era of California’s mid-twentieth century hydroelectric power and federal water projects.

The transmission line does not appear eligible under Criterion A of the NRHP because, in itself, it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. There is nothing to indicate that the construction of this line was linked to any pioneering advancements in the field of electrical transmission. The towers are modern examples of a standard design, do not appear to be the first of their kind, and represent a type of junction line common in the area. Therefore, the WAPA transmission line does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or CRHR.

Furthermore, the WAPA corridor and lines will remain as part of the SVSP project, and therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Urban Reserve

No structures are present in the Urban Reserve area, and no evidence of past farmsteads has been identified. Therefore, there would be **no impact** to historic resources.

IMPACT 4.9-3	DISTURB UNKNOWN PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES DURING SITE PREPARATION	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines	
	SVSP	Urban Reserve
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Significant	Significant
Mitigation Measures:	MM 4.9-2 Cease work and consult with qualified paleontologist	WMM 4.8-11, Policies that require Paleontologist review and recommendations should resources be uncovered
Significance after Mitigation:	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant

Geologically, the Project area is composed of the Quaternary Basin deposits (alluvium). Due to the depth of the overlying alluvium, the siltstone bedrock is not exposed in the project area. This formation, which consists of alluvial materials (gravel, sand and silt), derived from older granite and volcanic rocks in the Sierra Nevada to the east, could contain substantial numbers or unique types of invertebrate (marine), plant, or vertebrate fossils or other resources of paleontological value.

In areas where the geological formations are not exposed, paleontological resources would typically not be visible where the ground has not been disturbed and the formations exposed. However, they could be damaged or destroyed during site preparation, similar to archaeological resources. The potential for discovery and disturbance of paleontological resources would exist throughout the SVSP project area.

Sierra Vista Specific Plan

As discussed above, there are geological units in the SVSP project that could contain substantial numbers of unique types of invertebrate (marine), plant, or vertebrate fossils or other resources of paleontological value. These resources could be damaged or destroyed during site preparation. This would be a **potentially significant impact**. Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 requires that if any evidence of fossils is discovered during excavation or grading, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find. This requirement is analogous to the requirements of Section 15126.4(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, which seeks to avoid damaging effects on archaeological resources. Work would not resume until a qualified paleontologist is retained to review the find, and the paleontologist's recommendation for recordation and, if appropriate, preservation of the find have been implemented. Implementation of MM 4.9-2 would reduce this impact to a **less than significant** level.

Urban Reserve

The Urban Reserve area also contains geological formations that could contain paleontological resources. Development of the area could uncover paleontology resources. This would be considered a **potentially significant impact**.

Previously adopted WMM 4.8-11, identified in the WRSP, would continue to apply to the Urban Reserve area and requires that work be suspended within 100 feet of a find and a qualified paleontologist consulted to assess that resource and provide proper management recommendations. Work would not resume until a qualified paleontologist is retained to review the find, and the paleontologist's recommendation for recordation and, if appropriate, preservation of the find have been implemented. Implementation of WMM 4.8-11 would reduce this impact to a **less than significant** level.

IMPACT 4.9-4	DAMAGE OR DESTROY HISTORICAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, PREHISTORIC, OR PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES DURING CONSTRUCTION OF OFF-SITE INFRASTRUCTURE	
Applicable Policies and Regulations	CEQA Sections 21803.2 (b) – (f) Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines	
	SVSP	Urban Reserve
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Significant	Significant
Mitigation Measures:	MM 4.9-1 Cease work and consult with qualified archaeologist MM 4.9-2 Cease work and consult with qualified paleontologist MM 4.9-3 Conduct appropriate studies	WMM 4.8-11 Include policies and conditions that require proper handling of Paleontological resources; WMM 4.8-13 Conduct Appropriate Studies
Significance after Mitigation:	Less Than Significant as to Archaeological, Paleontological Resources; Potentially Significant and Unavoidable as to Historical Resources	Less Than Significant as to Archaeological, Paleontological, and Prehistoric Resources; Potentially Significant and Unavoidable as to Historical Resources

Development of the Project area would require off-site infrastructure improvements, including roadway expansion and or extensions, drainage improvements, and electrical, water, recycled water, and wastewater lines. Construction and installation of off-site improvements could result in disturbance of subsurface historical, archaeological, or prehistoric resources. Such resources could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of integrity if encountered during grading, excavation and/or construction.

Sierra Vista Specific Plan

Development of the SVSP area would require infrastructure improvements outside of the SVSP boundary and the Project area, such as extension of water, wastewater, recycled water, natural gas

lines, power lines, roadway extensions and widening. Much of the off-site infrastructure necessary to serve the SVSP will occur in existing or planned roadway corridors including intersection improvements at the Fiddymment Road/Baseline Road and Baseline Road/Watt Avenue or within the planned alignment and right of way of Westside Drive within the WRSP. Construction of the water tank would occur adjacent to the Roseville Energy Park, in an area previously improved in the WRSP.

In most cases, offsite infrastructure would be located within existing or planned roadway rights-of-way, and the potential for cultural resources to occur would have been addressed during the planning of those roads. However, in some cases, improvements may not coincide with the precise areas that were previously evaluated or be proposed in areas that are not planned for development, or have not been subject to environmental review. Because the precise alignments and design of the off-site improvements have yet to be determined, additional cultural resource surveys may need to be completed for small areas of land. Therefore, this analysis assumes that historic resources (both subsurface and buildings), prehistoric resources (primarily sub-surface), and or paleontological resources could be located within areas that would be disturbed during construction of off-site infrastructure. If encountered during grading, excavation, and construction, such resources could be damaged, destroyed, or removed resulting in a direct loss and or loss of integrity. This would be a potentially **significant impact**.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 requires that appropriate studies be conducted prior to construction of offsite infrastructure, and if any historical resources, unique archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or prehistoric resources are found that they be evaluated for significance, and avoided, preserved, and/or recorded as appropriate. This is consistent with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines for determining significance and Public Resources Code section 21803 (b)-(f) regarding preservation and recording. In addition, MM 4.9-1 and MM 4.9-2 would ensure that work cease if cultural or paleontological resources are discovered during construction, until such resources can be evaluated and treated as warranted by their significance. These mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a **less than significant level**, except with respect to any “historical resources” that might be discovered and for which avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout. As to any such historical resources, the impact is **potentially significant and unavoidable** because of the possibility that avoidance will be

infeasible, with the result that there could be “substantial adverse change in the significance” of such resources,

Urban Reserve

Like the SVSP, future development of the Urban Reserve area would require construction of infrastructure improvements outside of the Project area, including roadway improvements, drainage improvements, and electrical, water and sewer lines. Construction and installation of these offsite improvements could damage, destroy, or remove subsurface cultural resources, resulting in the loss of integrity if encountered during grading, excavation and construction. This is considered a **potentially significant Impact**.

Previously adopted WMM 4.8-13, Conduct Appropriate Surveys for offsite work, identified in the WRSP EIR, continues to apply to the Urban Reserve area requires that appropriate studies be conducted prior to construction of offsite infrastructure, and that if any prehistoric or historic resources are found, that they be evaluated for significance, and avoided, preserved, and recorded as appropriate. In addition, previously adopted WMM 4.8-11 requires development proposals include polices or conditions that require work to cease if cultural resources or paleontological resources are discovered during construction, until such resources can be evaluated and treated as warranted by their significance. These mitigation measures reduce this impact to a **less than significant level**, except with respect to any “historical resources” that might be discovered and for which avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout. As to any such historical or cultural resources, the impact is **potentially significant and unavoidable** because of the possibility that avoidance will be infeasible, with the result that there could be “substantial adverse change in the significance” of such resources.

4.9.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

The project area was included in the program-level analysis of the West Roseville Specific Plan Final EIR. Mitigation adopted by the City Council at time of approval in 2004 is still applicable to the project, especially to the Urban Reserve areas. This document includes the WRSP mitigation as “WMM” and provides ~~strikeout~~ to language that is being eliminated or underline to denote new language.

WMM 4.8-2:***Include Policies and Conditions That Require Proper Handling of Archaeological Resources (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-4 – Urban Reserve)***

At the time specific development is proposed additional environmental review will be required for the ~~Richland and Chan properties~~ Urban Reserve Area. Development proposals shall include policies and/or conditions that require proper handling of any subsurface cultural resources unearthed during project construction. The policies and conditions shall provide that if any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains are encountered during any development activities, work shall be suspended within 100-feet of the find, and the City of Roseville Planning and Public Works staff shall be notified. At that time the City shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with qualified archaeologists as needed to assess the resources (i.e., whether it is an “historical resource” or a “unique archaeological resource”) and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects, data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City staff, in consultation with the archaeologists, to be necessary to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources. In addition, pursuant to Section 5097.98 of 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.

WMM 4.8-3 *Conduct Archeological Surveys (Impact 4.9-4 Urban Reserve)*

Specific Plans and/or development proposals for the ~~Reminder Area~~ Urban Reserve Area, shall identify known and/or potential archaeological sites, based on field surveys of the area proposed for development conducted by a qualified archaeologist as part of the specific plan environmental review process. If significant resources or significant archaeological sites are present, the Specific Plan and/or development proposal shall designate the area surrounding the site as open space, as feasible. If retention of such resources is not feasible, recordation of the sites shall be required, along with treatment as is recommended by the archaeologist after consultation with SHPO and, if the find is prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Council.

The following two, previously adopted mitigation measures (WMM 4.8-8 and WMM 4.8-9) are not applicable to the Urban Reserve area because no structures (historic or otherwise) are present in that area; therefore, it is recommended that they be deleted:

WMM 4.8-8 *Properly Record Any Identified Historical Resources*

~~Specific Plans and/or other development proposals for the Remainder Area shall require that, if any historically significant resource is identified, the project applicants shall be required to prepare a record of the building in compliance with the National Parks Service standards [Historical American Building Surveys (HABS)]. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SHPO.~~

WMM 4.8-9 *Include Policies that Require Rehabilitation and Reuse of Historically Significant Properties)*

~~Specific Plans and/or other development proposals for the Remainder Area shall include policies or conditions of project approval requiring the exteriors of historic properties that will be adaptively reused, to be rehabilitated and reused in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic*~~

Buildings (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1992 [Standards]). In addition, finish materials, case work, and trim on the interior should be restored and/or reused where feasible.

WMM 4.8-11***Include Policies in Specific Plans to Ensure the Proper Handling of Paleontological Resources (Impacts 4.9-3 and 4.9-4 – Urban Reserve)***

Specific Plans and/or other development proposals for the ~~Remainder Area~~ Urban Reserve shall include policies and/or conditions of approval that require the proper handling should any evidence of paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) be encountered during grading or excavation. If any paleontological resources are identified during project construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the City of Roseville shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified paleontologist to assess the resource and provide proper management recommendations. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance, if feasible in light of project design or layout, or data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City staff in consultation with the paleontologist for the protection of the paleontological resources.

WMM 4.8-13***Conduct Appropriate Studies (Impact 4.9-4 Urban Reserve)***

Specific Plans and/or other development proposals for the ~~Remainder Area~~ Urban Reserve shall require that prior to undertaking construction of off-site infrastructure, the City shall ensure that cultural resource surveys are completed for any areas to be disturbed during construction. If surveys were conducted, the City shall ensure that a qualified archaeologist conducts the appropriate level of study. If resources are found, the study recommendations shall be implemented to ensure that the resources are avoided, protected and/or recorded, as appropriate.

MM 4.9-1: *Cease Work and Consult with Qualified Archaeologist (Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-4 – SVSP)*

Should any cultural resources, such as structural features, any amount of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains, be encountered during any subsurface development activities, work shall be suspended within 100-feet of the find. The City of Roseville Planning and Public Works Staff shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City of Roseville 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”) and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects, data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City staff, in consultation with the archaeologists, to be to avoid or minimize significant 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.

MM 4.9-2 *Cease Work Until Review conducted by Qualified Paleontologist and Recommendations Implemented (Impacts 4.9.3 and 4.9.4- SVSP)*

Should any evidence of paleontological resources (e.g. fossils) be encountered during grading or excavation, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the City of Roseville shall be immediately notified. At that time, the City shall coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified paleontologist to assess the

resource and provide proper management recommendations. Possible management recommendations for important resources could include resource avoidance, if feasible in light of project design or layout, or data recovery excavations. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed feasible and necessary by City staff in consultation with the paleontologist for the protection of the paleontological resources.

MM 4.9-3***Conduct Appropriate Off-Site Studies (Impact 4.9-4 – SVSP)***

Prior to undertaking construction of off-site infrastructure, the City shall determine whether or not cultural resource surveys have been undertaken for any areas to be disturbed during construction. If surveys were conducted, the City shall document that any identified resources were treated as recommended in the studies. If no studies or surveys were conducted, the City shall ensure that a qualified archaeologist conducts the appropriate level of study. If resources are found, recommendations, including the possible management recommendations listed in MM 4.9-1 and MM4.9-2, shall be implemented to ensure that the resources are avoided, protected and/or recorded, as determined to be feasible and appropriate by City staff.