4.9 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes potential impacts related to cultural and tribal resources in the Planning Area associated with the proposed General Plan Update, including archaeological resources and human remains. To provide context for the impact analysis, this chapter begins with an environmental setting describing the cultural context for the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic-era background of the Planning Area. Next, the regulatory framework is described, which informs the selection of the significance thresholds used in the impact analysis. The regulatory framework also includes existing General Plan policies related to the impact analysis of this chapter. The chapter concludes with the applicable significance thresholds, the impacts of the proposed changes to adopted General Plan policies, recommended mitigation measures, and the significance conclusions.

As part of the impact analysis, Notice of Preparation (NOP) comments were reviewed to help guide the analysis, and any comments were integrated into the analysis. One response was received from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) summarizing the existing requirements contained in Assembly Bill (AB) 52, Senate Bill (SB) 18, and suggestions for early tribal consultation. The City reviewed and considered this information during preparation of this chapter.

Cultural resources include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects generally older than 50 years and considered important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons. They include prehistoric, historic-era, and tribal cultural resources (TCRs) (the latter as defined by AB 52, Statutes of 2014, in Public Resources Code Section 21074).

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

4.9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The natural and geographical settings of the City’s Planning Area are described in other sections of this EIR, particularly Section 4.9 “Biological Resources,” and Section 4.7, “Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources.” The reader is referred to these sections for a more in-depth description of those aspects of the environment that were instrumental in the settlement patterns of this region.

Following is a discussion intended to provide a context for prehistoric and historic resources that could be found within the City’s Planning Area. While some of the material relates to other portions of northern California and the Central Valley, information on Placer County and the Roseville area is provided, as available.

4.9.1.1 PREHISTORIC SETTING

The archaeology of Placer County is included within the broad framework established by archaeologists for the Sacramento Valley. Although human occupation of the northern Sacramento Valley may extend back 10,000
years or more, reliable evidence of the presence of such an early human presence is lacking. Early archaeological sites bearing evidence of these Paleo-Indian populations may be present in the valley, but deeply buried under alluvium (Moratto 1984).

The following discussion of the prehistoric background is adapted from Rosenthal, et al. (2007). The region and its prehistory can be broken into local districts and phases (Elsasser 1978). New radiocarbon determinations adjusted with modern calibration curves are now used for a more precise time frame (Rosenthal, et al: 2007: 147-153). These different cultural patterns are characterized as:

► The **Paleo-Indian Period (12,000 to 10,500 Before Present [B.P.])** saw the first demonstrated entry and spread of humans into California. Characteristic artifacts recovered from archaeological sites of this time period have included fluted projectile points (often compared to Clovis points), cobble cores, and biface rough-outs.

► The beginning of the **Lower Archaic Period (10,500 to 7500 B.P.)** coincides with that of the Middle Holocene climatic change which resulted in widespread floodplain deposition. This episode resulted in burial of most of the early archaeological deposits. Most tools were manufactured of local materials, and distinctive artifact types include large dart points and the milling slab and handstone.

► The **Middle Archaic Period (7500 to 2500 B.P.)** is characterized by warm, dry conditions which brought about the drying up of pluvial lakes. Economies were more diversified and may have included the introduction of acorn processing technology, although hunting remained an important source of food. Characteristic artifacts include milling stones and pestles and continued use of a variety of implements interpreted as large dart points.

► The **Upper Archaic Period (2500 to 850 B.P.)** corresponds with a sudden turn to a cooler, wetter, and more stable climate. The development of status distinctions based upon wealth is well documented in the archaeological record. The development of specialized tools, such as bone implements and stone plummets as well as manufactured goods (e.g., Olivella saucer and saddle beads, Haliotis ornaments) were prolific during this time. The regional variance of economies was largely due to the seasonality of resources, which were harvested and processed in large quantities.

► Several technological and social changes distinguish the **Emergent Period (850 B.P. to Historic)** from earlier cultural manifestations. The bow and arrow were introduced, ultimately replacing the dart and atl-atl, and territorial boundaries between groups became well established. In the latter portion of this Period (450 to 1800 B.P.), exchange relations became highly regularized and sophisticated. The clam disk bead developed as a monetary unit of exchange, and increasing quantities of goods moved greater distances. It was at the end of this Period that contact with Euroamericans became commonplace, eventually leading to intense pressures on Native American populations.

### 4.9.1.2 Ethnographic Setting

The Planning area is situated within the traditional territory of the Nisenan. The language of the Nisenan, which includes several dialects, is classified within the Maiduan family of the Penutian linguistic stock. Kroeber (1925) recognized three Nisenan dialects: Northern Hill, Southern Hill, and Valley. The Nisenan territory included the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers, and the lower drainages of the Feather River, extending from the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the banks of the Sacramento River. According to Bennyhoff (1961:204–209), the
Southern boundary with the Miwok was probably a few miles south of the American River, bordering a shared area used by both Miwok and Nisenan groups that extended to the Cosumnes River. It appears that the foothills Nisenan distrusted the valley peoples but had a mostly friendly relationship with the Washoe to the east. Elders recall intergroup marriage and trade, primarily involving the exchange of acorns for fish procured by the Washoe (Wilson 1972:33). The northern boundary has not been clearly established due to similarities in language with neighboring tribes (Wilson and Towne 1978:387-389).

Nisenan settlement locations depended primarily on elevation, exposure, and proximity to water and other resources. Permanent villages were usually located on low rises along major watercourses. Houses were domed structures measuring 10 to 15 feet in diameter and covered with earth and tule reeds or grass. Brush shelters were used in the summer and at temporary camps during food-gathering rounds. Larger villages often had semi-subterranean dance houses that were covered in earth and tule reeds or brush, with a central hole at the top to allow the escape of smoke, and an east-facing entrance. Another common village structure was the granary, which was used for storing acorns.

Several political divisions in the Nisenan territory, constituting tribelets, had headmen in the larger villages. However, the relative levels of influence in these larger population centers are unknown. All of these larger villages were located in the foothills. More substantial and permanent Nisenan villages generally were not established on the valley plain between the Sacramento River and the foothills, although this area was used as a rich hunting and gathering ground. One tribelet consisted of people occupying the territory between the Bear River and the Middle Fork American River (Wilson and Towne 1978). According to Kroeber (1925:831), the larger villages could have had populations exceeding 500 individuals, although small settlements consisting of 15-25 people and extended families were common.

The Nisenan occupied permanent settlements from which specific task groups set out to harvest the seasonal bounty of flora and fauna that the rich valley environment provided. The Valley Nisenan economy involved riparian resources, in contrast to the Hill Nisenan, whose resource base consisted primarily of acorn and game procurement. The only domestic plant was native tobacco (Nicotiana sp.), but many wild species were closely husbanded. The acorn crops from the blue oak (Quercus douglasii) and black oak (Q. kelloggii) were carefully managed resources. Acorns were stored in granaries in anticipation of winter. Deer, rabbit, and salmon were the chief sources of animal protein in the aboriginal diet; but many insect and other animal species were taken when available (Wilson and Towne 1978:389).

The decimation of the Nisenan culture in the 19th century as a result of European colonization, coupled with a reluctance to discuss Nisenan spiritual beliefs and practices, makes it difficult to describe these practices in any detail. However, historic records document a number of observances and dances, some of which are still performed today, that were important ceremonies in early historic times. The Kuksu Cult, the basic religious system noted throughout Central California, appeared among the Nisenan. Cult membership was restricted to those initiated in its spirit and deity-impersonating rites. However, the Kuksu Cult was only one of several levels of religious practice among the Nisenan. Various dances associated with mourning and the change of seasons were also important. One of the last major additions to Nisenan spiritual life occurred sometime shortly after 1872 with a revival of the Kuksu Cult as an adaptation to the Ghost Dance religion (Wilson and Towne 1978). Today, Nisenan descendants are reinvesting in their traditions, and represent a growing and thriving community.
4.9.1.3 HISTORIC SETTING

The following section provides an overview of historic-era development, trends, and events that contributed to the growth and development of the built environment within the Planning Area. Unless stated otherwise, this overview is taken from the EDAW (2008) Downtown Roseville Specific Plan Draft EIR prepared for the City of Roseville.

Roseville, 1850–1900

The first Euro-Americans to settle in the area now known as Roseville were gold seekers who left the placer mining fields to farm on the plains region of southwestern Placer County. Many of these pioneering farmers formed the nucleus of what would become a bustling railroad town.

The first railroad to pass through this rich farming region was the California Central, an extension of the Sacramento Valley Railroad. Construction of the rail line through this area began in late August/early September of 1861. The route of this rail line was circuitous, passing through present-day Roseville Square Shopping Center, then crossing Dry Creek at Folsom Road where it proceeded northerly to the towns of Lincoln and Marysville. In 1864, track-laying crews from the Central Pacific pushed eastward from Sacramento across the plains on their way to building what would become the western half of the Transcontinental Railroad. In Roseville, the rails of the Central Pacific intersected with those of the California Central. The location of this meeting of the rails was simply labeled as “Junction” on early railroad maps. A small freight and passenger center, soon to be known as Roseville, developed around this junction.

The favorable location of the junction in the heart of a rich agricultural area would make it an important shipping and trading center in years to come. One of the first individuals to capitalize on this was O.D. Lambard, who, in 1864, platted the town-site of a city to be called Roseville. The name Roseville is purported to have been conferred because of the many wild roses growing profusely in and around the area. For the next four decades, Roseville remained a small railroad shipping point of approximately 250 inhabitants, catering to the needs of area farmers and ranchers. The town centered on the railroad depot and a few small businesses which lined the two principal streets of Atlantic and Pacific.

Roseville, Early 1900s–Present

By the turn of the century, Roseville’s population was still largely made up of ranchers. However, this setting abruptly changed in 1906 when the railroad roundhouse and repair facilities moved to Roseville from nearby Rocklin which had been the area’s major railroad service center. Almost overnight, the quiet ranching town evolved into a bustling city of approximately 3,000 people.

New subdivisions accommodated the new residents. Business and commercial growth during this time was extensive and caused the town to expand outward in all directions. Atlantic Street, which has been one of Roseville’s two principal business thoroughfares, was moved back approximately 100 feet to accommodate the laying of new track for roundhouse and repair facilities. The business section, which had been limited to Atlantic and Pacific streets, expanded along Lincoln, Main, Church, and later, Vernon streets. A Chamber of Commerce was organized to provided need municipal services such as water, electricity, police, and fire protection.

In 1909, the town was incorporated and steadily grew until it became Placer County’s largest city. In one three-year period (1911–1914), more than 110 new buildings were constructed. The population increased from 2,608 in
1910 to 4,477 in 1920, by which time Roseville was divided into two main sections including the North Side centered along Lincoln Street and extending back to and including Church and Main streets and the rapidly expanding South Side centered along Vernon Street.

The buildings during this time period in what would become “downtown” consisted mostly of commercial properties with the occasional modest-sized dwelling. Roseville continued as a major railroad center well into the post-World War II years; however, by the 1950s, interstate trucking and airlines provided stiff competition. The introduction of jet aircraft and the completion of Interstate 80 (I-80) through Roseville in 1956 saw the abrupt decline of the once booming passenger train service.

The town slowly expanded easterly with the competition of I-80. This led to the eventual decline of the Lincoln-Church-Main Street business center and the Vernon Street area. The town’s commercial center shifted from downtown to what became known as “East Roseville.” By 1968, a significant portion of business activity centered in the Roseville Square-Harding Way and Sunrise Boulevard areas.

A revitalization movement, began in 1977, aimed to restore the physical and economic prominence of Roseville’s downtown area to its heyday of the 1920s. Buildings were painted, facades reconstructed, and awnings and overhangs were installed. As part of the revitalization effort, the old downtown also saw new business development and reconstruction efforts during this time. Roseville continues to grow today and has a population of over 130,000 people (City of Roseville 2019). The meager beginnings of this ranching village—turned railroad town—blossomed into a vital economic center within Placer County.

### 4.9.3 Regulatory Framework

Cultural resources in California are protected by a number of federal, state, and local regulations and ordinances. The following provides a brief outline of the regulations, policies, and ordinances that are applicable to the proposed General Plan Update.

#### 4.9.2.1 Federal Plans, Policies, Regulations, and Laws

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

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

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

1. The property is at least 50 years old. (However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included in the NRHP.)

2. It retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and associations.
3. It possesses at least one of the following criteria:

A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (events).

B. Association with the lives of persons significant in the past (persons).

C. Distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant, distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (architecture).

D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history (information potential).

A property may be listed in the NRHP if it has both significance and integrity as defined in 36 CFR 60.4.

Significance is present if the resource meets one or more of the following significance criteria:

(a) the resource has an association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or,

(b) the resource has an association with the lives of persons significant in our past; or;

(c) the resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or,

(d) the resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Integrity requires that the resource possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (36 CFR 60.4).

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

**Traditional Cultural Properties**

Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are resources eligible for the NRHP based on cultural significance derived from the “beliefs, customs, and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through the generations” ([NPS] 1998:1). TCPs embrace a wide range of historic properties, such as the location associated with a Native American group’s origin or the origin of the world (cosmogony), or an urban neighborhood that is the traditional home of a particular cultural group and that still reflects and is associated with their beliefs and practices. Other examples include places where traditional people historically have gone and continue to visit for ceremonial practices. These examples are not intended to be exhaustive, but instead to illustrate the range of possible TCPs. The NPS National Register Bulletin 38 defines a historical property as a place that is eligible for NRHP inclusion “because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are
rooted in the community’s history and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community” (NPS 1998:1). The identification and evaluation of TCPs can be conducted only by consultation with members of the relevant group of people that ascribe value to the resource, or through other forms of ethnographic research.

**Evaluation of TCPs**

Federal agencies must evaluate TCPs for eligibility for listing in the NRHP to determine if they are historic properties subject to management as required under Section 106 of the NHPA. Evaluation of TCPs requires two major steps: first the Federal agency evaluates the integrity of the resource as a TCP, then evaluates the resource for eligibility listing on the NRHP under the process for assessing significance and integrity of historic properties. As with any resource that is evaluated for listing in the NRHP, the TCP must be a tangible district, site, building, structure, or object (NPS 1998:11).

These terms are not meant to limit or exclude places from evaluation as a TCP; for instance, a bare grassy expanse at Mt. Tonaachaw on Weno, an island that is part of the Federated States of Micronesia, has been evaluated as a component of a TCP (NPS 1998:20) because it is associated with at least two different spirits who reside on or are represented by the mountain. This consideration requires merely that the TCP be a physical place or tangible object, in the broadest sense, rather than the intangible beliefs or values alone.

**Integrity of TCPs**

The TCP must have integrity, like any property eligible for listing in the NRHP. For traditional cultural resources, this means that they must have “integrity of relationship” and “integrity of condition” (NPS 1998:11–12). Integrity of relationship means simply that the specific place is integral and necessary to a traditional cultural group’s beliefs or specific practices (NPS 1998:11). National Register Bulletin 38 gives the example of two different cultures, one that believes that baptism at a specific river is necessary to accept individuals as members, and another that simply requires baptism in any body of water. For the first example, the river is integrated into beliefs and practices of a traditional culture and thus has integrity of relationship.

Integrity of condition requires simply that the TCP has not been altered in such a way that it no longer can serve its function for the traditional cultural group. For example, a pilgrimage route to a sacred site would no longer have integrity of condition if modern construction had physically interrupted the route and thus made it unusable. This requirement does not mean that the TCP must be completely intact without any changes to the setting or features of the resource; rather, the test is whether the resource can still function for traditional cultural purposes or whether the presence of new elements disrupts the function. National Register Bulletin 38 offers an example of a resource that has integrity despite changes to the setting. One reach of the Klamath River in northern California is within the ancestral and present territory of the Karuk people, and is the place where they carry out world renewal ceremonies and other rituals despite the presence of a modern highway, a U.S. Forest Service ranger station, and modern residences (NPS 1998:12).

If the TCP has integrity of relationship and integrity of condition, evaluation progresses to the second step of evaluating the resource for eligibility for listing in the NRHP, as described above.
4.9.2.2 STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) established a list of properties that are to be protected from substantial adverse change (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1). A historical resource may be listed in the CRHR if it meets any of the following criteria:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important in California’s past.

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value.

4. It has yielded or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

The CRHR includes properties that are listed or have been formally determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, State Historical Landmarks, and eligible Points of Historical Interest. Other resources require nomination for inclusion in the CRHR. These may include:

- resources contributing to the significance of a local historic district,
- individual historical resources,
- historical resources identified in historic resource surveys conducted in accordance with State Historic Preservation Office procedures,
- historic resources or districts designated under a local ordinance consistent with Commission procedures, and
- local landmarks or historic properties designated under local ordinance.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires public agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historical resources, unique archaeological resources, and TCRs. Under 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.” Under Public Resources Code Section 21084.2, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether projects would have effects on unique archaeological resources.

Historical Resources

“Historical resource” is a term with a defined statutory meaning (Public Resources Code Section 21084.1). The determination of significant impacts on historical and archaeological resources is described in Sections 15064.5(a) and 15064.5(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines. Section 15064.5(a) states that historical resources include the following:
1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CRHR (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource will be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1).

4. The fact that a resource is not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1[k] of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1[g] of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

**Unique Archaeological Resources**

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will affect unique archaeological resources. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g) states that a “unique archaeological resource” means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

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

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will affect TCRs. TCRs may or may not manifest as archaeological sites. In some cases, TCRs are viewsheds, plant gathering areas, or other sacred spaces that are not readily identifiable to non-tribal members. In many cases, TCRs also include an archaeological component, such as artifacts, features, and sites (with or without human remains). Public Resources Code Section 21074 states the following:

(a) “Tribal cultural resources” are either of the following:
(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

   (A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

   (B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

(2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

(b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.

(c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Health and Safety Code, Section 7052 and 7050.5

Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code states that the disturbance, mutilation, or removal of interred human remains is a felony if the remains are within a dedicated cemetery and a misdemeanor if interred outside of a dedicated cemetery. Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner examines the find and determines whether the remains are subject to various laws, including recognizing whether the remains are or may be those of a Native American. If determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Health and Safety Code Section 8010 through 8030

In the California Health and Safety Code, Division 7, Part 2, Chapter 5 broad provisions are made for the protection of Native American cultural resources. The Act sets the state policy to ensure that all California Native American human remains and cultural items are treated with due respect and dignity. The Act also provides the mechanism for disclosure and return of human remains and cultural items held by publicly funded agencies and museums in California. Likewise, the Act outlines the mechanism with which California Native American tribes not recognized by the federal government may file claims to human remains and cultural items held in agencies or museums.

California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act

The California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act applies to both state and private lands. This law requires that if human remains are discovered, construction or excavation activity must cease and the county coroner must be notified. If the remains are of a Native American, the coroner must notify the NAHC. The NAHC then notifies those persons most likely to be descended from the Native American whose remains were discovered. The California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods.
Public Resources Code, Section 5097

Public Resources Code Section 5097 specifies the procedures to follow in the event of the unexpected discovery of human remains on nonfederal land. The disposition of Native American burial falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 states the following:

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

Senate Bill 18, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004

California State SB 18, signed into law in September 2004 and implemented March 1, 2005, requires cities and counties to notify and consult with California Native American Tribes about proposed local land use planning decisions for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Places (also referred to as Traditional Cultural Properties). This law directed an amendment to the General Plan Guidelines to require consultation with, and advice from California Native American Tribes. According to the Tribal Consultation Guidelines, SB 18 “requires local governments to involve California Native Americans in early stages of land use planning, extends to both public and private lands, and includes both federally recognized and non-federally recognized tribes.”

Assembly Bill 52, Public Resources Code Section 21074

California State AB 52 added Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.4, 21080.3.2, and 21082.3 to CEQA. These sections require that upon written request by a California Native American Tribe, a CEQA lead agency must begin consultation once it determines that the project application is complete, before the agency issues a notice of preparation (NOP) of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

As defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, TCR are either of the following:

1. listed or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, state, or local register of historical resources; or

2. a resource that the lead agency determines, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to treat as a tribal cultural resource pursuant to the criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c). Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c) provides that a resource meets criteria for listing as an historical resource in the California Register if any of the following apply:

   (1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.

   (2) It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

   (3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

   (4) It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
4.9.2.3 **REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS AND ORDINANCES**

**City of Roseville’s Existing General Plan**

The City of Roseville’s existing General Plan (City of Roseville, Last Amended August 17, 2016) list the following goal and policies related to the City’s archaeological, historic, and cultural resources.

**Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Goal:** 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 archaeologist 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 4:** Preserve and enhance Roseville’s historic qualities through the implementation of the Downtown and Riverside Gateway Specific Plans.

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

- **Policy 6:** Participate in the completion of a countywide inventory of historical sites.

- **Policy 7:** Encourage public activities, including the placement of monuments or plaques, that recognize and celebrate historic sites, structures, and events.

- **Policy 8:** Explore funding for cultural, archaeological and historic programs and activities.

- **Policy 9:** Provide opportunities to public awareness and education through coordination with the Historical Society and local schools.

**Existing General Plan Implementation Measures**

**Development Review Process**

Refer any development proposal that may have an impact on archaeological, historic or cultural resources to the appropriate federal, state or local agency for comment, including the State Office of Historic Preservation and the Native American Heritage Commission. Consider the comments of the agencies in the development review process.

In association with environmental review per CEQA, the City shall require that an archaeological survey be prepared by a qualified archaeologist for projects for which it is determined that there is a reasonable probability that archaeological or historic resources exist. If such resources are identified, a plan for their disposition shall be...
prepared. This may include designation as open space, excavation, capping, or donation to the Maidu Interpretive Center.

If archaeological or historic resources are discovered during project development, halt construction activity in the vicinity of the resource, contact a qualified archaeologist for determination of resource significance, and notify the State Office of Historic Preservation. Monitor projects during construction to ensure crews follow proper reporting, safeguards, and procedures.

Information identifying specific locations of archaeological and historic sites shall be kept confidential to prevent illegal removal or vandalism of artifacts.

Specific Plans

Ensure that new or revised specific plans are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The specific plans shall incorporate a comprehensive inventory, analysis, and mitigation plan for archaeological and historic resources. Where feasible, significant archaeological resources shall be incorporated into park or other open space areas. All significant archaeological sites located in parks and other open space areas should be protected and left in an undisturbed state. Development agreements should be utilized to ensure preservation, maintenance, and management techniques.

Land Use Designation

Designate all areas identified for open space use with the appropriate open space land use designation as defined in the Land Use Element. This will, where feasible, include areas identified as having significant archaeological resources.

Zoning Ordinance

Continue to implement the Zoning Ordinance’s open space land use and development regulations for consistency with the goals and policies of the open space and land use elements.

Downtown and Riverside Gateway Specific Plans

Continue to implement the Downtown and Riverside Gateway Specific Plans. These specific plans identify significant historic structures, provisions to preserve and/or enhance existing buildings, and guidelines for compatibility of new and existing development. Coordinate these specific plans with revitalization and development efforts to promote the preservation and enhancement of the areas.

Interagency Cooperation

Cooperate with other state, federal and local agencies in the identification and preservation of archaeological and historic resources. This will include working with Placer County and the Roseville Historical Society on the inventory of historic sites.

Community Organizations

Continue to encourage, support and cooperate with various community organizations, including the Roseville Historical Society, in recognizing significant places and events in Roseville's past.
Adopted Specific Plans

Currently, the City has adopted 14 Specific Plans. A Specific Plan is a comprehensive planning and zoning document that implements the General Plan by providing development and conservation standards for a defined geographic location within the Planning Area. Each Specific Plan has developed guidelines for site, architectural, landscaping, lighting, roadway networks, pedestrian/bicycle paths, open space corridors, parks, and other aspects of design. Each adopted Specific Plan included an EIR, which evaluated potential impacts to cultural resources. Where appropriate, mitigation measures were adopted to reduce the level of impact to cultural resources, and these measures are required to be implemented in the respective Specific Plan Areas. Adopted mitigation measures for cultural resources include requirements to conduct site-specific archaeological surveys; avoid archaeological sites if feasible and if not, record resources and consult with the SHPO; stop construction work in the vicinity of any materials that may be encountered; and perform a consultation with a qualified archaeologist who will prepare a treatment plan for implementation during further construction activities. Copies of the adopted Specific Plans and their associated EIRs are available upon request from the City of Roseville Development Services Department, Planning Division.

City of Roseville 2009 Downtown Specific Plan

The City of Roseville’s 2009 Downtown Specific Plan (City of Roseville, Adopted April 1, 2009) included policies and strategies for identification and treatment of historic buildings within the Downtown Specific Plan Planning area as part of the Land Use Plan.

► Land Use Policy 4.5.2: Where possible, preserve and restore historic buildings.

While higher intensity developments should be encouraged, it is equally important to ensure that existing, significant historic buildings and resources are considered for re-use when appropriate. When reviewing potential new development in the Downtown, historic resources need to be identified.

Strategy 4.5.2a: As part of the Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, complete an in-depth study to identify the significant historic resources. Provide an architectural inventory and evaluation of historic-era buildings in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines:

In order to assist the property owners and future developers, the City will complete a full architectural inventory of the existing historical resources in the Plan area. This inventory will identify buildings that are 45 years of age and are, therefore, eligible to be considered for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

The inventory will be documented on the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms. It will conclude which buildings are eligible for listing on the CRHR. The intent of this is to remove some of the burden from the property owners or future developers of property when they bring a development project forward in the future. By performing this analysis, the City is creating an incentive since future development will not be required to provide this information. This is an action that the City is taking in order to facilitate the redevelopment process. [Note: Results of this inventory are reported in section 4.9.3.]
Strategy 4.5.2b: Extend the provisions of the State Historic Building Code to include all eligible structures within the Specific Plan Area.

The designation as “Historic” area or district, by a local jurisdiction allows for the use of the State Historic Building Code to guide future rehabilitation work. The State Historic Building Code is contained as part of the City’s Building Code and administered based on the interpretations of the City’s Chief Building Inspector. “Eligible” structures will be identified within the architectural inventory contained as part of the Environmental Impact Report.

By implementing this section of the building code, it provides relief to certain current building codes that would otherwise constrain or act as a disincentive for the re-use of older buildings. The State Historic Building Code is written acknowledging the design, structural, and site issues typically associated with older structures.

Strategy 4.5.2c: Consider incorporating incentives to facilitate historic preservation.

The City should consider appropriate incentives for property owners with historically significant buildings. A program such as a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) should be studied as a potential incentive. Such a program will enable the development potential on properties with historic buildings to be transferred to other properties in Downtown.

City of Roseville Downtown Code, Adopted April 1, 2009 Ordinance #4728, Resolution #09-122

The purpose of the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan Downtown Code is to direct public and private development consistent with the community vision for the City of Roseville’s 2009 Downtown Specific Plan Area (City of Roseville, Adopted April 1, 2009). The goal is to ensure that the history of Roseville is honored, while balancing the desire for connectivity, pedestrian accessibility, a dynamic environment, and enhancement of amenities within the Downtown Specific Plan area. The Downtown Code will be provided to individuals interested in developing a new project or reuse of an existing building within the Specific Plan Area.

► 7.12 Additional Downtown Provisions

A. Purpose

The Downtown has been recognized as being a “unique” area within the Community. In order to preserve the unique character of the Downtown, the size, appearance of storefronts during vacancies, application of the state Historic Building Code and noise provisions are addressed in Sections 7.2 B-E of the Downtown Code.

C. California State Historic Building Code

The City shall apply the California State Historic Building Code for use in historic structures as described and identified as “Eligible” structures by the architectural inventory contained as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) [City of Roseville’s 2009 Downtown Specific Plan EIR]. By implementing this section of the building code, it provides relief to certain current building codes that would otherwise constrain or act as a disincentive for the re-use of older buildings. The State Historic Building Code is written acknowledging the structural, design and site issues typically associated with older structures. Eligible structures and potential eligible structures, as determined in the EIR, are shown in Downtown Specific Plan EIR Exhibit 7.2 and
Table 7.1. The City may also extend this designation to other structures within the Plan when deemed necessary. Determination of application shall be granted by the Director.

**D. Potentially Significant Building**

Prior to the approval of demolition or building permits that would result in substantial alteration of any of the potentially significant buildings, as shown in Downtown Specific Plan EIR Exhibit 7.2, an evaluation of significance in accordance with the California Register of Historic[al] Resources (CRHR) criteria shall be performed. If the evaluation indicates the property is not eligible for listing in the CRHR, no further action is required. If any of these buildings are found to be eligible for CRHR listing, renovations to retained structures shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s standards for the treatment of historic properties. If the structure is being demolished, documentation of the structure, consistent to the Historic American Building Survey (HABS), shall first be conducted. Additionally, buildings that have been identified in the City’s Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 19.61, Significant Buildings, will be subject to the provisions contained within the ordinance. Similar to these provisions, City owned significant buildings will require Council approval of a development plan prior to their demolition.

**City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.61 Significant Buildings**

Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance is intended to prevent demolition of identified buildings that have historic, cultural, or aesthetic interest, which may have significant value to the community, identified as “Significant Buildings.” These buildings cannot be demolished unless it is needed for the development of a new building and after having a noticed public hearing and a discretionary approval. (Ord. 5428 § 1, 2014.).

**Definitions:**

A. “Significant Building” shall be characterized by one or more of the following:
   
   (1) a building of at least fifty (50) years old;
   
   (2) a building listed on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Places\(^1\); or
   
   (3) a building determined by the City Council to be notably associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the broad architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of Roseville.”

B. “Demolition” means the intentional, physical act or process which removes or destroys a building, either in part or in whole. However, interior and exterior remodeling are not considered demolition and are not restricted by this Chapter.

**City of Roseville Municipal Code, Title 19 Zoning, Chapter 19.12 Commercial Zones**

Chapter 19.12 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance established a number of commercial zoning districts, including the “Old Town Historic District.” The Old Town historic district is intended to be applied to the original commercial core of Roseville to acknowledge its historic and architectural significance. The HD zoning district is intended to ensure that new land uses and development within the district further the rehabilitation, revitalization, and preservation of the architectural, aesthetic, historic and economic health of the district. Each parcel within the

---

\(^1\) Note: The correct name for the State register is the California Register of Historical Resources.
4.9.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research included examination of data collected from previous studies, as described below, and consultation conducted by the City of Roseville with local Native American groups.

4.9.3.1 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

In order to identify known and potential historical resources to determine whether any buildings, structures, objects, districts, or sites had been previously recorded or evaluated in the Planning Area, AECOM examined the Historic Property Data File for Placer County (OHP 2012 April 05), the current and previous General Plan, various Specific Plans and their environmental documents and technical appendices, and the City Municipal Code. In addition to these standard sources of information, the City also provided AECOM with summaries of Record Search results for selected specific plans and projects:

- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (2016) – Record search in 2008 identified a single archaeological resource, an isolated mano (a hand-held seed or plant grinding tool) found within the project site, and three historic-period architectural resources found outside the project site within a 0.5-mile radius. These three historic-period architectural resources included a lambing barn, a sheep-shearing barn, and the Fiddyment Ranch Complex. The Fiddyment Ranch was later nominated and added to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

- Cirby Creek Cultural Resources Survey (2003) – Record search in 2003 identified a single archaeological resource consisting of a historic-period trash dump.

- Cultural Resources Assessment for the Creekside Ridge Drive (2018) – Record search in 2018 identified a single archaeological resource consisting of a historic-period rock wall. Pedestrian survey revealed that the rock wall had been destroyed. The record search summary by the report authors stated that 33 cultural resources had been previously recorded within a one-mile radius of the project Area of Potential Effects (APE).

- Creekview Specific Plan (2011) – Record searches in 2006 and 2010 identified a single archaeological resource consisting of an archaeological site that was first recorded in 1961(CA-PLA-137). It consisted of several artifacts (mortar and pestle and fragments made of ground stone). Surveys in 2001 and 2006 could not relocate this site.

- Louis/Orland Transfer Point Improvement Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (2012) – Record search in 2012 did not identify any previously recorded archaeological or architectural resources within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE). A historic-period architectural property that consisted of a 1965-built church and a 1950s residence were identified within 0.5-miles of the project APE.

- Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation for the Shadowbrook Lift Station and Force Main Project (2015) – Record search in 2015 identified two archaeological resources located in the project APE or within 0.25-miles of the project APE.
► Washington Bridge Project (2005) – Record search in 2005 identified 34 previously recorded historic-period architectural resources and three archaeological resources located in the project APE or within 0.25-miles of the project APE. Most of the architectural resources were recorded by PAR Environmental Services Inc. in 2000 for the Vernon Streetscape Project.

► Westpark/Fiddyment Ranch Development Project (2001) – Record search in 2001 identified four archaeological sites within or adjacent to the project APE. Two sites were pre-historic, the third was a foundation of the old Pleasant Grove School that was outside the project APE, and the fourth was a historic archaeological site referred to as the Red Barn site. A bridge was also identified in the project APE (Bridge 19C00063) that was previously recommended ineligible for the NRHP.

4.9.3.2 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

The City of Roseville contacted the NAHC, pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52 consultation requirements, asking for a list of individuals that might have knowledge of the Planning Area. The City received a response from the NAHC in March of 2017 identifying potential contacts. The City used this list to circulate a letter dated April 3, 2017 providing the opportunity to participate in the Citywide General Plan Update, Qualified Climate Action Plan and Environmental Impact Report to ensure consideration of Tribal Cultural Resources in the context of local land use policy. United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) requested consultation in an email message dated May 2, 2017. They also requested:

► that a UAIC Tribal Monitor for this project, and

► copies of all existing cultural resource assessments, as well as requests for, and the results of, any records searches that may have been conducted.

UAIC stated that there are Tribal Cultural Resources, which are also historic resources, within the Planning Area, and they requested that the following recommendations should be incorporated into any mitigation measures that are developed:

► UAIC tribal representatives should be allowed to observe and participate in all cultural resource surveys, including initial pedestrian surveys for the project.

► When tribal cultural resources are identified within the project area tribal monitors must be present for all ground disturbing activities.

► UAIC’s strong preference is to preserve tribal cultural resources in place and avoid them whenever possible.

► Subsurface testing and data recovery must not occur without first consulting with UAIC and receiving UAIC’s written consent.

► Additional information about the nature and location of the Tribal Cultural Resources can be obtained via a Records Search Request of the UAIC Tribal Historical Resources Information System (THRIS).

The City of Roseville consulted with UAIC and incorporated their recommendations in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the proposed General Plan Update and the City’s draft Internal Guidance for Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation (Internal Guidance). This Internal Guidance is
organized into two parts. First is the City’s position on tribal participation during the project planning and approval process for discretionary projects. This includes both private sector and public (City) projects, which are subject to state and local laws and regulations that are under the jurisdiction of the City. It also includes guidance for City planners on determining when mitigation measures related to Native American participation are warranted under CEQA, standard treatment and mitigation measures that can be used consistently in project planning, and guidance on the City’s use of public funding when conducting consultation. Second, this guidance document also provides information and guidance for City staff and contractors during the project construction and implementation phases. This includes guidance for payment for tribal participation, instructions for contractors in the event of an unanticipated discovery, and guidance for City staff in assessing and acting upon unanticipated discoveries. The City may update this guidance periodically, as appropriate.

4.9.3.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Previous archaeological investigations conducted for various projects and specific plans have resulted in the identification of historic-era and prehistoric archaeological sites. Surveys conducted between 1979 and 1982 for the North Central Roseville Specific Plan identified seven prehistoric sites, six of which are food processing locations and one lithic scatter, and an unmortared rock wall built by immigrants during the historic period. Investigations for the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan identified four historic-era and four prehistoric isolated artifacts or features. Several prehistoric and historic-era sites were identified for the Southeast Roseville Specific Plan including those preserved within the Maidu Regional Park.

4.9.3.4 HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

The City of Roseville does not have a formal citywide historic resources inventory. At the time of this document’s preparation, the Roseville Historical Society is conducting a countywide inventory of historic sites.

Properties Previously Designated by the City of Roseville as Historic

Before adopting zoning ordinances to identify historically significant properties, the City designated a small number of properties/resources as “Historic” through property owners’ requests. The three properties that appear to have received this designation are listed in Table 4.9-1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Notes added by AECOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Theatre</td>
<td>417 Vernon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street Hotel</td>
<td>222-226 Vernon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Roseville Historic District</td>
<td>Bordered by Main Street, Pacific Street, Washington Boulevard, and Lincoln Street</td>
<td>The 2009 Downtown Specific Plan erroneously states that the historic district is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Downtown Specific Plan, Adopted April 1, 2009


Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance is intended to prevent demolition of identified buildings that have historic, cultural, or aesthetic interest, which may have significant value to the community, identified as “Significant Buildings.” The list of buildings was generated by using the list of historic resources provided in the City’s 2010 General Plan, published in 1992. Planning Department staff then met with two
founding members of the Roseville Historical Society, John Piches and Duke Davis, and the Chamber of Commerce Central Roseville Revitalization Committee to identify other significant buildings that were not on the list in the General Plan. Property owners of the newly identified buildings were contacted about the proposed ordinance (City of Roseville Planning Commission Meeting 2006 June 8). City-owned properties on the list in the 2010 General Plan, as well as the federally-owned Post Office (330 Vernon Street) were removed from the list because demolition of these buildings could not happen without a review process. The resulting list from this exercise contains 13 properties, listed in Table 4.9-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.9-2 Privately-Owned Significant Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Italy Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haman House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellows Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaseberg House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Exhibit Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill House (McAnally)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance, Amended August 2, 2006, Ordinance #4425, Section 19.61.030(A)

The City of Roseville also identified City-owned buildings located in the Downtown Specific Plan area as historically significant through City Resolution No. 06-610, listed in Table 4.9-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.9-3 City-Owned Significant Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Museum (Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station (Old Town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic Circle theatre (Roseville Theatre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Theatre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: March 2009 Downtown Specific Plan, Final EIR, Corrections and Revisions to Draft EIR

Downtown Roseville Specific Plan EIR (2009)

An historic architectural survey conducted by EDAW in 2008 fulfilled the City of Roseville’s Downtown Specific Plan, Land Use Strategy 4.5.2a by identifying and recording 213 historic-era properties over 45-years old in the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan area on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 forms. Of the 213 historic-era buildings located in the Plan Area, only two appeared eligible for listing in the CRHR: the City Hall Annex (316 Vernon Street), which was demolished in 2015, and the Tower theatre (241 Vernon Street). The Draft EIR stated that the Vernon Street Schoolhouse was previously determined to be eligible.
for the CRHR, but was demolished in 2005 and that the Old Town Roseville area had been designated as a historic district at the local level by the City of Roseville. See Table 4.9-4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>316 Vernon Street – Demolished 2015</td>
<td>Eligible for CRHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Theatre</td>
<td>417 Vernon Street</td>
<td>Eligible for CRHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Roseville Historic District</td>
<td>417 Vernon Street</td>
<td>Historic District at the local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: November 2008 Downtown Specific Plan, Draft EIR

The remaining buildings did not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR because of a lack of significance and integrity. Additionally, a total of 25 buildings within the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan area were less than 45 years old at the time of survey (see Table 4.7-2 in Downtown Roseville Specific Plan Draft EIR). Any future work in the Plan area at or near these 25 buildings would require evaluation if the building is older than 45 years old at the time of projection initiation.

**Sites of Historical and Cultural Importance (1992 and 2016)**

The 2010 General Plan (prepared in 1992) reported that the Roseville Historical Society compiled a list of significant historic sites. A figure was prepared that showed these sites and “other places of historic interest within the City.” In order to prevent vandalism and looting, the only archaeological site shown on the list is the Maidu Indian Sites which is part of the Maidu Museum. A table of these locations and additional notes compiled by AECOM are provided in Table 4.9-5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Notes added by AECOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Continental Railroad Marker</td>
<td>133 Church Street</td>
<td>Marker; California Historical Landmark No. 780-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haman House</td>
<td>424 Oak Street</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP in 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidu Indian Sites</td>
<td>1970 Johnson Ranch Drive</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaseberg House</td>
<td>16 Richards Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellows Hall</td>
<td>110-112 Pacific Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>109 Washington Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae Building</td>
<td>100 Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Italy Building</td>
<td>341 Lincoln Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library</td>
<td>557 Lincoln Street</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Park</td>
<td>Old Auburn Road</td>
<td>Zoned Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street School</td>
<td>725 Vernon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 General Plan, Exhibit 4.9-1

The existing General Plan (prepared in 2016) also reported that the Roseville Historical Society compiled a list of significant historic sites, but three more sites were added to the list since the 2010 General Plan was published. The Vernon Street School was revised to “Vernon Street School Site” because the school was demolished in 2002 and a marker was installed at the site. A table of the revised list is provided in Table 4.9-6.

**Historic Property Data File for Placer County**

Review of the Historic Property Data File for Placer County identified the California Historical Resources (CHR) Status Codes for a number of previously identified resources, listed in Table 4.9-7.
Table 4.9-6  Sites of Historical and Cultural Importance (Existing General Plan, Adopted 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Notes added by AECOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Continental Railroad Marker</td>
<td>133 Church Street</td>
<td>Marker; California Historical Landmark No. 780-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haman House</td>
<td>424 Oak Street</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP in 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidu Indian Sites</td>
<td>1970 Johnson Ranch Drive</td>
<td>Listed in NRHP in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaseberg House</td>
<td>16 Richards Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Fellow Hall</td>
<td>110-112 Pacific Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Methodist Episcopal Church</td>
<td>109 Washington Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae Building</td>
<td>100 Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Italy Building</td>
<td>341 Lincoln Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library</td>
<td>557 Lincoln Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Park</td>
<td>Old Auburn Road</td>
<td>Zoned Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street School Site</td>
<td>725 Vernon Street</td>
<td>Revised entry on list: School demolished in 2002, now the location of a marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School House Park</td>
<td>School House Lane</td>
<td>New entry on list. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddyment Homestead (Ranch)</td>
<td>4440 Phillip Road. Note: New road recently cut and new address will be on High School Road when completed</td>
<td>New entry on list. Listed in NRHP in 2010 as Fiddyment Ranch Main Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistachio Orchard</td>
<td>Orchard View Road</td>
<td>New entry on list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2035 General Plan, Figure V-4

Table 4.9-7  CHR Status Codes of Previously Identified Historical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>CHR Status Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maidu Indian Sites</td>
<td>1970 Johnson Ranch Dr</td>
<td>1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haman House</td>
<td>424 Oak St</td>
<td>1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library (Museum)</td>
<td>557 Lincoln St</td>
<td>1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddyment Homestead (Ranch)</td>
<td>4440 Phillip Rd</td>
<td>1S; 1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>316 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Theatre</td>
<td>417-419 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Bank (Forlow Building)</td>
<td>201 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street Hotel</td>
<td>222-226 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Exhibit Building</td>
<td>700 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic Circle Theatre (Roseville Theatre)</td>
<td>235-245 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Street School (Site)</td>
<td>725 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Continental Railroad Marker</td>
<td>133 Church St</td>
<td>1CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Roseville HD</td>
<td></td>
<td>7N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Historic Property Data File for Placer County, April 5, 2012
Notes: 1S = Individual property listed in National Register by the Keeper, Listed in the California Register; 1D = Contributor to a district or multiple resource property listed in the National Register by the Keeper, Listed in the California Register; 2S2 = Individual property determined eligible for National Register by consensus through Section 106 process, Listed in the California Register; 6Y = Determined ineligible for National Register by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for California Register or Local Listing; 1CL = Automatically listed in the California Register – Includes State Historical Landmarks; 7N = Needs to be reevaluated (Formerly NR Status Code 4).

In summary, the City of Roseville’s efforts to identify historical resources through previous General Plans, Specific Plans, Zoning Ordinances, City Resolutions, and coordination with the Roseville Historical Society has resulted in identification of 25 historical resources. A master table of the resource names, addresses, CHR Status Code (if applicable), origin of designation, and any additional notes are listed in Table 4.9-8 and their locations are depicted in Exhibit 4.9-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>CHR Status Code</th>
<th>Significant Building (City or Privately owned) [Zoning Ordinance 19.61 and City Resolution 06-610]</th>
<th>Site of Historical and Cultural Importance [2035 General Plan]</th>
<th>Local Historic District [Zoning Ordinance 19.12]</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maidu Indian Sites</td>
<td>1970 Johnson Ranch Dr</td>
<td>1S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Haman House</td>
<td>424 Oak St</td>
<td>1S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-123-018-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carnegie Library (Museum)</td>
<td>557 Lincoln St</td>
<td>1S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Local Historic District [Zoning Ordinance 19.12]</td>
<td>APN 011-143-006-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fiddymont Homestead (Ranch)</td>
<td>4440 Phillip Rd</td>
<td>1S; 1D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phillip Road address on NRHP nomination. New road recently cut and new address will be on High School Road when completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>316 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tower Theatre</td>
<td>417-419 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-123-022-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>West House</td>
<td>345 Atlantic St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-092-010-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barker Hotel</td>
<td>302 Lincoln St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 012-122-003-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bank of Italy Building</td>
<td>341 Lincoln St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APN 012-200-008-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>McRae Building</td>
<td>100 Main St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APN 11-146-024-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Odd Fellows Hall</td>
<td>110-112 Pacific St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APN 012-200-012-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kaseberg House</td>
<td>16 Richards Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APN 015-350-016-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Citizens Bank (Forlow Building)</td>
<td>201 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-093-007-000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vernon Street Hotel</td>
<td>222-226 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-093-005-520; Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Placer County Exhibit Building</td>
<td>700 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-250-014-000; Primary P-31-001172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>First Methodist Church</td>
<td>109 Washington Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APN 012-123-009-000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.9-8 Master List of City of Roseville’s Historical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>CHR Status Code</th>
<th>Significant Building (City or Privately owned) [Zoning Ordinance 19.61 and City Resolution 06-610]</th>
<th>Site of Historical and Cultural Importance [2035 General Plan]</th>
<th>Local Historic District [Zoning Ordinance 19.12]</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hemphill House (McAnally)</td>
<td>315 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 011-144-001-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fire Station (Old Town)</td>
<td>400 Lincoln St</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 011-147-011-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Union Pacific Hospital</td>
<td>315 Church St</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-250-022-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Magic Circle theatre (Roseville Theatre)</td>
<td>235-245 Vernon St</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APN 013-093-003-000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vernon Street School (Site)</td>
<td>725 Vernon St</td>
<td>2S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School demolished in 2002, now the location of a marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>First Continental Railroad Marker</td>
<td>133 Church St</td>
<td>1CL</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Marker; California Historical Landmark No. 780-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Barn Park</td>
<td>Old Auburn Rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoned Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>School House Park</td>
<td>School House Ln</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pistachio Orchard</td>
<td>Orchard View Rd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Old Town Roseville HD</td>
<td></td>
<td>7N</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Historical Resource (CHR) Status Codes:
1D: Contributor to a district or multiple resources property listed in the National Register by the Keeper. Listed in the California Register.
1S: Individual property listed in National Register by the Keeper. Listed in the California Register.
1CL: Automatically listed in the California Register – Includes State Historical Landmarks 770 and above and Points of Historical Interest nominated after December 1997 and recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission.
2S2: Individual property determined eligible for NR by a consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the California Register.
6Y: Determined ineligible for National Register by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for California Register or Local Listing.
7N: Needs to be reevaluated.
Exhibit 4.9-1  City of Roseville Historical Resources

- Maidu Indian Sites
- Raman House
- Carnegie Library (Museum)
- Fiddymont Homestead (Ranch)
- Tower Theatre
- West House
- Barker Hotel
- Bank of Italy Building
- MCG Building
- Odd Fellows Hall
- Laseberg House
- Citizens Bank (Forlow Building)
- Vernon Street Hotel
- Placer County Exhibit Building
- First Methodist Church
- Hemphill House (McAnally)
- Fire Station (Old Town)
- Union Pacific Hospital
- Magic Circle Theatre (Roseville Theatre)
- Vernon Street School (Site)
- First Continental Railroad Marker
- Barn Park
- School House Park
- Pistachio Orchard
- Old Town Roseville Historic District

Legend:
- Planning Area
- Old Town Roseville Historic District

2035 General Plan Update EIR
City of Roseville

AECOM
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources
4.9.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4.9.4.1 METHODOLOGY

Buildout of the General Plan is compared to existing conditions (i.e., environmental baseline) to determine potential impacts. General Plan policies and implementation measures promote development and infrastructure/public facility projects that avoid or minimize impacts to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources. This proposed General Plan Update does not include any changes to land use designations, expansion to the City’s Planning Area, or other major physical changes to areas planned for development compared to the existing General Plan, but does include changes to goals, policies, and implementation measures, which are analyzed as a part of this EIR.

4.9.4.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural Resources

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

► cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;

► cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;\(^2\)

► disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries.

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines “substantial adverse change” as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project results in demolition or material alteration in an adverse manner of those physical characteristics of a resource that:

► convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historic Resources;

► account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Public Resources Code 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code 5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the proposed project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

► convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

\(^2\) CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, checklist item V.b) only applies to “unique archeological resources.” CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(3)-(4) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(a).
Tribal Cultural Resources

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact on tribal cultural resources if it would:

- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Codes section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is:
  - Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
  - A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

4.9.4.3 IMPACT ANALYSIS

**IMPACT 4.9-1** Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource Pursuant to Section 15064.5. It is possible that development planned as a part of General Plan buildout could adversely affect historical resources through modification of existing buildings and structures through demolition, deconstruction, relocation, or alteration, or adversely impact the setting through new land uses. However, the existing and proposed General Plan, the 2009 Downtown Specific Plan, and Chapter 19.61 of the City of Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance contain goals and policies which would ensure that potential historical resources are assessed for their significance in advance of future development. Implementation of these goals and policies would reduce impacts, but if historical resources are substantially adversely affected by future development, this would be a significant impact.

A total of 25 designated historical resources have been identified in the General Plan Planning Area, including individual buildings, a historic district, a ranch complex, parks, markers, and an orchard. Many of these historical resources are located in or near the Downtown Roseville Historic District. It is estimated that buildout of the General Plan could accommodate the construction of between 20,000 to 25,000 housing units, 25 to 30 million square feet of non-residential building space, facilities for up to 10,000 additional K-12 students, and park and other public facilities and infrastructure to support such development throughout the Planning Area. This future development could result in significant impacts to known and unknown historical resources through either direct physical impacts or by indirect changes to the setting.

Direct physical impacts would result from activity such as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources that would materially impair the qualities that contribute to the significance of these historical resources. Changes to the cultural resources setting would occur where new land uses and built environment features are placed on rural undeveloped land, or other changes in land use. Changes to the setting could result in significant impacts where the natural or undeveloped setting forms part of the significance or integrity of a historical resource, such as a rural ranch property, or a previously residential area converted to commercial.
Construction would result from buildout of property in areas where the City anticipates infill development will happen during the planning horizon, as well as in the Specific Plan Areas. Buildout of the General Plan has the potential to affect historical resources both directly and indirectly.

When projects consistent with the General Plan occur in existing developed areas, depending on the context, this could add incompatible architectural elements; diminish the historic integrity of a setting, feeling, or association; or destroy the historic character of a property. The City has numerous buildings and structures that are either individually significant or contributors to a historic district, as well as buildings, structures, and infrastructure that could represent historical resources. These properties are representative of numerous development patterns, property types (residential, civic/cultural, commercial), and architectural styles important to the City’s past, and are listed in or eligible for listing in a federal, State, or local register.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to historical resources in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in bold, underlined text and deletions shown in strikethrough text:

**Goal OS4.1:** Strengthen Roseville’s unique identify through the protection of its archaeological, historic, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources.

- **Policy OS4.1:** Consult with local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with resources that could be affected by City plans or projects, identify areas that may be of cultural or tribal cultural significance, and determine appropriate treatment for the areas.

- **Policy OS4.6:** Buildings and other resources that have historical or architectural value should be preserved, wherever feasible, and the City will encourage private property owners to preserve and maintain or renovate significant historic resources, consistent with applicable Department of the Interior historic preservation standards. Establish standards for the designation, improvement and protection of buildings, landmarks, and sites of cultural and historic character.

- **Policy OS4.7:** Participate in countywide inventories of historical sites. Participate in the completion of a countywide inventory of historical sites.

- **Policy OS4.10:** Provide opportunities to for public awareness and education through coordination with the Roseville Historical Society and local schools.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above would result in improved protection for historical resources, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.6, OS4.7, and OS4.10 listed above would protect historical resources. The City’s 14 adopted Specific Plans, including the Downtown Specific Plan, contain mitigation measures that must be implemented to protect historic resources, such as avoidance of resources where feasible, or recordation and consultation with the SHPO. Chapter 19.61 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance protects “Significant Buildings” that have historic, cultural, or aesthetic interest, which
may have significant value to the community. Chapter 19.12 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance protects the designated Old Town Historic District. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures, such as referral of development projects to the SHPO and NAHC, preparation of site-specific archaeological surveys, proper treatment of materials encountered during construction activities, incorporation of measures to protect historic resources, protection of historic resources in parks and open space areas, and interagency cooperation to identify and preserve resources. These goals, policies, implementation measures, and Municipal Codes establish review procedures to protect historical resources. However, significant impacts to historical resources could still occur.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

As appropriate to each individual project or Specific Plan, the following actions or those determined to be equally as effective by the City shall be implemented where there may be an adverse impact on potential historical resources:

a. Consult the City’s Master List of Historical Resources Inventory and, as necessary, seek updated information from the North Central Information Center or other applicable data repositories to determine whether the project area has been surveyed, and whether historic built environment resources were identified.

b. If a survey of the property or the area in which the property is located has not been conducted, a qualified architectural historian shall conduct a study of the project area for the presence of historic built environment resources.

c. If a study is required, it will evaluate the significance of built environment resources greater than 45 years in age that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities. The study may include a field survey; background, archival and historic research; and consultation with local historical societies, museums or other interested parties; as necessary.

d. If necessary, the qualified architectural historian’s study will recommend appropriate protection or mitigative treatment, if any, and include recordation of identified built environment resources. Recommended treatment for historical resources identified in the report shall be implemented.

e. If no significant historic built environment resources are identified in the study or prior survey of the project area that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, there is no adverse change to documented built environment historical resources and no further action is required.

f. If a significant built environment historical resource could be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, avoidance shall be considered the primary mitigation option. If avoidance is not feasible, then the maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of the historical resource, conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. If adherence to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards cannot avoid materially altering in an adverse manner the physical characteristics or historic character of the surrounding environmental setting that contribute to a resource’s historic significance, additional mitigation may be required.
g. If avoidance is not feasible and minimizing impacts through adherence to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties is not feasible, documentation is required using, as appropriate, Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and/or Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) guidelines before the property is potentially altered during project activities.

**Significance after Mitigation**

Although implementation of the existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update goals, policies, implementation measures, and Mitigation Measure 4.9-1a will reduce the potential impacts associated with development in the General Plan Planning Area, development within the Planning Area may cause impacts that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level through mitigation. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

**IMPACT 4.9-2**

**Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of an Archaeological Resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.** Individual development and infrastructure projects within the Planning Area would involve grading, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities which could disturb or damage unique archaeological resources. This impact would be **significant**.

Numerous historic-era and prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified as part of investigations conducted for Specific Plans in the city, including several prehistoric and historic-era sites identified for the Southeast Roseville Specific Plan and preserved as the Maidu Indian Site within Maidu Regional Park. Other surveys conducted between 1979 and 1982 for the North Central Roseville Specific Plan identified seven prehistoric sites and an unmortared rock wall built by immigrants during the historic period. Investigations for the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan identified four historic-era and four prehistoric isolated artifacts or features. Several prehistoric and historic-era sites were identified for the Southeast Roseville Specific Plan including those preserved within the Maidu Regional Park.

It is estimated that buildout of the General Plan could accommodate the construction of between 20,000 to 25,000 housing units, 25 to 30 million square feet of non-residential building space, facilities for up to 10,000 additional K–12 students, and park and other public facilities and infrastructure to support such development throughout the Planning Area. Individual development projects within the Planning Area would involve grading, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities which could disturb or damage any as-yet- undiscovered archaeological resources. It is possible that prehistoric or historic-age archaeological resources have been covered by later deposits that could be removed, exposing the cultural deposits during project-related construction activities. Prehistoric archeological indicators can include: obsidian and chert flakes and flaked stone tools; ground stone implements (grinding slabs, mortars and pestles) and locally darkened midden soils containing some of the previously listed items plus fragments of burned and unburned faunal bone and fire affected stones. Historic-era site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations, privy pits, wells, and dumps.

The following proposed General Plan Update goal and policies related to archaeological resources in Roseville are proposed for revision:
Goal OS4.1: Strengthen Roseville’s unique identity through the protection of its archaeological, historic, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources.

- **Policy OS4.1:** Consult with local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with resources that could be affected by City plans or projects, identify areas that may be of cultural or tribal cultural significance, and determine appropriate treatment for the areas.

- **Policy OS4.4:** Subject to approval by The City shall coordinate with the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) Tribes upon discovery of artifacts. The City shall offer the Maidu Museum & Historic Site as a temporary housing location for artifacts that are discovered and subsequently determined to be “removable,” should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center Museum & Historic Site.

- **Policy OS4.6:** Buildings and other resources that have historical or architectural value should be preserved, wherever feasible, and the City will encourage private property owners to preserve and maintain or renovate significant historic resources, consistent with applicable Department of the Interior historic preservation standards. Establish standards for the designation, improvement and protection of buildings, landmarks, and sites of cultural and historic character.

- **Policy OS4.7:** Participate in countywide inventories of historical sites. Participate in the completion of a countywide inventory of historical sites.

- **Policy OS4.9:** Explore funding for cultural, archaeological, and historic programs and activities.

- **Policy OS4.10:** Provide opportunities for public awareness and education through coordination with the Roseville Historical Society and local schools.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above would result in improved protection for historical resources and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.4, OS4.6, OS4.7, OS4.9, and OS4.10 listed above, would protect archaeological resources. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures such as referral of development projects to the SHPO and NAHC, preparation of site-specific archaeological surveys, proper treatment of materials encountered during construction activities, incorporation of measures to protect archaeological resources, protection of archaeological resources in parks and open space areas, and interagency cooperation to identify and preserve resources. These goals, policies, and implementation measures establish review procedures that would help to protect archaeological resources. However, significant impacts to archaeological resources may still occur.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Mitigation Measure 4.9-2a –** The proposed General Plan Update should be amended as follows:
Implementation Measure

Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources shall be required to assess impacts and provide feasible mitigation. The following steps, or those determined to be equally as effective by the City, will be followed:

a. Request information from the California Native American Heritage Commission to obtain a review of the Sacred Lands File and a list of local Native American groups and individuals that may have specific knowledge of cultural resources in the area that could be affected by project implementation. Each Native American group and individual identified by the Native American Heritage Commission will be contacted to obtain any available information on cultural resources in the project area. Additional consultation with relevant tribal representatives may be appropriate, depending on the relative level of cultural sensitivity.

b. Request updated information from the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (California State University, Sacramento) to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether archaeological resources were identified. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted or existing survey data is greater than five years old, the applicant will retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to assess the adequacy of the existing data (if any) and assess the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. If the survey did not meet current professional standards or regulatory guidelines, or relies on outdated information, a qualified archaeologist will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the project area for archaeological resources.

c. If a survey is warranted, it will include all necessary background research in addition to an archaeological pedestrian survey. Based on findings of the survey, additional technical studies may be required, such as geoarchaeological sensitivity analysis, or other analysis scaled according to the nature of the individual project. A report will document the results of the survey and provide appropriate management recommendations, and include recordation of identified archaeological resources on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports.

d. Management recommendations may include, but are not limited to additional studies to evaluate identified sites or archaeological monitoring at locations determined by a qualified archaeologist to be sensitive for subsurface cultural resource deposits.

e. Once approved by the City, provide the North Central Information Center with appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports for any resources identified. Any subsequent reports completed as a result of additional technical work will likewise be submitted to the Northcentral Information Center.

f. If no archeological resources are identified that may be directly or indirectly impacted by project activities, mitigation is complete as there would be no adverse change to documented archeological resources. The exception would be in the event of the discovery of a previously unknown archaeological site inadvertently exposed during project implementation. In such an event, a qualified archaeologist will be retained to assess the discovery and provide management recommendations as necessary.
g. When a project will impact a known archaeological site, and avoidance is not a feasible option, a qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the eligibility of the site for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. If the archaeological site is found to be a historical resource as per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(3), the qualified archaeologist shall recommend further mitigative treatment which could include preservation in place or data recovery.

h. If a site to be tested is prehistoric, local tribal representatives should be afforded the opportunity to monitor the ground-disturbing activities. Appropriate mitigation may include curation of artifacts removed during subsurface testing.

i. If significant archaeological resources that meet the definition of historical or unique archaeological resources are identified in the project area, the preferred mitigation of impacts is preservation in place. If impacts cannot be avoided through project design, appropriate and feasible treatment measures are required, which may consist of, but are not limited to actions, such as data recovery excavations. If only part of a site will be impacted by a project, data recovery will only be necessary for that portion of the site. Data recovery will not be required if the implementing agency determines prior testing and studies have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from the resources. Studies and reports resulting from the data recovery shall be deposited with the North Central Information Center. Archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

Mitigation Measure 4.9-2b – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Projects that could have significant adverse impacts to undiscovered, potentially significant archaeological resources shall be required to implement the following steps, or those determined to be equally as effective by the City:

a. During ground-disturbing activities necessary to implement proposed development and infrastructure projects, if any prehistoric or historic subsurface archaeological resources are discovered, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist
   shall be consulted within 24 hours to assess the significance of the find, according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and implement, as applicable, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(d), (e), and (f).

b. If any find is determined to be a historical resource according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, representatives from the City and the archaeologist will meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. Cultural resources shall be recorded on appropriate Department of

---

The California Office of Historic preservation utilizes the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation as found in Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61. The minimum professional qualifications in archeology are a graduate degree in archeology, anthropology, or closely related field plus: 1. At least one year of full-time professional experience or equivalent specialized training in archeological research, administration or management; 2. At least four months of supervised field and analytic experience in general North American archeology; and 3. Demonstrated ability to carry research to completion. In addition to these minimum qualifications, a professional in prehistoric archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the prehistoric period. A professional in historic archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the historic period.
Parks and Recreation forms, and all significant cultural materials recovered shall be, as necessary and at the discretion of the qualified archaeologist and in consultation with the local Native American community if the discovery is prehistoric in age, subject to scientific analysis, professional curation, and documentation according to professional standards. If it is determined that the proposed development or infrastructure project could damage a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines), mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, with a preference for preservation in place. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out. Preservation in place may be accomplished by planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.

c. If avoidance is not feasible, the qualified archaeologist shall develop and oversee the execution of a treatment plan. The treatment plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, data recovery procedures based on location and type of archaeological resources discovered and a preparation and submittal of report of findings to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. Data recovery shall be designed to recover the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain, based on the scientific/historical research questions that are applicable to the resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable resource questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by project proponents’ actions. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

Significance after Mitigation

The existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update policies and implementation measures summarized above, along with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.9-2a and 4.9-2b, establish appropriate review procedures and consultation requirements, while also addressing the need for qualified personnel to undertake technical analysis, where necessary. These policies and implementation programs provide for the identification and evaluation of cultural resources, as well as for the assessment of potential impacts to such resources and the development of mitigation strategies. Additionally, CEQA review and local regulatory review, including mitigation measures that have been adopted as part of existing Specific Plans, provide additional levels of protection for known resources and address the identification of unidentified cultural resources. Because prehistoric and historic-era archaeological sites can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts during buildout of the General Plan, despite implementation of state and federal laws and the City’s proposed policies and mitigation measures. If unknown archaeological resources are encountered during construction without prior discovery, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.
Disturb Any Human Remains, Including Those Interred Outside of Formal Cemeteries. The general project vicinity is known to have been heavily used by Native American groups prehistorically; in addition, Roseville was settled by European immigrants by the mid-19th century. While some burial ground locations (generally from the historic-era) are known, there is the possibility that ground disturbing activities in the general plan update area could encounter prehistoric, historic-era, or other human remains. This impact is considered to be significant.

It is possible that buildout of the General Plan, including development and infrastructure improvement projects throughout the Planning Area involving grading, trenching, excavation, soil stockpiling, and other earthmoving activities, could impact human remains. While there are no known interment sites within the developable areas of the Planning Area, there is the potential for discovery during construction of development and infrastructure projects which are consistent with the General Plan.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to cultural resources, including human remains, in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in bold, underlined text and deletions shown in strikethrough text:

Goal OS4.1: Strengthen Roseville’s unique identify through the protection of its archaeological, historic, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources.

Policy OS4.1: Consult with local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with resources that could be affected by City plans or projects, identify areas that may be of cultural or tribal cultural significance, and determine appropriate treatment for the areas.

Policy OS4.4: Subject to approval by The City shall coordinate with the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) Tribes upon discovery of artifacts. The City shall offer the Maidu Museum & Historic Site as a temporary housing location for artifacts that are discovered and subsequently determined to be “removable,” should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center/Museum & Historic Site.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above would result in improved protection for cultural resources, including human remains, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

Conclusion

Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1 and OS4.4 listed above, would protect cultural resources, including human remains. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures, such as referral of development projects to the SHPO and NAHC, preparation of site-specific archaeological surveys, proper treatment of materials encountered during construction activities, incorporation of measures to protect archaeological resources, protection of archaeological resources in parks and open space areas, and interagency cooperation to identify and preserve resources. These goals, policies, and implementation measures establish general review procedures that would help to protect archaeological resources. However, significant impacts to cultural resources, including human remains, may still occur.
Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure 4.9-3 – The General Plan Update should be amended as follows:

Implementation Measure

Management of Tribal Cultural Resources and Consultation

The City will develop and implement guidance for consultation and management of cultural and tribal cultural resources. This guidance should have two parts. First is the City’s position on tribal participation during the project planning and approval process for discretionary projects. This includes both private sector and public (City) projects, which are subject to State and local laws and regulations that are under the jurisdiction of the City. It should also include guidance for City planners on determining when mitigation measures related to Native American participation are warranted under CEQA, standard treatment and mitigation measures that can be used consistently in project planning, and guidance on the City’s use of public funding when conducting consultation. Second, this guidance document should also provide information and guidance for City staff and contractors during the project construction and implementation phases. This includes thresholds for payment for tribal participation, instructions for contractors in the event of an unanticipated discovery, and guidance for City staff in assessing and acting upon unanticipated discoveries. The City may update this guidance periodically, as appropriate.

Significance after Mitigation

Because prehistoric and historic archaeological sites that contain human remains can occur below ground with little or no surface manifestation it may not be feasible to entirely avoid impacts to interred human remains during buildout of the General Plan Planning Area, despite implementation of the state and federal laws, the City’s proposed goals, policies, implementation program, and Mitigation Measure 4.9-3. If unanticipated buried human remains are encountered during construction, they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.

IMPACT 4.9-4 Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource. Buildout of the General Plan Planning Area would result in development projects throughout the Planning Area that would involve earthmoving activities. The Planning Area and vicinity are known to have been heavily used by Native American groups prehistorically and UAIC has indicated that TCRs are located within the Planning Area. This impact is considered to be significant.

Numerous prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified as part of investigations conducted for Specific Plans in the city, including the Maidu Indian Sites. Prehistoric resources also may be considered TCRs and can include sites, features, and objects that are CRHR-listed, eligible to be listed, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) stated that there are TCRs within the Planning Area. State and federal law requires maintaining confidentiality of the location and nature of archaeological sites and TCRs, and therefore this EIR does not include an exhibit or physical description their locations. However, based on information provided by UAIC during consultation on this project, development projects within the Planning Area which would involve grading, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities could disturb or damage TCRs.
The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to tribal cultural resources in Roseville are proposed for revision, with additions shown in **bold, underlined** text and deletions shown in strikethrough text:

**Goal OS4.1**: Strengthen Roseville’s unique identity through the protection of its archaeological, historic, **palaeontological**, and **tribal** cultural resources.

- **Policy OS4.1**: Consult with local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with resources that could be affected by City plans or projects, identify areas that may be of cultural or tribal cultural significance, and determine appropriate treatment for the areas.

- **Policy OS4.4**: Subject to approval by **The City shall coordinate with** the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) Tribes upon discovery of artifacts. **The City shall offer the Maidu Museum & Historic Site as a temporary housing location for artifacts** that are discovered and subsequently determined to be “removable,” should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center/Museum & Historic Site.

- **Policy OS4.9**: Explore **Pursue** funding for cultural, archaeological, and historic programs and activities.

- **Policy OS4.10**: Provide opportunities to for public awareness and education through coordination with the **Roseville** Historical Society and local schools.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above would result in improved protection for tribal cultural resources, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Existing General Plan Archaeological, Historic, and Cultural Resources Policies 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Goal OS4.1 and Policies OS4.1, OS4.4, OS4.9, and OS4.10 listed above, would help to protect tribal cultural resources. In addition, the existing General Plan contains implementation measures, such as referral of development projects to the SHPO and NAHC, preparation of site-specific archaeological surveys, proper treatment of materials encountered during construction activities, incorporation of measures to protect archaeological resources, protection of archaeological resources in parks and open space areas, and interagency cooperation to identify and preserve resources. These goals, policies, and implementation measures establish general review procedures that would help to protect tribal cultural resources. However, **significant** impacts to tribal cultural resources may still occur.

**Mitigation Measure**

**Mitigation Measure 4.9-4 – Implement Mitigation Measure 4.9-3.**

**Significance after Mitigation**

While the existing laws, General Plan policies, and implementation programs, along with proposed General Plan Update policies and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9-4 will reduce potential effects, the potential remains for residual effects. No other feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, the impact of development in the General Plan Planning Area to TCRs is considered **significant and unavoidable**.