

SECTION 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.5.1 Introduction

This section describes the prehistoric and historical resources that could be damaged or destroyed as a result of development of the Life Time Fitness Project (proposed project). Prehistoric resources include sites and artifacts associated with the indigenous, non-Euro-American population, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historical resources consist of structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euro-American settlement of the region. Paleontological resources are subsurface flora and fauna fossil resources from the Plio-Pleistocene era less than 600,000 years ago. Information referenced to prepare this section includes the following:

- *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*, as amended February 2013 (City of Roseville 2013)
- *Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines* (City of Roseville 2007)
- *Stoneridge Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report* (City of Roseville 1998)
- Records search results for Lifetime Fitness Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (see Appendix H)
- *Creekview Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)* (City of Roseville 2010)

The documents listed above are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Roseville Permit Center, 311 Vernon Street, Roseville, California 95678. A copy of the records search results is included in Appendix H.

No comments related to prehistoric, historic, paleontology resources were submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP). A copy of the NOP and comment letters received in response to the NOP is included in Appendix A.

4.5.2 Environmental Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped; the site was graded in the late 1990s and has been kept mowed since that time.

Prehistory Background

The Native Americans who occupied the City of Roseville and the surrounding areas at the time of Euro-American contact (circa 1850s) are known as the Nisenan, also referred to as the Southern Maidu. Several ethnographers have studied the Maidu people and generally agree that the Nisenan territory includes the drainages of the Bear, American, Yuba, and Southern Feather rivers. Tribes from this language family dominated the Central Valley, the

San Francisco Bay area, and the western Sierra Nevada foothills. Their permanent settlements were generally located on crests, knolls, or terraces partway up ridges separating parallel streams.

Politically, the Nisenan were divided into “tribelets,” made up of a primary village and a series of outlying hamlets, presided over by a more or less hereditary chief. The exact location of these villages is hard to determine, but a village site is known to have been located at Maidu Park in Roseville. Generally, the Maidu were nomadic throughout much of the year, moving from place to place following game migration patterns and gathering seasonal plants.

Two events drastically affected the population. In 1833 there was a malaria epidemic that is estimated to have eliminated three-quarters of the Nisenan population that year. In addition, the Nisenan hunting and gathering cycle was altered drastically with the discovery of gold in Coloma in 1848. As miners arrived in the area, the Native Americans were forced out of their winter villages, land was fenced, streams were silted, and food resources became increasingly difficult to procure. The Nisenan survived as best they could by working in mines or on ranches, panning for gold, and carrying out other activities.

History of the Project Area

The first European exploration of the Roseville area was conducted by the Spanish under Gabriel Moraga between 1806 and 1808. The purpose of Moraga’s exploration was to search for possible mission sites, find runaway Native Americans, and punish those hostile to Spanish rule. Jedediah Smith and his party of fur trappers are credited with next visiting the Roseville vicinity in historic times. In 1827–1828, the Smith party trapped beaver from camps near Roseville.

The settlement of Euro-Americans in the Roseville area began in the 1850s, and the local Nisenan people were removed from their traditional villages to be settled in rancherias. By 1852, the California State Census of Placer County listed 730 Native American residents. The discovery of gold brought more than 10,000 people to Placer County by 1860. Mining ventures spread to Roseville, where gold was found at Secret Ravine, north of the proposed project site.

After the gold rush, ranching and farming became the dominant industries of Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. Historic uses in the project vicinity included ranching, farming, and water storage. The majority of the Stoneridge Specific Plan (SSP) area, in which the proposed project site is located, was originally deeded out by Congress in 1875 as one of the alternate sections of public domain granted to the Central Pacific Railroad. The land remained railroad property until the 1890s, when it was divided and came under private ownership.

Records Search

A records search for an area encompassing the proposed project site plus a 0.25-mile radius surrounding the project site was conducted by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) for the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) in May 2013. NCIC reviewed the State of California Office of Historic Preservation records, base maps, historic maps, and literature of Placer County. The NCIC records search results indicate that within the area researched, one recorded prehistoric archaeological site and six historic-period resources are listed within the CHRIS. No historic properties are listed within the project area. The results of the records search also indicate that, given the recorded bedrock mortar prehistoric resource located approximately 0.25 mile east of the project area and other resources in similar geographic settings in the region, there is a moderate potential for prehistoric-period sites to be present in the project area. In addition, the recorded historic site P-31-1588 for the Southern Pacific Reservoir complex lies within the project vicinity. Given the recorded resources and the known patterns of historic land use, there is also a moderate potential for identifying subsurface historic-period cultural resources in the project site.

Cultural Resources Identified within the Stoneridge Specific Plan Area

The project site is within the SSP area. The SSP EIR conducted an archaeological and historical investigation of the entire SSP area in the late 1990s. A complete records search and historical background study was conducted, as well as a reconnaissance-level field survey. The field survey examined portions of the SSP area that were previously unsurveyed for cultural resources and also reexamined select portions of previously surveyed areas. Nine historic sites, 3 prehistoric sites, and 15 minor historical finds have been documented in the SSP area (City of Roseville 1998).

Paleontological Setting

Locally, three geologic formations that could contain paleontological resources are found in the general project vicinity: the Late Cretaceous Chico Formation, the Eocene Ione Formation, and the Miocene Mehrten Formation. These formations have all been identified south of the project site. The SSP EIR included a survey of the entire SSP area conducted by a qualified paleontologist; no significant paleontological resources were discovered during this survey (City of Roseville 1998).

4.5.3 Regulatory Setting

The treatment of cultural resources is governed by federal, state, and local laws and guidelines. There are specific criteria for determining whether prehistoric and historic sites or objects are significant and/or protected by law. Federal and state significance criteria generally focus on the

resource’s integrity and uniqueness, its relationship to similar resources, and its potential to contribute important information to scholarly research. Some resources that do not meet federal significance criteria may be considered significant by state criteria. The laws and regulations seek to mitigate impacts on significant prehistoric or historic resources. The federal, state, and local laws and guidelines for protecting historic resources are summarized below.

Federal Regulations

Historical Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as the official federal list of cultural resources that have been nominated by state offices for their historical significance at the local, state, or national level. Properties listed in the NRHP, or determined eligible for listing, must meet certain criteria for historical significance and possess integrity of form, location, and setting. Under Section 106 of the act and its implementing regulations, federal agencies are required to consider the effects of their actions, or those they fund or permit, on properties that may be eligible for listing or that are listed in the NRHP.¹ The regulations in 36 CFR 60.4 describe the criteria to evaluate cultural resources for inclusion in the NRHP. Properties may be listed in the NRHP if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and they:

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

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

In addition, the resource must be at least 50 years old, except in exceptional circumstances. Eligible properties must meet at least one of the criteria and exhibit integrity, which is measured by the degree to which the resource retains its historical properties and conveys its historical character, the degree to which the original fabric has been retained, and the reversibility of the

¹ Because no federal agency approvals are required for the Life Time Fitness Project, the National Historic Preservation Act does not apply to the project. The information on this federal statute is provided for background purposes only.

changes to the property. Archaeological sites are evaluated under Criterion D, which concerns the potential to yield information important in prehistory or history.

The Section 106 review process is typically undertaken between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as part of issuing a Section 404 permit and the State Historic Preservation Officer, involves a four-step procedure:

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

The Department of the Interior has set forth Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation. These standards and guidelines are not regulatory and do not set or interpret agency policy. A project that follows the standards and guidelines generally shall be considered mitigated to a less than significant level, according to Section 15064.5(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.).

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by several federal and state statutes, most notably by the 1906 Federal Antiquities Act (PL 59-209; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.; 34 Stat. 225), which calls for protection of historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest on federal lands. Because the proposed project does not include any federal lands, this statute does not apply.

State Regulations

Historical and Archaeological Resources and Human Remains

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both “historical resources” and “unique archaeological resources.” Pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) 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.” PRC 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on “unique archaeological resources.”

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

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

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the CRHR criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project’s impacts to historical resources (PRC 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)(3)). In general, a historical resource, under this approach, is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- A. Is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, or cultural annals of California; and
- B. Meets any of the following criteria:
 - 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)(3)).

These factors are known as “Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4” and parallel Criteria A, B, C, and D under the National Historic Preservation Act. The fact that a resource is not listed or determined to be eligible for listing does not preclude a lead agency from determining that it may be a historical resource (PRC 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)(4)).

CEQA also distinguishes between two classes of archaeological resources: archaeological sites that meet the definition of a historical resource, as described above, and “unique archaeological resources.” Under CEQA, an archaeological resource is considered “unique” if it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (PRC 21083.2(g)).

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

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

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

Senate Bill 18

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

Senate Bill 297

This law addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction; and establishes the Native American Heritage Commission to resolve disputes regarding the disposition of such remains (SB 297). It has been incorporated into Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Paleontological Resources

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

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

Local Regulations***City of Roseville General Plan***

The City of Roseville currently does not have a historic preservation ordinance nor does it have a citywide historic resources inventory. Significant cultural resources are shown on Figure V-4 in the City's General Plan (City of Roseville 2013).

The General Plan includes goals and policies for the preservation of cultural resources. Those goals and policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below.

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

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

Policy 2: When feasible, incorporate significant archaeological sites into open space areas.

Policy 3: Subject to approval by the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD), artifacts that are discovered and subsequently determined to be removable should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center.

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

4.5.4 Impacts

Methods of Analysis

Information used to conduct the analyses of the proposed project’s potential impacts to cultural resources was compiled from the May 2013 NCIC records search conducted for the proposed project area and the SSP EIR.

Development of the project site would not require any off-site infrastructure improvements; therefore, impacts related to the damage or destruction of historical, archaeological, prehistoric, or paleontological resources during construction of off-site infrastructure are not discussed in this section. In addition, because there are no structures on the project site, impacts associated with removal of historically significant properties and/or the loss of historic integrity of such resources are not addressed. The project site was also surveyed by a paleontologist during preparation of the SSP EIR, and because the site does not contain the geologic formations likely to contain paleontological resources, the likelihood of finding any resources is extremely low. No significant paleontological resources were discovered during preparation of the SSP EIR. Therefore, this issue is not addressed further.

Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the City’s General Plan, and professional judgment, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would do any of the following:

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

Impact 4.5-1	Disturb, Damage or Destroy Unidentified Subsurface Archaeological or Historical Resources or Human Remains during Project Construction
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4(b) of the CEQA Guidelines
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Potentially significant
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (a) and (b)
Significance after Mitigation	Less than significant

As discussed in the Environmental Setting section, a records search for an area encompassing the proposed project site plus a 0.25-mile radius was conducted by the NCIC for the CHRIS in May 2013. The records search for the project area revealed one recorded prehistoric archaeological site, six historic-period resources, and no historic properties. The records search results indicate that the proposed project site has a moderate sensitivity for identifying subsurface prehistoric archaeological sites and historic-period cultural resources. The moderate sensitivity of the site indicates that the recorded prehistoric site and historic resources are not located on the proposed project site itself, but rather somewhere within the 0.25-mile radius surrounding the project site. In addition, the United Auburn Indian Community has reviewed the potential prehistoric sensitivity of the City of Roseville and prepared a map identifying those areas that have a medium- and high-sensitivity risk. Based on a review of the map, this area of the City does not fall within a medium- or high-sensitivity area.

The SSP EIR identified 9 historic sites, 3 prehistoric sites, and 15 minor historical finds in the entire plan area. All the identified sites had previously been documented by other surveys in the vicinity. The SSP EIR concluded that some of the identified cultural sites would be subject to disturbance with buildout of the SSP. However, none of the sites subject to disturbance would be

considered significant according to state or federal standards, and all sites have been previously recorded. Mitigation included in the SSP EIR to address potential impacts to cultural resources requires construction within the SSP area to cease if a discovery is made, and requires that a qualified archaeologist be contacted.

Although there are no known resources on the proposed project site, recorded resources are documented in the vicinity. There is a potential that subsurface historic or prehistoric resources or human remains could be encountered during grading, excavation, and/or construction of the proposed project. If such resources are encountered during construction associated with the proposed project, they could be damaged, destroyed, or removed, resulting in a loss of integrity. This would be considered a **potentially significant impact**.

Impact 4.5-2	Disturb Unknown Paleontological Resources during Site Preparation
Applicable Policies and Regulations	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Less than significant
Mitigation Measures	None required
Significance after Mitigation	Less than significant

As discussed in the Environmental Setting section and in the SSP EIR, no significant paleontological resources have been discovered in the SSP area. In areas where the geological formations are not exposed, paleontological resources would typically not be visible where the ground has not been disturbed and the formations exposed. However, paleontological resources could be damaged or destroyed during site preparation, similar to archaeological resources. The potential for discovery and disturbance of paleontological resources exists throughout the project area.

As discussed above, there are geological units in the project area that could contain fossilized leaves and wood or other resources of paleontological value. These resources could be damaged or destroyed during site preparation. The SSP EIR determined that there was a potential for fossils to be present within Parcel 1 due to the underlying Ione Formation. No other areas within the SSP area were identified as having a high likelihood of finding any paleontological resources, and none have been found during development of the SSP area. There is no evidence that the soils underlying the project site contain any geologic formations that could contain fossilized resources. Therefore, this would be considered a **less-than-significant impact**.

4.5.5 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis for the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts on cultural resources is the City of Roseville and western Placer County (the area which reasonably relates to the historical development of the City and exceeds the normal buffer for an archaeological records search).

Impact 4.5-3	Contribute to the Cumulative Loss of Cultural Resources
Applicable Policies and Regulations	City of Roseville General Plan policies Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Potentially significant
Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (a) and (b)
Significance after Mitigation	Less than significant

Both subsurface prehistoric and historic resources are expected to be confined to local areas, and not included within a broader significance pattern to the State of California or the federal government (per CEQA Guidelines and the Federal Historic Preservation Act). Historic resources and prehistoric sites have been recorded in the vicinity of Roseville and could occur elsewhere in south Placer County. Development in the region could result in the damage or destruction of known and unknown archaeological and historical resources, as well as any existing undiscovered subsurface artifacts. The cumulative impact from past, present, and probable future projects, as well as the proposed project, is potentially significant.

The vicinity of Roseville is known to include both prehistoric and historic cultural resources. The project site is located within the SSP area. The SSP EIR concluded that none of the identified prehistoric and historic sites subject to disturbance during buildout of the SSP would be considered significant according to state or federal standards. However, the inadvertent destruction of resources during site preparation and construction of the proposed project, if not properly treated, would result in the project incrementally contributing to a significant cumulative impact.

Numerous laws, regulations, and statutes, on both the federal and state levels, seek to protect cultural resources. These would apply to development within and outside the city. In addition, the Roseville General Plan provides local policies that safeguard cultural resources from unnecessary impacts. These policies include inventory and evaluation processes and require consultation with qualified archaeologists in the event that previously undiscovered cultural materials are accidentally exposed.

Because the project site contains a moderate likelihood for the discovery of unknown subsurface historical or prehistoric resources, the project's contribution to the cumulative loss of cultural resources is considered **potentially significant**.

While other development throughout south Placer County could encounter paleontological resources, such discoveries have not been made within the SSP area. It is highly unlikely that development of the proposed project site would result in the discovery of paleontological resources, as discussed above, and the cumulative impact of past, present, and probable future projects, as well as the proposed project, are **less than significant**.

4.5.6 Mitigation Measures

The project site was included in the program-level analysis of the SSP EIR. Mitigation adopted by the City Council at time of approval in 1998 is still applicable for the project site unless superseded by project-specific mitigation identified in this Draft EIR. Based on current City standards and other legal requirements for mitigating potential impacts to cultural resources, Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 (a) and (b) supersede mitigation contained in the SSP EIR.

If evidence of historic or prehistoric artifacts or sites or human remains is uncovered during project development, Mitigation Measure 4.5-1(a) requires that all work cease within 100 feet of the find so that artifacts or remains are not damaged by equipment. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 reduces impacts to unknown cultural resources that qualify as either historical resources or unique archaeological resources by requiring avoidance where feasible or appropriate study, handling, and recordation of such resources. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1(b) also calls for following the procedures established in the Health and Safety Code with regard to human remains. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 (a) and (b) would reduce the project-level and cumulative impact identified under Impacts 4.5-1 and 4.5-3 to **less-than-significant**.

4.5-1(a) Proper Handling of Archaeological Resources. If any cultural resources, such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, human remains, or architectural remains are encountered during any construction activities, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find, and the project applicant shall immediately notify the City of Roseville Community Development Director and coordinate any necessary investigation of the site with a qualified archaeologist as needed to assess the resources (i.e., whether it is a "historical resource" or a "unique archaeological resource") and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be found to be significant. Possible management recommendations for historical or unique archaeological resources could include resource avoidance or, where avoidance is infeasible in light of project design or layout or is unnecessary to avoid significant effects, data recovery excavations. In consultation with the archaeologists, the contractor

shall implement any measures deemed by City staff to be necessary and feasible to avoid or minimize significant effects to the cultural resources.

4.5-1(b) Accidental Discovery of Human Remains. Pursuant to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, in the event of the discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, guidelines of the Native American Heritage Commission shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains.

4.5.7 Sources

City of Roseville. 1998. *Stoneridge Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared by EIP Associates. December 1998.

City of Roseville. 2007. *Stoneridge Specific Plan and Design Guidelines*. Adopted March 18, 1998. Last amended March 28, 2007. http://roseville.ca.us/planning/planning_document_library/specific_plans/stoneridge.asp.

City of Roseville. 2010. *Creekview Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*. Adopted September 19, 2012. http://roseville.ca.us/planning/planning_document_library/specific_plans/creekview_specific_plan.asp

City of Roseville. 2013. *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*. As amended February 13, 2013. Roseville, California: City of Roseville Planning Department. Adopted May 5, 2010 (Resolution No. 10-161). Accessed April 2013. <http://www.roseville.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=2546>.