

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section summarizes an analysis of the potential impacts to cultural resources attributable to buildout of the 2030 General Plan. This section identifies potential impacts by examining the baseline sensitivity for cultural resources and comparing this sensitivity to the areas where development could be accommodated under the 2030 General Plan.

4.5.1 REGULATORY SETTING

FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA, 16 US Code Section 470f) requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings cultural resources listed on or determined potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Federal agencies must also allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on the proposed undertaking, and consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Native American Tribes and the public regarding adverse effects on historic properties. The regulations implementing Section 106 are promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, as codified in Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800 (36 CFR 800 et seq.).

Section 106 applies to historic properties. Historic properties consist of cultural resources (prehistoric and historic archaeological site and aspects of the built and natural environment) that are eligible for or listed on the NRHP. Determining the NRHP eligibility of a site or district requires evaluation of the resource's significance under the criteria specified in 36 CFR 60.4. The NHPA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to maintain and expand the NRHP which lists districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. 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).

Cultural Landscapes

Cultural landscapes consist of cultural resources that exist at a landscape-scale and usually include multiple elements, both natural and constructed. As defined by the National Park Service (NPS), a cultural landscape is a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person; or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.

The NPS defines four general types of cultural landscapes, which are not mutually exclusive:

- (1) historic sites;
- (2) historic designed landscapes;
- (3) historic vernacular landscapes; and
- (4) ethnographic landscapes.

Historic vernacular landscapes are most prolific, as they have developed without the direct involvement of a professional designer, planner, or engineer. They are ordinary places that reflect the customs and everyday lives of people. Examples include a farm complex, rural historic districts and architectural landscapes.

Many methods are available for identifying landscape characteristics, including plant inventories, archaeological and architectural investigations, ethnographic interviews, tree coring, aerial photography, topographic and hydrographic surveys, geophysical surveys, soil analyses, mapping, and historic research. Available tools include magnetometers, ground penetrating radar, electrical resistivity and electromagnetic conductivity equipment, global positioning systems, and geographic information systems (GIS).

Historic research is important to identifying and evaluating the landscape, but equal consideration must also be given to “reading the landscape” (Page et al. 1998). Although people read landscapes on many levels, including “landscape as nature, habitat, artifact, system, problem, wealth, ideology, history, place and aesthetic,” it is recommended that the landscape always be read in its context of place and time (Birnbaum 1994).

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” (U.S. Department of Interior [US DOI] 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. 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” (US DOI 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

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 resources. As with any resource that is evaluated for listing in the NRHP, the TCP must be a tangible district, site, building, structure, or object (US DOI 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 (US DOI 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

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” (US DOI 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 (US DOI 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.

STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

CEQA applies to all discretionary projects undertaken or subject to approval by the state’s public agencies (Title 14, Section 15002[i] of the California Code of Regulations). CEQA states that it is the policy of the State of California to “take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with... historic environmental qualities...and preserve for future generations examples of the major periods of California history” (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21001[b] and 21001[c]). Under the provisions of CEQA, a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (CCR Section 15064.5[b]).

CEQA defines a “historical resource” as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- ▶ listed in, or eligible for listing in, the CRHR;
- ▶ listed in a local register of historical resources (as defined at PRC Section 5020.1[k]);
- ▶ identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code; or
- ▶ determined to be a historical resource by a project’s lead agency (CCR Section 15064.5[a]).

A historical resource consists of “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...Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be ‘historically significant’ if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources” (14 CCR Section 15064.5[a][3]).

CEQA also requires consideration of impacts on unique archaeological sites (PRC Section 21083.2, 14 CCR Section 15069.5[c][3]). In practice, most archaeological sites that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource will also meet the definition of a historical resource (Bass, Herson, and Bogdan 1999).

CEQA defines a “unique archaeological resource” as 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 one or more of the following criteria (PRC Section 21083.2[g]):

- ▶ 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.

Impacts on historical resources and unique archaeological sites are significant if they materially impair those characteristics that contribute the resource’s significance as a historical resource or unique archaeologically resource. If an impact on a historical or archaeological resource is significant, CEQA requires feasible measures to minimize the impact (14 CCR Section 15126.4[a][1]). Mitigation of significant impacts must lessen or eliminate the physical impact that the project will have on the resource. Generally, the use of drawings, photographs, and/or displays does not mitigate the physical impact on the environment caused by demolition or destruction of a historical resource. However, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation be undertaken even if it does not mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level (California Office of Historic Preservation 2001a, 2001b; see also 14 CCR Section 15126.4[a][1]).

REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND ORDINANCES

No regional or local plans, policies, regulations, or laws pertaining to cultural resources are applicable.
Environmental Setting

An understanding of the county’s history and cultural resources is important to the development of the General Plan. Land use change, construction, infrastructure planning, and interpretive projects can be implemented in a way that protects and enhances the value of the county’s cultural resources.

In particular, the California Gold Rush of 1849-1855 brought population to the area and established many of the existing communities. Mining practices along the Yuba River reshaped the river, leaving dredge tailings, mines, adits, and historic structures that allow a glimpse into the county’s rich historic past. As a result of the development boom during and following the Gold Rush, the reclamation of land with flood control structures allowed for the development of a substantial local agricultural industry and enabled settlement in areas that would otherwise be undevelopable. The county’s diverse geography, with access to water and food provided an ideal place for human settlement . Many remnants of a rich Native American history can be found throughout the county today.

PREHISTORIC SETTING

Fredrickson (1973 and 1974) proposed a sequence of cultural patterns for the central districts of the North Coast Range, placing them within a framework of cultural periods that he believed were applicable to California as a whole. He proposed and used the concept of the cultural pattern as an adaptive mode shared in general outline by a number of analytically separable cultures. These different cultural modes could be characterized by:

- ▶ similar technological skills and devices;
- ▶ similar economic modes, including participation in trade networks and practices surrounding wealth; and

- ▶ similar mortuary and ceremonial practices.

The **Paleo-Indian Period (8,000 to 12,000 years ago)** saw the first demonstrated entry and spread of humans into California. Known occupation sites are situated along lake shores, and a developed milling tool technology may have existed at this time. The social units were not heavily dependent upon exchange of resources, with exchange activities occurring on an ad hoc basis. Most resources were acquired by the group changing habitat.

Characteristic artifacts of this period include fluted projectile points and chipped stone crescents. Traditionally, Paleo-Indians are viewed as big-game hunters. However, more recent research suggests that they pursued much more varied subsistence and economic systems than previously thought.

The beginning of the **Lower Archaic Period (5,000 to 8,000 years ago)** coincided with the mid-Holocene climatic change and generally drier conditions that brought about the drying up of the pluvial lakes. Subsistence appears to have been focused on the consumption of plant foods over food obtained by hunting. Settlement appears to have been semisedentary with little emphasis on wealth. Most tools were manufactured of local materials and exchange remained on an ad hoc basis. Distinctive artifact types of this period are large dart points, the milling slab, and handstones.

The Middle Archaic Period (3,000 to 5,000 years ago) began at the end of mid-Holocene period when the climate became similar to present-day conditions. Cultural change during this time was primarily in response to environmental technological factors. Economies were more diversified, possibly with the introduction of acorn technology. Hunting remained an important source of food. Human populations became more sedentary, followed by a general growth and expansion of native populations. Little evidence shows development of regularized exchange relations. Artifacts characterized by this period include the bowl mortar and pestle and the continued use of large projectile points.

At about this time, evidence for Native American use of the northern and central Sierra Nevada appears (Yuba County 1994). The Martis Complex, thought to date from about 2000 B.C. to A.D. 500 and based on projectile point types, exclusive use of basalt for flaked stone tools, and use of mano and metate, is recognized at sites in and around the Tahoe Basin region. A slightly different cultural complex has been identified in the Oroville region, from A.D. 1500 to Euro-American contact. This was thought to represent Northwestern Maidu Indians, who occupied the foothills of Yuba County at the time of contact. A contrasting school of thought suggests that the Martis culture was restricted to the highest elevations of the Sierra Nevada, and that the cultures of the Martis period relate more closely to central California cultures. The Mesilla Complex occupied the mountains of eastern Yuba County along the western slopes of the northern Sierra Nevada. The Mesilla Complex may have represented a wave of immigration of Penutian-speaking peoples who settled in the Central Valley and became identified as Nisenan.

The growth of sociopolitical complexity marks the **Upper Archaic Period (1,500 to 3,000 years ago)**. The development of status distinctions based upon wealth is well documented at this time. Group-oriented religions emerged and may have been the origin of the Kuksu religious system at the end of the period. There was greater complexity of exchange systems with evidence of regular, sustained exchanges between groups. Shell beads gained in significance as possible indicators of personal status and as important trade items. Archaeological assemblages of this period indicate the retention of large dart points of different styles, but the bowl mortar and pestle replace the milling stone and handstone throughout most of the state.

Several technological and social changes distinguished the **Emergent Period (200 to 1,500 years ago)**. The bow and arrow were introduced at this time, ultimately replacing the dart and atlatl. Territorial boundaries between groups were well established and may have closely resembled those documented in the ethnographic literature. It became increasingly common during this period that distinctions in an individual's social status could be linked to acquired wealth. Exchange of goods between groups became more regularized with more trade goods, including raw materials and manufactured products, entering into the exchange networks. In the latter portion of this period

(150 to 450 years ago), exchange relations became highly regularized and sophisticated. The clam disk bead served as a monetary unit for exchange and increasing quantities of goods moved greater distances. Specialists arose to govern various aspects of production and exchange. It was during the latter decades of this period that large-scale Euro-American-related impacts on Native American groups took place.

ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING

Yuba County is situated within the lands occupied and traditionally used by the Nisenan, sometimes referred to as the Southern Maidu. The language of the Nisenan, which includes several dialects, is classified within the Maidu family of the Penutian linguistic stock (Kroeber 1925; Shipley 1978). The western boundary of Nisenan territory was the western bank of the Sacramento River. The eastern boundary was “the line in the Sierra Nevada mountains where the snow lay on the ground all winter” (Littlejohn 1928).

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. Several major Nisenan villages were located near the confluence of the Feather and Bear Rivers, near the site of present-day Marysville (Wilson and Towne 1978). Wilson and Towne (1978) indicate that village size ranged from three houses to up to 40 or 50. During expeditions in 1833, John Work (Maloney 1944) indicated that these villages along the Feather River were composed of up to 200 individuals. Houses were domed structures measuring 10 to 15 feet in diameter and covered with earth and tule or grass. Brush shelters were used in the summer and at temporary camps during food-gathering rounds. Larger villages often had semisubterranean dance houses that were covered in earth and tule or brush, had a central smoke hole at the top, and an east-facing entrance. Another common village structure was the granary, which was used for storing acorns (Wilson and Towne 1978).

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 crop from the blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*) and black oak (*Q. kelloggii*) was so carefully managed that use of this plant food can be considered the equivalent of agriculture. Acorns could be stored in anticipation of winter shortfalls in times of resource abundance. 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.

HISTORICAL SETTING

Two major historic themes exist in Yuba County: agriculture and the Gold Rush.

Early Exploration

Europeans first explored the area that is now Yuba County in 1808, when Spanish explorer Gabriel Moraga led an expedition from Mission San Jose to the northern Sacramento Valley (Hoover et.al.1990; Gordon 1988). The earliest Euro-American settlement in what is now Yuba County coincided with the establishment of land grants by the Mexican government. John A. Sutter obtained the first such grant in the region in 1841. Sutter’s New Helvetia Rancho encompassed lands on the east bank of the Feather River, including portions of Yuba County (Beck and Haase 1974).

Agriculture and Flood Control

Agriculture and ranching became the primary industries of the Yuba County region during the early historic period. Regional ranching originated on the New Helvetia and Johnson’s ranchos in the early 1840s. The Gold Rush of 1848 precipitated growth in agriculture and ranching as ranchers and farmers realized handsome returns from supplying food and other goods to local miners (Fryman 1996). Frequent floods, however, plagued the

residents of the Yuba-Feather-Bear River floodplain and posed a significant threat to the viability of agricultural interests and further settlement of Yuba County.

Initial efforts at flood control were usually uncoordinated and consisted of small levees and drains constructed by individual landowners. These features proved insufficient to protect cultivated land, and much land east of the Feather River remained marshland that was unsuitable for agriculture (U.S. Geological Survey 1910, 1911). In 1861, the California Legislature created the State Board of Swampland Commissioners to affect reclamation of swamp and overflow lands. The State Board of Swampland Commissioners established 32 districts that attempted to enclose large areas prone to flooding with natural levees. Lack of cooperation among the landowners in the districts led to chronic financial crises. When the California Legislature terminated the State Board of Swampland Commissioners in 1866, responsibility for swamps and overflowed land fell to the individual counties. Many counties offered incentives to landowners for reclaiming agriculturally unproductive land. If a landowner could certify that he or she had spent at least 2 dollars per acre in reclamation, the county would refund the purchase price of the property to the owner. Speculators took advantage of this program and a period of opportunistic and often irrational levee building followed (McGowan 1961; Thompson 1958).

In response to the flood of 1907, citizens of Yuba County formed Reclamation District 784 (RD 784). At the time of its formation, RD 784 encompassed 22,762 acres of land, much of which was owned by the Farm Land Investment Company. RD 784 built substantial levee and drainage systems to restrain floodwaters from the Bear and Feather Rivers and incorporated levees built by the Farm Land Investment Company and other landowners.

In 1911, the California Legislature established the State of California Reclamation Board to exercise jurisdiction over reclamation districts and levee plans. That year, the state approved and began implementation of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. The ambitious project included the construction of levees, weirs, and bypasses along the river to channel floodwaters away from population centers. Under the Sacramento River Flood Control Project, new reclamation districts were created and existing districts, such as RD 784, were placed under the jurisdiction of the Reclamation Board.

In 1920, RD 784 voters approved a plan to improve levees along the Yuba, Bear, and Feather Rivers and to improve drainage near Messick Lake, Plumas Lake, and other backwater marshes along the Feather River. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assisted RD 784 with the construction of a levee system at the eastern boundary of the district. Reclamation efforts in RD 784 promoted settlement and development of the land between Rio Oso and Marysville.

The Gold Rush

California can be divided into 11 geomorphic provinces, each of which has distinct features, mineral deposits, and geography (Clark 1992). Yuba County lies almost entirely within the Sierra Nevada geomorphic province which, of the 11, has the highest quantities of gold. Almost half of California's gold production has come from alluvial, or placer, deposits, found in quartz gravels and in and along stream channels. They have been mined by hydraulic, hard-rock, and dredge mining methods. Of these, hydraulic mining has caused the most lasting changes to the environment because of the thousands of tons of soils deposited in river channels downstream from the mines.

Jonas Spect may have been the first person to find gold in Yuba County in June 1848 at Rose's Bar on the Yuba River (Yuba County 1994). Mining communities quickly sprang up along the river above Marysville, many of which are now buried beneath hydraulic mine waste. Many of the earliest miners focused on sand bars in the river, which had high gold content and were easily accessible. As the bars were exhausted, mining moved further from the rivers, focusing on other mining methods, including dredging in the Yuba River. In 1905, the Yuba Consolidated Goldfields began operations 9 miles east of Marysville, in the Hammonton Gold District.

Besides Hammonton, the Browns Valley, Brownsville, Camptonville, Clipper Mills, Dobbins, and Smartsville mining districts were all established in the County. These towns, established during the Gold Rush, survive today.

City of Marysville

Marysville is the largest city in Yuba County. The land upon which the city of Marysville sits was once a part of one of John A. Sutter's ranches. In 1842, Sutter leased the land to Theodore Cordua for 19 years. Cordua created a stock ranch and built a house and trading post near what is now D Street (Hoover et al 1990). In 1844, Cordua obtained an additional seven leagues (30,996 acres) of land from the Mexican government, adjacent to the land being leased from Sutter. A half-share of the Cordua ranch was purchased by Charles Covillaud, a native of France, and a former employee of Cordua. In January of 1849, the other half was sold to two brothers-in-law of Covillaud's wife, Michael Nye and William Foster. The brothers sold out to Covillaud in September of that same year. Although the land was later sold by Covillaud to a Jose M. Ramirez, when a formal town was laid out in 1850, it was named after Covillaud's wife, Mary (Hoover et al 1990).

Marysville was laid out in the path of thousands of miners, merchants, and capitalists who flocked to the region during the Gold Rush. It was officially incorporated on February 5, 1851. Within the first month of its formal status as a town, the population grew from 300 to approximately 1,500. By 1853, Marysville's tent city had been replaced by brick buildings, iron works, machine shops, and factories. The population around this time was estimated at 10,000. For a brief period, in 1852, Marysville was considered California's third largest city, after San Francisco and Sacramento (Downtown Marysville Business Improvement District 2009).

A levee system was erected around the city in the late 19th century to protect it from flooding. This same levee system hampered further growth in the latter part of the 20th century. As the City of Yuba City and nearby unincorporated areas continued to grow and expand, Marysville remained an incorporated city but did not experience much expansion. The ad hoc construction of buildings and infrastructure that has taken place throughout the city over time has modified the built environment. However, the economic base that provided Marysville its early foundation as a city is still visible in the several historic buildings located throughout the city.

DOCUMENTED CULTURAL RESOURCES SITES WITHIN YUBA COUNTY

The County directed an extensive record search by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historic Resources Information System to support this General Plan Update. The NCIC was asked to provide information regarding documented cultural resource sites within Yuba County, excluding federal lands. Federal land was excluded because the County's planning policies have little if any influence on these lands which instead are governed by the relevant federal agencies. Based on the extensive records search, a series of cultural resource exhibits have been prepared to guide policy development and environmental analysis under the 2030 General Plan and EIR.

The numbers and types of sites in these exhibits are listed in Table 4.5-1. It is important to note that these sites have been identified generally during the course of archaeological survey efforts resulting from planned development of some kind, including federal projects, new construction, or other similar activities. The marked site density visible in the central portion of the county is a result of, among other things, surveys conducted for the proposed Marysville Dam. Known sites tend to be clustered in regions where surveys have been done for proposed projects such as roadway or highway corridors and regions near urban or hydroelectric activity, because these types of projects include requirements for identification of cultural resources. This should be considered when reviewing actions in less-developed areas, as the density and types of known sites are presumed to continue into unexplored areas. However, examining groupings of similar site types helps to more accurately predict types and densities of sites in similar geographic locations within Yuba County.

**Table 4.5-1
Known Sites in Yuba County¹**

Quadrangle Name ²	Prehistoric Sites	Mining-Related Sites ³	Other Historic Sites ⁴	Combined Prehistoric and Historic Sites	No. of sites	NRHP or SHL ⁵
Browns Valley	110	54	35	1	200	
Camp Far West	25	59	30	-	114	
Camptonville	56	94	40	2	192	
Challenge	74	99	40	2	215	
Clipper Mills	16	35	8	1	60	1
Forbestown	4	51	12	-	67	
French Corral	55	19	22	2	98	
Honcut	-	-	-	5	15	
Loma Rica	135	39	39	5	218	
Marysville	-	-	-	-	-	
Nicolaus	3	-	9	-	12	
Olivehurst	5	1	31	-	37	
Oregon House	252	48	67	5	372	
Rackerby	44	64	35	3	146	
Smartsville	243	290	114	4	651	2
Strawberry Valley	8	68	15	1	92	
Wheatland	1	-	6	-	7	4
Yuba City	1	4	385	-	390	12
Totals	1,032	925	888	31	2,876	19

Notes:

¹ Excludes portions of the county owned or operated by the Federal Government (U.S. Forest Service).

^{2,3} Very small portions of Yuba County fall on the American House, Gridley, and Sutter quadrangles but are not included here because no known sites or studies are on those quadrangles within Yuba County.

³ Sites likely related to mining activity, although some ditches may have been used for agriculture.

⁴ Sites may be related to mining (such as roads) but are not conclusive in origin.

⁵ National Register of Historic Places or State Historic Landmark

Source: NCIC record search conducted in 2008; Data compiled by AECOM (formerly called EDAW) in 2009.

4.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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 an archaeological resource or a historical resource as defined in Section 21083.2 of CEQA and Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, respectively; or,
- ▶ directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or,

- ▶ disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of 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 an historical resource would be materially impaired.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

IMPACT 4.5-1 **Damage to Identified Historical Resources and Unique Archaeological Resources.** *The 2030 General Plan contains policies and a growth template that would allow construction and development, as depicted in the Land Use Diagram. Yuba County has a high density of identified cultural resources. Many of these resources, upon evaluation, are likely to qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA. Construction activity under the General Plan could affect one or more of these resources, resulting in significant impacts by either direct disturbance through excavation or by changes to the setting. These impacts are potentially significant.*

Table 4.5-1 above lists identified cultural resources. A total of 2,876 resources have been identified within Yuba County. While the individual CRHR evaluation of each resource is beyond the scope of analysis for this General Plan Program EIR, it is reasonable to assume that many of these resources are CRHR-eligible since previous investigations have identified significant cultural resources within Yuba County. In addition, some of these resources are likely to qualify as unique archaeological resources.

Ground-disturbing construction would result from buildout of the lands designated for development within unincorporated Yuba County, particularly within the Valley Growth Boundary and Rural Community areas. This future development could result in significant impacts to historical resources and unique archaeological resources through either direct physical impacts or by changes to the setting.

Direct physical impacts would result from activity such as excavation, grading, or ground compaction required for construction of new land uses. Changes to the setting would occur where new land uses and built environment features are placed rural, undeveloped land. Changes to the setting could result in significant impacts where the natural or undeveloped setting forms part of the significance or integrity of a resource.

Relevant Policies and Actions of the 2030 General Plan

Goal NR6–Cultural Resources of the Natural Resources Element of the 2030 General Plan indicates that Yuba County policy is to identify, protect, and preserve Yuba County’s important prehistoric and historic resources. This goal is to be implemented through the following policies:

- ▶ **Policy NR6.1:** New developments involving the movement, scraping, or leveling of soil in areas of moderate or high potential for prehistoric resources shall conduct archeological background research, site analysis, and surveying to inform site design and avoid impacts to prehistoric sites.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.2:** The County will require environmental assessment and mitigation for impacts to cultural resources, per state and federal legislation and regulation.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.3:** If potential paleontological or prehistoric resources are detected during construction, work shall stop and consultation is required to avoid further impacts.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.4:** Roads, water and sewer lines, and stormwater infrastructure should be located to avoid impacts to significant cultural resources.

- ▶ **Policy NR6.5:** The County will encourage adaptive reuse of historic structures in a way that maintains important aspects of the historic character.
 - ▶ **Policy NR6.6:** Priority investment should go to preserving or rehabilitating historic structures that are grouped in close proximity, are particularly good examples of a specific architectural style, or are associated with important people or events in the County’s history.
 - ▶ **Policy NR6.7:** The County will disseminate information to property owners regarding tax incentives and other federal and state programs that support the rehabilitation of historic structures.
 - ▶ **Action NR6.1: Environmental Review and Mitigation.** Building on the analysis in the General Plan Program EIR, development projects that could have significant adverse impacts to prehistoric or historic resources will be required to assess impacts and provide mitigation. The following steps, or those deemed equally effective by the County, will be followed:
 - Request information from the Native American Heritage Commission regarding Native American groups that may have important sites in areas that could be affected by project development.
 - Involve the local Native American community in determining the appropriate mitigation of impacts to significant prehistoric sites.
 - Consult the County’s historic and cultural resources database and updated information from the North Central Information Center regarding cultural resource sites, structures, or landscapes that could be affected by project activities.
 - Avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources to the greatest extent feasible through project site planning.
 - Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by a qualified professional archaeologist or architectural historian, as appropriate.
 - If impacts are unavoidable, mitigate to a less-than-significant level.
 - Provide the North Central Information Center with appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports.
 - Require a professional archaeologist to monitor ground-disturbing activities in areas of high prehistoric resource sensitivity.
- Related Goals: Goal NR6
 - Agency/Department: Community Development and Services Agency
 - Funding Source: Project applicant funds
 - Time Frame: Ongoing, as construction occurs under the General Plan

Implementation of the County’s General Plan will require consistency findings for discretionary actions, such as project and plan approvals. The General Plan is also used to update County codes, which may include measures to avoid cultural resources. Applicants for entitlements requiring General Plan consistency findings will need to comply with the policies of the Yuba County General Plan, as described above. These policies include avoidance of resources where possible, adaptive reuse of existing resources such as historic structures, and technical studies and preparation of treatment to minimize impacts that cannot be avoided. The 2030 General Plan also requires consultation with local Native American groups when determining appropriate mitigation.

Conclusion

Although the General Plan is structured to avoid cultural resource impacts, the development of unincorporated Yuba County could affect the setting of one or more significant cultural resources. This impact is considered **significant**.

Mitigation Measure

The proposed policies of the 2030 General Plan constitute the feasible mitigation available to reduce impacts on cultural resources. Beyond technical work to identify, evaluate, avoid where possible, and mitigate impacts on known cultural resources no further mitigation is available. This impact is **significant and unavoidable**.

IMPACT 4.5-2 **Damage of Previously Unidentified Cultural Resources.** *Buildout of the areas designated for development within the planning area identified 2030 General Plan has the potential to damage or disturb previously unidentified cultural resources. The density of known cultural resources within Yuba County is high; indicating that additional resources occur that have not been recorded and which could be damaged by construction prior to discovery. This impact is potentially significant.*

The 2030 General Plan would allow buildout of the unincorporated County as indicated in the Land Use Diagram. The density of identified resources indicates that many areas in unincorporated Yuba County are likely to contain cultural resources. Many of these resources are anticipated to be previously unidentified, and may be uncovered during construction of neighborhoods, commercial districts, developed recreational facilities, and other activities that could occur under the General Plan. Where agricultural land uses have altered the landscape such resources may not be easily identifiable based on surface manifestations. Archaeological resources can occur below the land surface where soil has been deposited over older land forms. Buried archaeological resources may consist of historic or prehistoric material.

Construction that would occur during buildout of the 2030 General Plan would require ground-disturbing work that could inadvertently damage or destroy previously unidentified cultural resources. For resources that qualify as historical resource, unique archaeological resources, or historic properties such damage would be significant if it diminished the qualities that contribute to the significance of these resources.

Relevant Policies and Actions of the 2030 General Plan

Goal NR6 in the Natural Resources Element of the 2030 General Plan indicates that Yuba County policy is to “identify, protect, and preserve Yuba County’s important prehistoric and historic resources.” The following policies to implement this goal would reduce the potential for damage to previously unidentified cultural resources:

- ▶ **Policy NR6.1:** New developments involving the movement, scraping, or leveling of soil in areas of moderate or high potential for prehistoric resources shall conduct archeological background research, site analysis, and surveying to inform site design and avoid impacts to prehistoric sites.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.2:** The County will require environmental assessment and mitigation for impacts to cultural resources, per state and federal legislation and regulation.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.3:** If potential paleontological or prehistoric resources are detected during construction, work shall stop and consultation is required to avoid further impacts.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.4:** Roads, water and sewer lines, and stormwater infrastructure should be located to avoid impacts to significant cultural resources [the avoidance of identified resources would reduce the risk of damage to previously unidentified elements of the same resource].

► **Action NR6.1:** Environmental Review and Mitigation. Building on the analysis in the General Plan Program EIR, development projects that could have significant adverse impacts to prehistoric or historic resources will be required to assess impacts and provide mitigation. The following steps, or those deemed equally effective by the County, will be followed:

- Request information from the Native American Heritage Commission regarding Native American groups that may have important sites in areas that could be affected by project development.
- Involve the local Native American community in determining the appropriate mitigation of impacts to significant prehistoric sites.
- Consult the County’s historic and cultural resources database and updated information from the North Central Information Center regarding cultural resource sites, structures, or landscapes that could be affected by project activities.
- Avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources to the greatest extent feasible through project site planning.
- Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by a qualified professional archaeologist or architectural historian, as appropriate.
- If impacts are unavoidable, mitigate to a less-than-significant level.
- Provide the North Central Information Center with appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports.
- Require a professional archaeologist to monitor ground-disturbing activities in areas of high prehistoric resource sensitivity.

- Related Goals: Goal NR6
- Agency/Department: Community Development and Services Agency
- Funding Source: Project applicant funds
- Time Frame: Ongoing, as construction occurs under the General Plan

Implementation of the County’s General Plan will require consistency findings for discretionary actions, such as project and plan approvals. The General Plan is also used to update County codes, which may include measures to avoid cultural resources. Applicants for entitlements requiring General Plan consistency findings will need to comply with the policies of the Yuba County General Plan, as described above. Relevant policies that reduce the risk of impacts to previously unidentified resources include background research and monitoring of areas of sensitivity for unidentified resources during construction. The 2030 General Plan also requires consultation with local Native American groups when determining appropriate mitigation. Consultation with such groups may result in identification of additional resources or areas of sensitivity.

In addition to monitoring areas of sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources as indicated above in Action NR6.1, applicants for entitlements to construct improvements shall be required to retain a professional archaeologist to monitor ground-disturbing work in areas of high sensitivity for previously unidentified historic-era resources, if areas of sensitivity are identified during background research or on-the-ground surveys.

Conclusion

Because the density of resources in the County is relatively high, there is a reasonable potential that buildout of the General Plan will involve one or more projects that inadvertently disturb one or more previously unidentified

cultural resources. Many of these resources are likely to qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA or historic properties. Damage to such resources would be a **significant** impact.

Mitigation Measure

The proposed policies of the 2030 General Plan constitute the feasible mitigation available to reduce impacts on previously unidentified cultural resources. Beyond technical work to identify resources in advance, consult with relevant information repositories and the Native American community, monitor construction and stop work if resources are identified, no further mitigation is feasible. For these reasons this impact remains **significant and unavoidable**.

IMPACT 4.5-3 **Disturbance and Damage to Human Remains.** *Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would allow construction in areas that could contain previously undiscovered buried human remains. Previously identified cultural resources within the County include prehistoric archaeological sites with human burials. In addition, historic archaeological deposits may include human remains and cemeteries. It is possible that ground-disturbing work that would be performed during buildout of the General Plan will encounter such remains, and potentially result in damage. This impact is **potentially significant**.*

Previously identified resources within Yuba County include prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-era mining-related sites, historic-era other cultural resources, and resources with combined prehistoric and historic components. Prehistoric archaeological deposits frequently include burials and associated grave goods. Historic-era cultural resources may also contain previously unidentified human remains.

Buildout of the 2030 General Plan would require ground-disturbing construction. The density of previously identified resources within the County in general suggests that this construction could inadvertently damage and disturb buried human remains. Where the surface manifestations of subterranean deposits have been removed by agriculture or have been covered by recent soil deposits there may be no indication that such remains exist, thus such remains may not be avoided prior to construction.

Relevant Policies and Actions of the 2030 General Plan

Goal NR6 of the Natural Resources Element of the 2030 General Plan indicates that the County will “identify, protect, and preserve Yuba County’s important prehistoric and historic resources.” The following policies would reduce the risk of inadvertent damage to buried human remains:

- ▶ **Policy NR6.1:** New developments involving the movement, scraping, or leveling of soil in areas of moderate or high potential for prehistoric resources shall conduct archeological background research, site analysis, and surveying to inform site design and avoid impacts to prehistoric sites.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.2:** The County will require environmental assessment and mitigation for impacts to cultural resources, per state and federal legislation and regulation.
- ▶ **Policy NR6.3:** If potential paleontological or prehistoric resources are detected during construction, work shall stop and consultation is required to avoid further impacts [prehistoric human remains are included in this category of resources].
- ▶ **Policy NR6.4:** Roads, water and sewer lines, and stormwater infrastructure should be located to avoid impacts to significant cultural resources.
- ▶ **Action NR6.1:** Environmental Review and Mitigation. Building on the analysis in the General Plan Program EIR, development projects that could have significant adverse impacts to prehistoric or historic resources will

be required to assess impacts and provide mitigation. The following steps, or those deemed equally effective by the County, will be followed:

- Request information from the Native American Heritage Commission regarding Native American groups that may have important sites in areas that could be affected by project development.
 - Involve the local Native American community in determining the appropriate mitigation of impacts to significant prehistoric sites.
 - Consult the County’s historic and cultural resources database and updated information from the North Central Information Center regarding cultural resource sites, structures, or landscapes that could be affected by project activities.
 - Avoid potential impacts to significant cultural resources to the greatest extent feasible through project site planning.
 - Determination of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by a qualified professional archaeologist or architectural historian, as appropriate.
 - If impacts are unavoidable, mitigate to a less-than-significant level.
 - Provide the North Central Information Center with appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site record forms and cultural resources reports.
 - Require a professional archaeologist to monitor ground-disturbing activities in areas of high prehistoric resource sensitivity.
- Related Goals: Goal NR6
 - Agency/Department: Community Development and Services Agency
 - Funding Source: Project applicant funds
 - Time Frame: Ongoing, as construction occurs under the General Plan

Implementation of the County’s General Plan will require consistency findings for discretionary actions, such as project and plan approvals. The General Plan is also used to update County codes, which may include measures to avoid cultural resources. Applicants for entitlements requiring General Plan consistency findings will need to comply with the policies of the Yuba County General Plan, as described above.

In addition to monitoring areas of sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources as indicated above in Action NR6.1, applicants for entitlements to construct improvements will be required to retain a professional archaeologist to monitor ground-disturbing work in areas of high sensitivity for previously unidentified human remains, as appropriate.

Conclusion

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 2030 General Plan, despite implementation of the County’s proposed policies and this mitigation measure. If buried human remains are encountered during construction without prior discovery they may be inadvertently damaged or destroyed. The impact is considered **significant**.

Mitigation Measure

Compliance with the requirements of the 2030 General Plan represents the feasible measures that may be used to avoid impacts to interred human remains that could be encountered during ground-disturbing construction. No additional feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.