

CHAPTER 8 – CULTURAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory setting) for the regional cultural resource environment in the MTP Plan Area. This chapter also presents the federal, state, and local policies and regulations that determine mitigation requirements and identifies impacts on cultural resources that may result from implementation of the proposed MTP 2035 projects, and mitigation measures to reduce these impacts where necessary.

The study area consists of transportation routes, including highways, rail alignments, bicycle trails, state routes, roads, and Caltrans right-of-way in the MTP Plan Area. The key sources of data and information used in the preparation of this section are listed below.

General cultural resources information was collected for each county within the MTP Plan Area. This information is kept at the following regional cultural resources information centers:

- the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University (Yolo County),
- the North Central Information Center at Sacramento State University (Sacramento, Yuba, Placer, and El Dorado Counties), and
- the Northeast Information Center at California State University, Chico (Sutter County).

Each Information Center keeps records and reports of known archaeological sites and historic architecture. Resources consulted at the Information Centers included data from the following:

- State Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility,
- State Historical Property Data File,
- California Points of Historical Interest,
- California Historical Landmarks,
- California Inventory of Historical Resources, and
- Caltrans state and local bridge inventories.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was also contacted, with a request to search their Sacred Lands database and to provide a list of Native American representatives from each county in the MTP Plan Area; the NAHC responded with a list of interested Native American representatives (Appendix C). On March 1, 2007, letters were sent to each individual provided on the NAHC's list, with an explanation of the project and a request for information on cultural resources in the MTP Plan Area. The letter also invited individuals to comment on the project. To date, five groups and one individual have responded to the letters. These responses came from the Miwok Tribe of the El Dorado Rancheria, Enterprise Rancheria, Rumsey Indian Rancheria, the Ione Band of Miwok Indians, and The United Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (see Appendix C). The five groups said they were unable to comment on any traditional cultural properties, or cultural resources at this time due to lack of a specific information on the areas that may be affected and requested they be kept informed as specific projects are developed. The United Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria also requested copies of any a future environmental documents and archaeological reports that will be completed for specific projects in the MTP 2035. An archaeologist also met with Mr. Randy Yonemura on May 22, 2007, at his request to discuss the project.

The information presented in this chapter is based on a review of existing and available information and is regional in scope. Data provided in this section should be considered preliminary and appropriate for general policy planning and tiering of subsequent environmental documents. Site-specific cultural resource assessments will be necessary to determine future project-level environmental effects and appropriate mitigation.

SETTING

Environmental Setting

This section discusses the federal, state, and local regulations relating to cultural resources that would apply to the MTP Plan Area, as well as existing conditions relating to cultural resources in the MTP Plan Area.

Cultural resource is the term used to describe several different types of properties: prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, and architectural properties, such as buildings, bridges, and infrastructure and locations important to Native Americans. Federal regulations (36 CFR 800) define a *Historic Property* as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Historical resource is a term from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that includes buildings, sites, structures, objects, or districts—each of which may have historical, prehistoric, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance, and is eligible for listing or is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

Prehistory

Much of our current understanding of MTP Plan Area prehistory stems from work that was done in the region in the 1930s by Sacramento Junior College (Moratto 2004).

Although the region may have been inhabited by humans as early as 10,000 years ago, the evidence for early human use is likely buried by deep alluvial sediments that accumulated during the late Holocene epoch. The economy of this early period is generally thought to be based on the exploitation of large game. Although rare, archaeological remains of this early period have been identified in and around the Central Valley and the Sierra Nevada Foothills (Treganza and Heizer 1953; Johnson 1967; Peak and Associates 1981). Johnson (1967:283–284) presents evidence for some use of the Mokelumne River area, under what is now Camanche Reservoir, during the late Pleistocene. Archaeologists found a number of lithic cores and a flake that are associated with Pleistocene gravels. These archaeological remains have been grouped into what is called the Farmington Complex, which is characterized by core tools and large, reworked percussion flakes (Treganza and Heizer 1953:28). Later periods are better understood due to a more abundant representation in the archaeological record.

The taxonomic framework of the Central Valley and surrounding area, which includes the MTP Plan Area, has been described in terms of archaeological patterns (Moratto 2004). A pattern is a general mode of life archaeologically characterized by technology, particular artifacts, economic systems, trade, burial practices, and other aspects of culture. Fredrickson (1973) identified three general patterns of resource use for the time period between 2,500 B.C. and A.D. 1,500, specifically the Windmill, Berkeley, and Augustine Patterns.

The Windmill Pattern (2,500 B.C. to 1,000 B.C.) shows evidence of a mixed economy of game procurement and use of wild plant foods. The archaeological record contains numerous projectile points with a wide range of faunal remains. Hunting was not limited to terrestrial animals, as is evidenced by the Windmiller toolkit, which included fishing hooks and spears. The remains of sturgeon, salmon, and other fish are frequently recovered from Windmill Pattern sites (Moratto 2004). Plant resources were also used, as indicated by ground stone artifacts and clay balls that were used for boiling acorn mush. Settlement strategies during the Windmill period reflect a seasonal adaptation. Habitation sites in the valley were occupied during winter, but populations moved into the foothills during summer (Moratto 2004).

The Windmill Pattern was superseded by a more specialized adaptation labeled the Berkeley Pattern (1,500 B.C. to A.D. 500). A reduction in the number of manos and metates, and an increase in mortars and pestles, indicate a greater dependence on acorns. Although gathered resources grew in importance during this period, the continued presence of projectile points and atlatls in the archaeological record indicates that hunting was still an important activity (Fredrickson 1973).

The Berkeley Pattern is superseded by the Augustine Pattern around A.D. 500. The Augustine Pattern reflects a change in subsistence and land-use patterns to those of the ethnographically known people (Nisenan) of the historic era. This pattern exhibits a great elaboration of ceremonial and social organization, including the development of social stratification. Exchange became well developed, and an even more intensive emphasis was placed on the use of the acorn, as is evidenced by the presence of shaped mortars and pestles and numerous hopper mortars in the archaeological record. Other notable elements of the artifact assemblage associated with the Augustine Pattern include flanged tubular smoking pipes, harpoons, clamshell disc beads, and an especially elaborate baked clay industry, which included figurines and pottery vessels (Cosumnes Brownware). The presence of small projectile point types, referred to as Gunther Barbed series, suggests the use of the bow and arrow. Other traits associated with the Augustine Pattern include the introduction of preinterment burning of offerings in a grave pit during mortuary ritual, increased village sedentism, population growth, and an incipient monetary economy in which beads were used as a standard of exchange (Moratto 2004).

Ethnography

Three aboriginal populations lived in the MTP Plan Area; the Nisenan (also referred to as the Southern Maidu), the Eastern Miwok, and the Patwin. Native American populations grew in numbers sporadically between 5,000 years ago and before the arrival of the Spanish in the late eighteenth century. By the beginning of the first millennium A.D., the Indians were living in the more favorable environmental niches of the MTP Plan Area, thanks to the discovery of acorns that could be used as a food staple throughout the year.

The Nisenan/Southern Maidu territory was the drainage of the Yuba, Bear, and American Rivers and the lower drainage of the Feather River. Three different groups of the Nisenan were the Northern Hill Nisenan, Southern Hill Nisenan, and the Valley Nisenan. Several archaeological sites of significance have been found in the City of Roseville (along Strap Ravine) and along the river terraces in Sacramento County.

Of the five different groups that comprised the Eastern Miwok, the Plains Miwok lived in the MTP Plan Area. This culture inhabited the lower reaches of the Mokelumne and Cosumnes rivers and both banks of the Sacramento River, from Rio Vista to Freeport. Most of the known settlements of the Plains Miwok were located on natural levees and knolls along major rivers. Many archaeological sites of this group have been discovered in Sacramento County.

The Patwins were composed of different cultural groups and once occupied the southern portion of the Sacramento River Valley to the west of the river. The River Patwins were located along a strip on both sides of the Sacramento River, several miles below Stony Creek south to just above the mouth of the Feather River.

After 1770, Indian populations declined and settlement patterns were disrupted within the Central Valley from Spanish colonial expeditions and mission recruitment. However, epidemics of malaria in the early to mid 1800s and early American settlements after 1848 contributed significantly to the rapid decline in Native American populations.

Early American Settlements

The pace of physical change to the landscape and the construction of adobes and other structures widened as the missions were disbanded in the 1830s and Mexican settlers took title to the land. Agriculture, grazing, and mining activities led the establishment of permanent settlements and urban centers. The natural environment began to change rapidly as cattle and other domesticated animals grazed the land, as woodlands were cut for fuel and lumber, and as native vegetation gave way to imported grasses and plants spread by the settlers and their livestock.

Gold Rush

In January 1848, gold was discovered by James Marshall on the South Fork of the American River near present day Coloma. Subsequent gold discoveries were made not long after that, such as the discovery made by Jonas Spect on the Yuba River in the vicinity of Marysville in June 1848. The onset of the Gold Rush brought large numbers of people into California; miners poured into the Sierra Nevada foothills in search of placer deposits along the rivers and creeks of Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba, El Dorado, and Placer counties. When the placer deposits were depleted, the miners turned to other methods to reach gold-bearing strata. One of the most common methods of mining, hydraulic mining, introduced huge quantities of rock, sand, and mud into and adjacent to the mountain waterways. Later, mining companies deployed dredges to reach gold deposits along the rivers. Some of the tailings associated with this type of gold mining—particularly in and around the City of Folsom—have contributed to the city’s historic significance. The Gold Rush dramatically altered the landscape of California, particularly the Sacramento Valley and the counties and regions that are part of and surround it (Kyle et. al. 1990: 27, 290, 540).

Subregional Setting

The following is a brief overview of the history of the counties in the MTP Plan Area.

Sacramento County

Sacramento County is one of the original 27 counties established by the California Legislature in 1850, and the City of Sacramento has been the county seat since it was created. Spanish explorers first visited the Sacramento County region as early as the 1700s in their search for suitable inland mission sites. In 1772, Pedro Fages passed through San Francisco Bay and reached the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers, while in 1793, Francisco Eliza sailed into the as-yet unexplored Sacramento River. The first European American to travel through the Sacramento area was explorer and trapper Jedediah Strong Smith, who established the Sacramento Trail during the 1820s. Other explorers followed Smith’s general path in the 1830s (Holden 1988: 130; Kyle et. al. 1990: 285-286).

European American settlement of the Sacramento area did not begin until the late 1830s and early 1840s, when individuals such as John Sutter obtained land grants from the Mexican government. Mexican citizens generally received these grants in exchange for an agreement to protect Mexican interests in these remote interior regions. Sutter's settlement at New Helvetia (Sutter's Fort) is probably the best known of these early operations. In addition to Sutter, numerous other European Americans pursued land grants in the mid-nineteenth century in what would become Sacramento and Yolo Counties (Beck and Haase c. 1974; Thompson and West 1880; Kyle et. al. 1990: 286, 288).

At its inception, Sacramento County was largely supported by commerce related to the Gold Rush and river shipping. The county and particularly the City of Sacramento continued to grow, however, after the conclusion of the Gold Rush, when agriculture in the Sacramento Valley became an important part of the economy. Wheat was a staple product early on, but by the twentieth century, a variety of fruits, including citrus fruits, as well as nuts, displaced it in importance. The county also experienced tremendous growth as a result of the construction railroads in the Sacramento area. In 1856, the Sacramento Valley Railroad constructed an alignment from Sacramento to Folsom; in 1869, the transcontinental railroad was completed, linking the Sacramento region directly with markets in the east. By the mid-twentieth century, two military bases had been constructed in the county and a major freeway, Interstate 5, ran through the heart of the old City of Sacramento. While the military bases closed in the late twentieth century, the county continued to grow in economic wealth and population. As of the year 2000, Sacramento County boasted a population of 1,223,499 (Phillips and Miller 1915: 17, 23, 83; Holden 1988: 288; Kyle et. al. 1990: 293-294; U.S. Census Bureau)

Sutter County

The County of Sutter, one of the original twenty-seven counties created in 1850 by the California State Legislature, was named in honor of the famous Sacramento Valley settler and pioneer, John Augustus Sutter. Initially, the county seat was located in Auburn; however, after Auburn became the seat for Placer County in 1851, it was moved to the small town of Vernon. Eventually, in 1856, Yuba City was designated the county seat, where it remains to this day (Gudde 1975: 326; Kyle et. al. 1990: 257, 494).

The Spanish were the first Europeans to explore the region of Sutter County. Gabriel Moraga, in 1808, visited the area and was probably the first European to see one of Sutter County's most distinctive features, the Sutter Buttes. In 1817, Father Narciso Duran and Luis Arguello, seeking suitable mission sites within the interior, also explored the area. The first European American to enter it was famed hunter and trapper, Jedediah Strong Smith, who discovered the Yuba River in 1828. Other hunters and trappers followed him in the 1830s. In late May and early June of 1848, well-known American explorer, John C. Fremont, camped in the vicinity of the Sutter Buttes (Gudde 1975: 326, 371; Kyle et. al. 1990: 492-493).

Sutter County's initial growth was a result of the influx of miners to the region during the Gold Rush. Its principal city, Yuba, was founded during this period. After the Gold Rush, however, the county grew slowly, and its economy was largely focused on agriculture. In 1863, county farmer, William Thompson, grew the first Thompson seedless grapes, which were exhibited to the public in Marysville in 1875. The county also became known for producing an assortment of other crops, including grains, peaches, rice, and walnuts. By the early 1900s, in addition to the aforementioned crops, the county was also producing figs, Bartlett pears, prunes, almonds, and alfalfa. Stock raising and dairy farming were also practiced. Still relatively small and rural as of 2000, the county's population was 79,454 (Kyle et. al. 1990: 494-495; Phillips and Miller 1915: 73-75; Sutter County, California).

Yolo County

Yolo County is located in the northern part of California's Central Valley and is bounded on the west by Lake and Napa Counties, to the south by Solano County, to the north by Colusa County, and to the east by Sutter and Sacramento counties. The Sacramento River spans the entire length of its eastern border. The county is one of the original 27 counties created by the California State Legislature in 1850. Initially, the county's territory was nearly twice as large as it is now and included a large portion of present-day Colusa County. By 1923, the boundaries were redrawn to their current configuration. The City of Woodland became the county seat in 1862 and remains so to this day (Gudde 1975:370; *Daily Alta California* 1850:2; Coy 1973: 296; Kyle et. al.: 533).

As early as 1808 the Spanish explored Yolo County. That year, Gabriel Moraga passed through the region when he guided an expedition up the Sacramento River to present-day Sutter County. Moraga's excursion was followed in 1817 by Father Narciso Duran, Father Ramon Abella, and Luis Arguello, who camped temporarily near present-day Clarksburg. In 1821, Arguello and a party of explorers entered the region once again, this time passing through Solano and Yolo counties before reaching the Sacramento River near Grimes. European American hunters and trappers such as Jedediah Strong Smith, Ewing Young, and a group of Hudson's Bay Company trappers also visited the region in the early 1800s (Kyle et. al. 1990:533).

Yolo County initially comprised 11 Mexican land grants. Of these 11 grants, only five—Rancho Rio de los Putos, Rancho Quesesosi, Rancho Rio de Jesus Maria, Rancho Jimeno, and Rancho Canada de Capay—were eventually confirmed by the United States government. Owners of these ranchos, such as John Wolfskill, raised horses and cattle, in addition to cultivating vines, fruit trees, and grain fields. (Kyle et. al. 1990:533–534).

The California Gold Rush of the 1850s transformed Yolo County from an isolated farming community into a booming agricultural region as disenchanting miners realized they could make greater fortunes through farming and ranching. In the 1840s and 1850s, residents of the county based their livelihood on raising livestock; however, as floods and droughts decimated their herds, farmers increasingly turned to crop farming. Barley and wheat became the dominant crops in Yolo County starting in the 1860s. Alfalfa, used to feed livestock and enrich the soil, was the major irrigated crop in the 1870s. Other crops included hops, green peas, onions, beans, tomatoes, corn, sugar beets, flax, berries, and grapes. Varieties of fruit trees were planted, such as almond, walnut, cherry, prune, pear, plum, apple, olive, orange, lemon, apricot, peach, and nectarine. Irrigation improvements in the twentieth century allowed the introduction of new crops, such as rice, into the area. Commercial enterprises related to agriculture and livestock—rice mills, dried fruit companies, vegetable and fruit-packing plants, and feed and barley plants—were also established during this period. In 1906, the University of California established a College of Agriculture in Yolo County. This evolved into the University of California, Davis, and its agricultural school continues to enjoy global renown for agricultural research and education (Olney 1902:171–172; De Pue & Company 1879a:41; Larkey and Walters 1987: 37, 73).

In the last half of the twentieth century, Yolo County enjoyed a dramatic increase in population growth due to its climate, the rural atmosphere, and nearby educational opportunities. Between 1950 and 1980, the county's population jumped from 40,640 to 113,374. Today, agriculture remains Yolo County's primary source of commercial activity (Hart 1978: 489).

Yuba County

Yuba County is one of the original 27 counties created by the California State Legislature in 1850. At the time of its creation, the county included portions of Placer, Nevada, and Sierra counties. In 1851, Yuba County lost almost one-half of its territory when Placer and Nevada counties were created. In the following year, more of its territory was lost when Sierra County was created. It reached its current boundary configurations in 1923, and is bounded on the east by Sierra and Nevada counties, on the south by Placer County, on the north by Butte County, and on the west by Sutter County. Marysville, the county's principal city, has been the county seat since 1850 (Kyle et. al. 1990: 538-539; Coy 1973: 298-299).

The Spanish were likely the first Europeans to enter the territory of what is now Yuba County. In 1808, Gabriel Moraga passed through the region when he guided an expedition up the Sacramento River to present-day Sutter County. Periodically, in the 1830s, hunters and trappers from the Hudson's Bay Company also penetrated the region. In 1846, American explorer, John C. Fremont, wrote a detailed account of the Maidu Indians living there (Kyle et. al. 1990: 533, 538).

The first settlements in Yuba County were established just a few years before Fremont's visit, after John A. Sutter took control of the territory in 1841. In 1842, Theodore Cordua leased a portion of land from Sutter. An employee of Cordua's, Charles Cuvillaud eventually purchased some of Cordua's ranch. The town of Marysville was laid out on this land, which was named after Cuvillaud's wife, Mary Murphy Cuvillaud (Kyle et. al. 1990: 539).

The Gold Rush brought an influx of miners into Yuba County, and the county experienced an economic and population boom as a result. When the Gold Rush ended, the county still gained a portion of its income from gold-related industries. In the 1870s, equipment for hydraulic mining was manufactured in Marysville foundries. In the early twentieth century, after the Sawyer decision ended hydraulic mining, extensive dredging took place along the Yuba River (Kelley 1989: 75; Kyle et. al. 1990: 541).

For most of its history, agriculture has been an important part of Yuba County's economy. In 1845, the first wheat crop was planted in the county. From the 1850s to the 1870s, vineyards were planted, grain was produced, and livestock raising was practiced in the eastern part of the county. In the twentieth century, livestock raising continued to be important, as did cultivation of fruits and nuts. By 2005, the most important agricultural elements of Yuba County's economy were peach, rice, and walnut production, as well as cattle raising (Thompson & West 1879 ; Dennis Pooler 2005).

Today, the population of Yuba County remains relatively small, and government services function as the predominant economic provider for the county (Yuba County, California).

El Dorado County

El Dorado County is one of the original 27 counties created by the California State Legislature in 1850. Originally, the county's boundaries included parts of present-day Amador, Alpine, and Placer Counties. By 1919, the state adopted the current boundary lines that are marked to the east by the state of Nevada and to the west by Sacramento County. The American and Consumes rivers form the county's northern and southern boundaries. The original county seat was the town of Coloma, but in 1857 it was moved to Placerville (Coy 1973: 97-99; Kyle et. al. 1990: 71).

On January 24, 1848, James W. Marshall, an employee of John A. Sutter, discovered gold near the area of present-day Coloma. The first mining town in California sprouted soon after his discovery, and the

gold region of El Dorado County experienced rapid growth. It was likely Marshal's discovery, as well as the gold discovered by others, from which the county derives its name, El Dorado, meaning "the gilded man" in Spanish (Kyle et. al. 1990: 71-72).

Both during and after the Gold Rush, gold mining was the predominant industry in El Dorado County for many years. The county lies on a rich ore vein, which extends through several counties on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada. Other mineral products in the region include large deposits of slate, granite, lime, and asbestos, as well as building stones. By the turn of the twentieth century, lumbering, livestock raising, and farming had joined mining as the principal industries of the county. Crops included pears, plums, apples, peaches, cherries, oranges, olives, walnuts, wheat, rye, corn, and acres of vineyards. Another industry that gained popularity in El Dorado County was tourism. In the 1910s and 1920s, with the advent of the automobile, visitors increasingly traveled to the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe. Highway 50 (which was the primary route to the gold fields in 1849) was California's first state-sanctioned wagon road. It was incorporated into the State (and later the national) highway network during the twentieth century, when it became part of the Interstate Highway System, which linked the east coast of the United States to the west. At present, the county's economy is based mainly on lumber, mining, agriculture, livestock, manufacturing, and tourism (Phillips and Miller 1915: 47; Supernowicz 1993).

Placer County

Placer County was created by the Legislature of the State of California in 1851, from portions of Sutter and Yuba counties. The county takes its name from a form of mining predominant during the Gold Rush—placer mining. The City of Auburn, one of the earliest mining towns in California, was designated the seat of justice when the county was created. It continues to be the seat of justice today. (Kyle et. al. 1990: 257, 260).

The earliest settlement in Placer County was Sicard's ranch, established in 1845 after Theodore Sicard obtained a Mexican grant of land in 1844. Due to its location along the emigrant trail, the ranch became an important stopping point for emigrants to California. While the population of the county was small at this time, it grew exponentially with the onset of the Gold Rush, and mining towns and camps sprouted up in various places throughout the county (Kyle et. al. 1990: 259; Lardner and Brock 1924: 163).

For many years, the primary focus Placer County's economy was gold mining. During the Gold Rush, easier-to-obtain placer deposits were mined in the rivers, but as gold became more difficult to mine, miners turned to hydraulic mining. Ditches, flumes, and canals were constructed throughout the county to enable the functioning of hydraulic mines, and the amount of gold shipped out of the county from 1865 to 1878 amounted to \$6,125, 000. However, the Sawyer decision of 1882 effectively ended hydraulic mining, and Placer County's economy shifted slowly away from gold production to agriculture, timber production, and the shipping and freighting industries. The production of citrus fruits became especially important during the 1880s and 1890s, while fruit packing and shipping were key industries in the first two decades of the twentieth century. In the 1930s, Lake Tahoe became known as a recreation center, and the area boomed as a ski resort destination after World War II. In the last half of the twentieth century, Placer County continued to grow and boasted a population of 248,399 by the year 2000 (Lardner and Brock 1924: 214, 228, 230, 234, 169-171,179-181; Kyle et al. 1990: 258; U. S. Census Bureau).

Archaeology

For the six counties in the MTP Plan Area, records identifying the locations of archaeological sites and studies detailing the interpretations of the cultures who created those sites are contained in technical reports stored at three previously mentioned California Archaeological Inventory Centers: the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University (Yolo County), the Northeast Information Center at California State University-Chico (Sutter County), and the North Central Information Center at California State University-Sacramento (Sacramento, Yuba, Placer, and El Dorado Counties). These reports contain information regarding known archaeological sites and other cultural resources in the MTP Plan Area.

Records and reports contained at the above-mentioned information centers reveal an abundance of archaeological sites and other cultural resources in the MTP Plan Area. The types of resources generally present in the MTP Plan Area include prehistoric Native American habitation and burial sites, as well as a variety of historic sites relating to the Gold Rush era. Concentrations of sites are commonly located along natural waterways, such as the Cosumnes, American, and Sacramento rivers. Excavations throughout the years have repeatedly uncovered prehistoric sites buried in deep sediments. For example, an archaeological deposit located near Arcade Creek, north of Sacramento, was discovered under 9 feet of natural soil.

Significant Archaeological Resources

The California Office of Historic Preservation maintains a list of Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility by county. This list documents sites that have been evaluated for significance based on NRHP or CRHR criteria, and the determinations of these evaluations. Sites are generally coded into one of the following groups:

- 1) listed in the NRHP or CRHR;
- 2) determined eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR;
- 3) appearing eligible through survey evaluation;
- 4) eligible through other evaluation;
- 5) recognized as historically significant by local government;
- 6) not eligible for listing or designation as specified;
- 7) not evaluated or needs re-evaluation.

Table 8 -1 below lists the number of archaeological sites by county that fall into categories 1 through five.

Table 8-1. Significant Archaeological Resources in the MTP Plan Area

County	Number of Eligible Historic Resources	NRHP Register	CRHR Register	Local Register
El Dorado	36	36	36	0
Placer	76	76	76	0
Sacramento	20	20	20	0
Sutter	11	11	11	0
Yolo	16	16	16	0
Yuba	5	5	5	0

Architecture

Numerous historic architectural (built-environment) resources are also located throughout the greater MTP Plan Area. Historic architectural resources generally include buildings, roads, trails, bridges, canals, and railroads usually associated with the time period beginning with the first Euro-American contact. In general, concentrations of historic resources in the greater MTP Plan Area are expected to occur:

- adjacent to transportation corridors (historic highways, railroads, navigable sloughs);
- on historic ranches;
- in areas of historic rock, soil, and mineral extraction; and
- within historic neighborhoods and business districts.

These resources are commonly associated with key historic events that occurred in the region, including the Gold Rush, mining, agriculture, irrigation, reclamation, and transportation. Several architectural resources are currently listed in or are eligible for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR. Additional historic architectural resources have also been designated as State Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, or as local historic landmarks important to a region or community. In addition to the programs maintained at the national and state level, several local governments throughout the MTP Plan Area have also established listings or passed ordinances in recognition of the importance of such resources to their community.

Historic Properties in State Database

The Historic Property Data File Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), which is maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation, identifies properties that have been surveyed, as well as properties that appear eligible or have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. In general, listing a property in the NRHP involves submission of a formal nomination form that requires concurrence from State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the State Historical Resources Commission, and the Keeper of the National Register. Properties that are evaluated and found, with SHPO concurrence, to be eligible for listing under one or more of the NRHP criteria but are never nominated, are afforded the same protections for federally funded projects as listed properties. Properties listed or found eligible for listing in the NRHP are also automatically eligible for the CRHR. The HRI also includes buildings that have been identified as historically significant by local government agencies. The property types listed in the

HRI are typically non-archaeological in nature (for confidentiality reasons) and encompass numerous architectural and engineering features.

Table 8-2 lists by county the number of known historic architectural resources in the greater MTP Plan Area listed on or eligible for listing on national, state, or local registers. It should be noted that because new resources are continuously located through survey work and other means, the following table should not be considered the final or the most comprehensive listing.

Table 8- 2. Table of Historic Architectural Resources in the MTP Plan Area

County	Number of Eligible Historic Resources	NRHP Register	CRHR Register	Local Register
El Dorado	112	111	111	1
Placer	490	203	203	287
Sacramento	1291	983	991	300
Sutter	34	34	34	0
Yolo	822	426	426	396
Yuba	357	197	197	160

Regulatory Setting

Archaeological and paleontological resources are frequently uncovered during construction of projects that require excavation, while historic resources are generally known. Strict mitigation and protection measures are required whenever such resources are discovered. In addition, there is a general requirement that a cultural resource survey and environmental analysis be prepared prior to commencement of any action, development, or land use change subject to CEQA or NEPA on lands subject to federal jurisdiction or for projects involving federal funds.

Federal Regulations

Federal requirements would apply to subsequent project-specific components of the MTP that receive federal funding or otherwise affect federal lands and federal decisionmaking; these additional requirements do not apply to SACOG’s MTP or this program EIR, but would need to be addressed if federal funding or another federal action (e.g., if federal lands were crossed or a federal permit were required) were triggered at the time of consideration and approval of the specific project.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

The NHPA of 1966, as amended, is the primary mandate governing projects under federal jurisdiction that may affect cultural resources.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Specific regulations regarding compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA state that, although the tasks necessary to comply with Section 106 may be delegated to others, the federal agency is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the Section 106 process is completed according to statute. The Section 106

process is a consultation process that involves the SHPO throughout; the process also calls for including Native American Tribes and interested members of the public, as appropriate, throughout the process. Implementing regulations for Section 106 (36 CFR 800) detail the following five basic steps.

- 1) Initiate the Section 106 process.
- 2) Identify and evaluate historic properties.
- 3) Assess the effects of the undertaking on historic properties within the area of potential effects (APE).
- 4) If historic properties are subject to adverse effects, the federal agency, the SHPO, and any other consulting parties (including Native American tribes) continue consultation to seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect. A memorandum of agreement (MOA) is usually developed to document the measures agreed upon to resolve the adverse effects.
- 5) Proceed in accordance with the terms of the MOA.

National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP is the official list of the nation's recognized cultural resources. Authorized under the NHPA (1966), the NRHP is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archaeological resources. The National Park Service, under the Secretary of the Interior, administers the NRHP. Properties listed in the NRHP include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. These resources contribute to an understanding of the historical and cultural foundations of the nation.

The NRHP includes:

- All historic areas in the National Park System;
- National Historic Landmarks which have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior for their significance to all Americans; and
- Properties significant to the nation, state, or community which have been nominated by the states, federal agencies, and others, and which have been approved by the National Park Service.

Federal Historic Significance Criteria

For federal projects, cultural resource significance is evaluated in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. NRHP criteria for eligibility are defined below.

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and that:

- A. are associated with events that have made a contribution to the broad pattern of our history;
- B. are associated with the lives of people significant in our past;
- C. embody the distinct characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a

significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
or

- D. have yielded, or are likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4).

American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act pledges to protect and preserve the traditional religious rights of American Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and Native Hawaiians. Before the act was passed, certain U.S. federal laws interfered with the traditional religious practices of many American Indians. The Act establishes a national policy that traditional Native American practices and beliefs, sites (and right of access to those sites), and the use of sacred objects shall be protected and preserved.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA)

The intent of NAGPRA is to identify proper Native American ownership and ensure the rightful disposition, or repatriation, of Native American remains and items of cultural patrimony that are in federal possession or control. The regulations implementing the requirements of NAGPRA relating to the inadvertent discovery of human remains of Native American origin are described in 43 CFR 10.4.

Section 4(f) Requirements

Historic and cultural resources are also protected under regulations of the NHPA and the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act requires a comprehensive evaluation of all environmental impacts resulting from federal-aid transportation projects administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration that involve the use—or interference with use—of the following types of land.

- Public park lands
- Recreation areas
- Wildlife and waterfowl refuges
- Publicly or privately owned historic properties of federal, state, or local significance

This evaluation, called the Section 4(f) statement, must be completed by proponents of federal-aid transportation projects in the MTP 2035 that affect Section 4(f) land, as defined above. The evaluation must be sufficiently detailed to permit the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to determine that:

- there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land;
- the program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to any park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site that would result from the use of such lands; or that
- if there is a feasible and prudent alternative, a proposed project using Section 4(f) lands cannot be approved by the Secretary; or if there is no feasible and prudent alternative, the proposed project must include all possible planning to minimize harm to the affected lands.

Detailed inventories of the locations and likely impacts on resources that fall into the Section 4(f) category are required in project-level environmental assessments.

In August 2005, Section 4(f) was amended to simplify the process and approval of projects that have only de minimis impacts on lands affected by Section 4(f). Under the new provisions, the U.S. Secretary of Transportation may find such a de minimis impact if consultation with the SHPO results in a determination that a transportation project will have no adverse effect on the historic site or that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed action. In this instance, analysis of avoidance alternatives is not required and the Section 4(f) evaluation process is complete.

Native American Heritage Commission

The NAHC regulates Native American concerns toward the excavation and disposition of Native American cultural resources. Among its duties, the NAHC is authorized to resolve disputes relating to the treatment and disposition of Native American human remains and items associated with burials. Upon notification of the discovery of human remains by a County coroner, the NAHC notifies the Native American group or individual most likely descended from the deceased.

State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

CEQA requires that public agencies financing or approving public or private projects must assess the effects of the project on cultural resources. Furthermore, it requires that, if a project results in significant impacts on important cultural resources, alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered; only significant cultural resources, however, need to be addressed. Thus, prior to the development of mitigation measures, the importance of cultural resources must be determined. The steps that are normally taken in a cultural resources investigation for CEQA compliance are as follows:

- identify cultural resources,
- evaluate the significance of resources,
- evaluate the effects of a project on all resources, and
- develop and implement measures to mitigate the effects of the project only on significant resources.

The State CEQA Guidelines define three ways that a cultural resource may qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA review:

- if the resource is listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR;
- if the resource is included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) 5020.1(k), or is identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC 5024.1(g) unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant; or
- the lead agency determines the resource to be significant as supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15064.5[a]).

State Historical Significance Criteria

A cultural resource may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, if it:

- is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, CEQA distinguishes between two classes of archaeological resources: archaeological resources that meet the definition of a historical resource as above, and “unique archaeological resources.” An archaeological resource is considered unique if it:

- is associated with an event or person of recognized significance in California or American history or of recognized scientific importance in prehistory;
- can provide information that is of demonstrable public interest and is useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable research questions; or
- has a special or particular quality such as oldest, best example, largest, or last surviving example of its kind (PRC 21083.2).

Other Provisions of the California Public Resources Code

Unauthorized Actions

Section 5097.5 of the PRC specifically defines “unauthorized excavation, removal, destruction, etc. of archaeological, paleontological, or historical features on Public Lands as a misdemeanor.

Native American Heritage

California Public Resources code 5097.9 states that no public agency or a private party on a public property shall “interfere with the free expression or exercise of Native American Religion...” The code further states that

No such agency or party [shall] cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine...except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require.

County and city lands are exempt from this provision, except for parklands larger than 100 acres.

Human Remains

Disturbance of human remains without the authority of law is a felony (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7052). According to state law (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98), if human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until

- the coroner of the county has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and
- if the remains are of Native American origin:
- the descendants from the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of with appropriate dignity the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98; or
- the NAHC was unable to identify a descendent or the descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC, who has jurisdiction over Native American remains (California Health and Safety Code, 7052.5c; Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98).

Local Regulations

In addition to federal and state regulations, many county and city general plans and ordinances address the identification maintenance, and protection of cultural resources. This section presents local cultural resources–related policies that could affect or be affected by the MTP. Policies may either support or conflict with proposed project improvements.

County General Plans

All six Counties within the MTP Plan Area specifically address cultural resources in their general plans (Table Cultural-3). Cultural resources are generally discussed in either the Open Space Element or the Conservation Element of the General Plan. Policies regarding cultural resources are similar throughout the MTP Plan Area General Plans and call for the identification, protection, interpretation and enhancement of important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environments.

Municipal Preservation

Many local municipalities include cultural resources preservation elements in their general plans that include some mechanism pertaining to cultural resources in those communities. In general, the sections pertaining to archaeological and historical properties are put in place to afford the cultural resources a measure of local protection. The policies outlined in the individual general plans should be consulted prior to any undertaking or project.

Table 8-3. MTP Plan Area Counties and Cultural Resources Policies

County	Document	Section
Sacramento	General Plan (1993)	Open Space Element, Conservation Element, Section VI
Sutter	General Plan Policy Document (1996)	Conservation and Open Space Element, Section V—Recreational and Cultural Resources
Yolo	General Plan (1983)	Open Space and Recreation Element, Chapter 2.
El Dorado	General Plan (2004)	Conservation and Open Space Element, Goal 7.5—Cultural Resources
Yuba	General Plan Draft EIR (1994)	Volume III Section III, Goal 12-OSCG
Placer	Countywide General Plan Policy Document (1994)	Section 5. Recreational and Cultural Resources, Goal 5.D

Local Historical Societies

Local historical, heritage, and landmark societies throughout the greater MTP Plan Area also work in conjunction with their city or county toward the identification and protection of cultural resources. These organizations are largely non-profit societies that gain their purpose through educating the public and creating awareness of the historical heritage of their community. They are also involved in protecting the history of the area through the documentation, publication, and/or preservation of historical materials, and artifacts pertaining to the community. Historical organizations within the greater MTP Plan Area include:

- Forest Hill Divide and Museum Historical Society
- Placer County Museum
- Colfax Area Historical Society
- Sacramento County Historical Society
- Folsom Historical Society
- Sacramento Archives Museum and Collection Center
- Sutter County Historical Society
- West Sacramento Historical Society
- Yolo County Historical Society, and the
- Forbes Museum /Yuba-Feather Historical Association

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Methods and Assumptions

This analysis is based on information obtained from the general plans of the six counties comprising the MTP Plan Area, as well as information from the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, the North Central Information Center at Sacramento State University, and the Northeast Information Center at California State University, Chico. The known archaeological and historical resources located within the MTP Plan Area were assessed using the criteria set forth by the Office of Historic Preservation and the CRHR, and guidelines set forth by CEQA. Impact assessments for cultural resources are based on the type of resource, the type of impact, and the extent of the impact.

Criteria for Determining Significance

The standards of significance described in CEQA, and the County General Plans in the MTP Plan Area were used in this analysis. Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15064.5[b]) provides guidance for evaluation of project effects on cultural resources. A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA further states that a substantial adverse change in the significance of a resource means the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resources would be materially impaired. Actions that would materially impair the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource are any actions that would demolish or adversely alter those physical characteristics of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource that convey its historic significance and qualify it for inclusion in the CRHR or in a local register or survey that meets the requirements of PRC 5020.1(k) and 5024.1(g). Therefore, an impact pertaining to cultural resources was considered significant under CEQA if it would:

- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or unique archaeological resource;
- directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or destroy a unique geologic feature; or
- disturb human remains.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

This section describes potential impacts on cultural resources that could result from the MTP 2035. Some projects within the MTP 2035 could significantly affect cultural resources. However, prior to final approval of each project considered in the MTP 2035, the implementing agency will conduct the appropriate project-specific environmental review. Significant impacts and mitigation measures will be considered during that project-level review.

Impact CR-1: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Archaeological Resources during Specific Project Construction

Archaeological resources could be encountered during construction of specific projects included in the MTP 2035. Disturbance of such features would compromise the physical integrity and information potential of any archaeological deposits and would result in a significant impact if

the physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its significance and qualify it for inclusion in the CRHR, or in a local register or survey that meets the requirements of PRC 5020.1(k) and 5024.1(g) are demolished or substantially altered.

Based upon the general planning nature of the MTP 2035, development of detailed, site-specific information on this impact at the program level is not feasible. As a result, SACOG does not have sufficient reliable data to permit preparation of a meaningful and accurate report on the impact and no significance determination can be reasonably made. The implementing agency will conduct appropriate project-level environmental review and will be responsible for consideration of mitigation measures for significant effects on the environment. The following mitigation measure could be used by implementing agencies to address potential impacts during project-level review:

Mitigation Measure CR-1: Conduct Cultural Resource Inventories Concurrently with Environmental Review

Consult with the Native American Heritage Commission to determine whether there known sacred sites are in their specific project area, and to identify the Native American(s) to contact to obtain information about their specific project area. A qualified archaeologist will conduct a records search at the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System to determine whether the specific project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified.

If the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Information Center will recommend whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the specific project area for archaeological resources. As necessary, prior to construction activities, the proponents of specific projects will retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct archaeological surveys as recommended by the Information Center.

If the archaeological survey indicates that archaeological resources are located in the specific project area, the proponents of specific projects will retain a qualified archaeologist to assess the significance of the resources according to the applicable local, state, and federal significance criteria. Treatment measures to ameliorate “substantial adverse changes” in the significance of significant archaeological resources will be developed in consultation with qualified archaeologists and other concerned parties, and may include avoidance through project redesign, data recovery excavation, and public interpretation of the resource.

If this process indicates that the specific project area is rich with cultural materials, a qualified archaeologist will monitor any subsurface operations, including but not limited to grading, excavation, trenching, or removal of existing features of the subject property. If archeological materials are uncovered during construction, they should be avoided. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist familiar with the local conditions will recommend further work necessary to determine importance in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal guidelines. If the archaeological resource is determined to be important under local, state, or federal guidelines, treatment measures will be developed as described above.

Impact CR-2: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Previously Undiscovered Buried Archaeological Sites or Unique Paleontological Resources

During construction of specific projects included in the MTP 2035, construction and staging activities could disturb buried, as-yet-undiscovered archaeological sites and unique paleontological resources. Improvements and modifications occurring within existing rights-of-way would have less potential to encounter previously unknown resources relative to projects in undisturbed areas; however, projects within existing rights-of-way that entail deep ground disturbance will still have potential to damage or destroy resources. Based upon the general planning nature of the MTP 2035, development of detailed, site-specific information on this impact at the program level is not feasible. As a result, SACOG does not have sufficient reliable data to permit preparation of a meaningful and accurate report on the impact and no significance determination can be reasonably made. The implementing agency will conduct appropriate project-level environmental review and will be responsible for consideration of mitigation measures for significant effects on the environment. The following mitigation measures could be used by implementing agencies to address potential impacts during project-level review:

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Stop Work If Archaeological Materials Are Discovered during Construction

If archaeological materials (such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or non-human bone) are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, ensure that the contractor will notify the agencies responsible for project implementation and will stop work in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and develop appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures will be made in consultation with the agencies responsible for project implementation. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation.

Mitigation Measure CR-3: Conduct Project-Specific Paleontological Resource Assessments Concurrently with Environmental Review

Retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate sensitivity for paleontological resources in their project area. Any area of known paleontological resources will be avoided during construction. If unique paleontological resources are discovered during construction and avoidance is not feasible, the paleontological resources will be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local agency, state university, or other applicable institution, where they may be curated and displayed for public education purposes.

Impact CR-3: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Previously Undiscovered Human Remains

Indications are that humans have occupied portions of the MTP Plan Area for at least 10,000 years. It is not always possible to predict where human remains may occur outside of formal burials; therefore, excavation and construction activities, regardless of depth, may yield human remains that may not be interred in marked, formal burials. Under CEQA, human remains are protected under the definition of archaeological materials as being “any evidence of human activity.” Based upon the general planning nature of the MTP 2035, development of detailed,

site-specific information on this impact at the program level is not feasible. As a result, SACOG does not have sufficient reliable data to permit preparation of a meaningful and accurate report on the impact and no significance determination can be reasonably made. The implementing agency will conduct appropriate project-level environmental review and will be responsible for consideration of mitigation measures for significant effects on the environment. The following mitigation measure could be used by implementing agencies to address potential impacts during project-level review:

Mitigation Measure CR-4: Stop Work If Human Remains Are Discovered during Construction

If human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, prevent further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

- the applicable County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and
- if the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken:
 - The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains.
 - The implementing agency or its authorized representative will retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs.
 - The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendent.
 - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.
 - The implementing agency or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

Impact CR-4: Proposed Projects May Occur Near Some Architectural (Built Environment) Resources

Proposed improvement may occur near or close to architectural resources (buildings/structures and/or linear features) that are 50 years old or older. Given the age of these resources, it is possible they are historically significant and eligible for listing in the CRHR or the NRHP.

Proposed improvements may lead to physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of potential historical resources. The impact on architectural resources could be potentially significant and further studies would be required to determine the level of significance of this impact. Because the significance of architectural resources and their eligibility for listing in the CRHR may not be known, there is the possibility that the proposed projects may result in the demolition of an eligible resource. Based upon the general planning nature of the MTP 2035, development of detailed, site-specific information on this impact at the program level is not feasible. As a result, SACOG does not have sufficient reliable data to permit preparation of a meaningful and accurate report on the impact and no significance determination can be reasonably made. The implementing agency will conduct appropriate project-level environmental review and will be responsible for consideration of mitigation measures for significant effects on the environment. The following mitigation measure could be used by implementing agencies to address potential impacts during project-level review:

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Conduct Historic Inventory and Evaluation for Architectural Resources

Prior to construction activities, ensure that an inventory and evaluation is conducted for architectural resources located their project areas. The inventory and evaluation will be prepared by a qualified architectural historian and will include conducting an intensive field survey, background research on the history of the project area, and property specific research. The significance of architectural resources located in the project area will be evaluated by the architectural historian using criteria for listing in the CRHR. The resources would be recorded by the architectural historian on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, photographed, and mapped. The DPR forms would be produced and forwarded by the architectural historian to the appropriate Information Center. If federal funding or approval is required, the project proponents will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation.

If the architectural resource appears to be to be eligible for the CRHR or NRHP, avoidance through project redesign is the preferred mitigation measure, but it is often not feasible. When a project has sufficient flexibility, the project implementation agencies will consider avoidance as the primary mitigation measure. If avoidance of a significant architectural resource is not feasible, Historic American Building Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Standards document will be completed. The HABS and HAER are programs to formally document historic resources through the use of large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. Such documentation packages are entered into the Library of Congress, and a second copy is generally archived in the regional information centers of the California Historic Resources Information System.

If an eligible building must be relocated, any alterations will conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.