

## 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section is to identify any potential cultural resources within or adjacent to the proposed project, and to assist the Lead Agency, in this case Shasta County, in determining whether such resources meet the office definitions of “historical resources,” as provided in the California PRC, in particular under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The analysis in this section has been prepared in accordance with §15064.5 of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, which considers the potential impacts on prehistoric, historic, and paleontological resources. This section describes the potential cultural resources within the project study area, and the applicable regulations that govern those resources. The following analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to recreation is derived from the following sources and agencies:

- Shasta County. *Shasta County General Plan*. September 2004.
- Coyote & Fox Enterprises. *Additional Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch Development*. April 2006.
- Coyote & Fox Enterprises. *Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Chatham Ranch Environs (820 Acres North of Boyle Road Between Deschutes Road and Old Alturas Road), Palo Cedro, Shasta County, California*. July 2004.
- Coyote & Fox Enterprises. *Cultural Resources Investigation for Tierra Robles Development (North of Boyle Road Between Deschutes Road and Old Alturas Road) Palo Cedro, Shasta County, California*. January 2013.

### 5.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project encompasses approximately 715.4 acres and is currently undeveloped vacant land. A single wood and wire corral, some interior fences, and a network of dirt ranch roads crisscross the proposed project site. Onsite topography is characterized as level to rolling terrain in the western portion of the project site, and steeper slopes and ridges are located in the eastern portion of the site, with elevations ranging from 600 feet above msl to 650 feet above msl. The project site is dissected by three major drainage systems including Clough Creek, which flows southwest across the northwest corner of the site, and a major unnamed drainage that flows from north to southeast across the eastern side of the project site. In addition, there are two small streams with attached tributaries which drain the central portion of the site. Currently the project site is vacant, but has been used for ranching and grazing cattle activities in the past.

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

A review of archaeological records was conducted at the Northeast Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, California State University, Chico (NE/CHRIS). This review covered maps and records for archaeological sites in this portion of Shasta County and also the following documents: *National Register of Historic Places – Listed Properties and Determined Eligible Properties* (1990 and supplements through May 2004 by National Park Service), the *California Register of Historic Resources* (2000 and updates), *California Point of Historical Interest* (1992), *California Historical Landmarks* (1996), and the NE/CHRIS Historic Property Data File for Shasta County.

No portion of the project area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, and no archaeological sites have been previously noted or recorded within the area, previous to the 2004 survey. Five archaeological surveys have been conducted within a one-mile radius of the project site (Jensen 1991, 1999; Vaughan 1991, 2003, 2004); and three prehistoric sites were recorded as a result of these surveys. Based on this information and the proximity of the project site to Clough Creek, sensitivity for cultural resources in the project area was considered to be at least moderate.

The project area lies within the ethnographic territory of the Wintu, and ethnographic accounts of Wintu culture come primarily from three references: DuBois (1935), Kroeber (1925), and LaPena (1978). The Wintu were intensive hunters and gatherers who inhabited the northern end of the Sacramento Valley, as well as the mountainous areas to the north and west. Whistler (1977) has suggested that the ancestral Wintu migrated to the Sacramento Valley area from southwestern Oregon, possibly via the Sacramento River Canyon. For additional information on the Wintu, please see Section 5.15, Tribal Resources.

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

The project area lies between the present-day towns of Palo Cedro and Bella Vista. Historically, Cow Creek Valley was first occupied in 1852 by L.C. and George Woodman. This farming area increased in population over the years; and by 1881, Millville was reported to be the third most populous town in Shasta County after Shasta and Redding. The post office, is in what is today Palo Cedro, was first established in 1883 as Albertson, then changed to Roberts in 1885. Palo Cedro was named in 1891 when T.W.H. Shannahan and Joe Enright purchased 30 acres from Lem Benton and had the plot surveyed into 12 town lots. They named the town after a large cedar tree which was later cut down. The post office became Palo Cedro in 1893.

The original town of Bella Vista was located at the end of present-day Meyer Road on what had been the Gipson Ranch. Shasta Lumber Company purchased the town in 1887, and the Terry Lumber Company took over in 1897. Terry Lumber Company operated a box factory and planing mill in the area, and the town of Bella Vista was the terminus of a 32-mile long flume and the origin of the railroad carrying lumber to Anderson for shipment to market. Bella Vista had a population of 2,000 at this time. The town site moved to its present location in the early 1900s, and following the close of the Terry Lumber Company mill in 1919, the town became a small rural community.

Boyle Road is most likely named for George Boyle, who with his brother Frank, homesteaded in the area in 1884 and raised cattle, horses, hogs, and turkeys. In 1900, George purchased a ranch from Alfred Estep at the junction of Swede Creek Road and North Cow Creek. This ranch became established as a popular stopping place for travelers from Redding to Buzzard Roost. The project property was acquired by J.G. and Ella Chatham in the early 1940s and operated as Chatham Ranch until recently.

## **5.5.2 METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE (JULY 2004)**

A pedestrian survey was conducted over the entire parcel in meandering transects spaced at approximately 30 meter intervals. Ground visibility was generally good, with greater than 75 percent visibility; and even in the areas of dense grass, the grass was short, and there were several rodent mounds providing visibility in the mineral soil. This survey is considered to have been thorough enough to have located any archaeological sites that may be present within the project area.

During this survey, one prehistoric site was identified and 26 isolated artifacts or feature locations were noted. The prehistoric site, named Chatham Prehistoric (CA-SHA-3721), is a light concentration of obsidian flakes situated on a gentle north-facing slope above a small un-named drainage.

The 26 isolated artifact or feature locations show evidence of human activity, but they do not meet CEQA criteria to be formally recorded as sites. The 12 numbered items listed below include a small scatter of historic debris of insufficient size to be documented as a site, and 11 isolated artifact or feature locations. Of the latter, four are of prehistoric origin and seven are considered to be of historic origin, although they may not all be 50 years old. Also, 14 isolated obsidian flakes were noted. In addition to these isolated flakes, numerous natural obsidian nodules were noted, some of which were broken.

- 2 corrugated sheet metal fragments, approximately 28 inches by 46 inches.
- Burnt corrugated roofing and burnt boards with round nails in a 50-foot diameter area.
- Earthen dam, 200 feet long by 10 feet high at a bearing of 300°/120°, breached on the east end.
- Obsidian projectile point tip.
- Basalt core, 10 centimeters (cm) by 7 cm by 9 cm.
- Sanitary seam can, 9 ½ inch square by 13 inches high.
- An old almond tree with two glass fragments nearby, one amethyst and one cobalt.
- Hopper mortar, 25 cm by 20 cm by 5.5 cm thick, with a 10 cm diameter depression.
- Basalt core, 8.5 cm by 6 cm by 5 cm thick.
- Grey enamelware kettle, 12-inch diameter by 7 ¾ inches high, bottom and bail handle missing.
- In the vicinity of a recent corral and loading chute, a concentration of debris was noted which is thought to be historic (i.e., 50 years old). Items noted were four barrel hoops, a galvanized sheet metal fragment, a non-galvanized sheet metal piece, three heavy-gauge steel hoops, a metal band 2 inches wide by 26 inches long with a rolled edge, and aqua insulator fragments.
- Clear glass bottle, 2 ½ inches in diameter by 6 ½ inches tall, embossed Listerine near the shoulder, and near the base, LAMBERT PHARMACAL Co.

### **ADDITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE (APRIL 2006)**

An additional archaeological survey was conducted for the proposed access road to connect the north end of the project area to Seven Lakes Road, near its intersection with Old Alturas Road. The archaeological survey was conducted by Coyote & Fox Enterprises on March 22, 2006. A pedestrian survey was conducted along the corridor in a meandering transect south and north. Vegetation consists of a light over story of oak and grey pine, and an under story of primarily pasture grasses, with some manzanita. Soil visibility was considered good (80 percent) as the grasses were short, the manzanita was sparse, and there were many rodent mounds.

As a result of this additional survey, no new archaeological sites were identified, but five isolated artifacts or feature locations were noted of both historic and prehistoric origin. These isolated finds indicate human activity in the area, but do not meet the criteria to be recorded as archaeological sites, due to the limited number of items at each location. These are listed below.

- Two cement rings set in the ground approximately 20 feet apart. Each ring is 5 inches thick and 32 inches in diameter, and cemented into the rings are rocks of various materials including obsidian, quartz, cryptocrystalline silicates, and petrified wood. The age of these features are not known, but they are probably not “historic,” i.e., more than 50 years old.

- Grey enamelware bowl, 12 inches in diameter and 3 ½ inches deep.
- Basalt flake.
- Sanitary seam can, 5 ¾ inches in diameter and 5 ½ inches high, with an external friction lid.
- Obsidian flake.

### **CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATION FOR TIERRA ROBLES (JANUARY 2013)**

A review of archaeological records was conducted by Coyote & Fox Enterprises at NE/CHRIS on September 12, 2012. This review covered maps and records for archaeological sites in this portion of Shasta County to determine if any additional surveys have been conducted within the vicinity of the project area since the original records search in June 2004. Relative to the 820-acre project area, records show that no additional cultural resource surveys have been conducted since mid-2004 within a 1/2-mile radius of the project area, and no archaeological sites have been recorded or noted within this radius.

The prehistoric site, CA-SHA-3721, was originally recorded as a result of the 2004 survey. This prehistoric lithic scatter is in an area measuring 38 meters NE/SW by 20 meters NW/SW, and nine obsidian flakes and one metavolcanic flake were noted at the time. The site was visited on September 8, 2012, the datum was located, and the site boundary flagged, using the 2004 site map. Three persons then spent about 45 minutes looking for flakes. Soil visibility was fair to good, and considerable scraping of duff was conducted using trowels, but only two metavolcanic flakes were noted. Also at this time, an additional intensive archaeological survey was conducted in a 50-meter radius around the site boundary and no cultural material was noted.

A return visit was made to the site on November 14, 2012 to conduct some limited test excavations and determine if the site had a significant intact subsurface deposit and might, therefore, be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Again, an intensive surface survey was conducted within the site boundary, but only the two flakes noted in the September site survey were found.

Four units were then excavated: two Subsurface Scrapes (SS), each three meters square, and two test units (TU), each 50 cm square. Each SS was excavated to 3 cm depth. No cultural material was noted in SS1 and two obsidian flakes were found in SS2, along with a small natural obsidian nodule. Each TU was excavated to a 30 cm depth, and no cultural material was recovered from either unit. The soil in both units was a gravelly clay loam which gradually increased with depth to a denser clay content and more rocks. This excavation at CA-SHA-3721 has been documented on the appropriate State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms with a new site map showing unit locations.

Based on the above testing, CA-SHA-3721 does not appear to have a significant subsurface deposit. The site is identified as a sparse surface lithic scatter, and there, is not considered eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. This is a common site type throughout the area, and additional work at this site is not likely to yield important information to add to the database for the prehistory of this area of Shasta County.

A second archaeological site was documented as a result of this additional work in the project area. The site includes an old corral and nearby trash scatter. In the 2004 report, the corral was not thought to be "historic," i.e., more than 50 years old, and the trash scatter with some historic material was thought to have been dumped more recently from another location. There is no indication of human habitation at this location. The debris scatter was noted as an isolate in the 2004 report, but when the significance of

this location was questioned during the recent public comment period, a determination was made to formally record this site.

The corral is constructed of a mix of materials, probably mostly not historic, but two hand-hewn posts indicate that the original construction most likely occurred prior to 1960. The historic debris scatter possibly dates circa 1920s/1930s, although the materials could have been deposited here at a later date. This 1920s date is based on the amethyst glass fragments and the recorder's experience in documenting numerous historic sites in northern California.

### 5.5.3 REGULATORY SETTING

#### FEDERAL

##### National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is "an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation's cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment." However, the federal regulations explicitly provide that National Register listing of private property, "does not prohibit under Federal law or regulation any actions which may be taken by the property owner with respect to the property."

The eligibility for inclusion in the National Register is determined by applying the following criteria, developed by the National Park Service as per provisions of the National Preservation Act:

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

- *That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- *That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- *That embody the distinctive 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*
- *That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4).*

#### STATE

##### California Register of Historical Resources

In 1992, the Governor signed AB 2881 into law establishing the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The California Register is an authoritative guide in California used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the State's historical resources and to indicate what properties are

to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change. The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon the National Register criteria. Certain resources are determined by the statute to be included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places, State Landmarks, and State Points of Interest.

The State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) has broad authority under federal and State law for the implementation of historic preservation programs in California. The OHP makes determinations of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources.

### **California Public Records Act**

Section 6253 and 6254.10 of the California Code authorize state agencies to exclude archaeological site information from public disclosure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA). In addition, the California Public Records Act (CPRA; Government Code Section 6250 et. seq.) and California's open meeting law (The Brown Act, Government Code Section 56950 et. seq.) protect the confidentiality of Native American cultural place information. The CPRA (as amended, 2005) contains two exemptions that aid in the protection of records relating to Native American cultural places by permitting any State or local agency to deny a CRPA request and withhold from public disclosure:

- *“records of Native American graves, cemeteries, and sacred places and records of Native American places, features, and objects described in Section 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code maintained by, or in the possession of, the Native American Heritage Commission, another state agency, or local agency” (GC Section 6254(r)); and*
- *“records that relate to archaeological site information and reports maintained by, or in the possession of, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Historical Resources Commission, the State Lands Commission, another state agency, or local agency, including the records that the agency obtains through a consultation process between a California Native American tribe and a state or local agency” (GC Section 6254.10).*

Likewise, the Information Centers of the California Historical Resources Information System maintained by the Office of Historic Preservation prohibit public dissemination of records search and site location information. In compliance with these requirements, and those of the Code of Ethics for the Society of California Archaeology and the Register of Professional Archaeologists, the locations of cultural resources are considered restricted information with high restricted distribution and are not publicly accessible.

### **California Environmental Quality Act**

For CEQA compliance consideration, the Public Resources Code (PRC) establishes the definition and criteria for “historical resources,” which require similar protection to what NHPA Section 106 mandates for historic properties. “Historical resources,” according to PRC Section 5020.1(j), “includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annuals of California.” More specifically, State *CEQA Guidelines* state that the term “historical resources” applies to any such resources listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, included in a local

register of historical resources, or determined to be historically significant by the Lead Agency (Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(a)(1)-(3)).

Regarding the proper criteria for historical significance, the State *CEQA Guidelines* mandate that “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” (Title 14 CCR Section 15064.5(a)(3)). A resource may be listed in the California Register if it meets any of the following criteria:

- *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, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.*
- *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

The significance of paleontological resources is evaluated using state guidelines. State *CEQA Guidelines* indicate that a project could have significant effect on the environment if project activities disrupt or adversely affect a paleontological site (CEQA, Appendix G).

### **California Public Resources Code**

The California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.5, prohibits the excavation or removal of any “vertebrate paleontological site, or any other archaeological, paleontological, or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction of such lands.” Public lands are defined as lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the State, or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation. Any unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historic, or paleontological materials or sites located on public lands is considered a misdemeanor.

## **LOCAL**

### **Shasta County General Plan**

Under California law, cities and counties must adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan, which consists of a set of goals and policies that guide local land use decisions. The general plan must, at a minimum, contain seven elements – land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. The general plan must also contain a map or diagram within the land use element illustrating land use distribution by type of use, such as commercial, residential, and open space. A jurisdiction may choose to organize their general plan with the mandatory elements in the order that meets the communities’ needs. Mandatory elements may also be combined, as is often the case with open space and conservation or noise and safety. A jurisdiction may adopt additional elements to address unique needs of the community.

The Shasta County *General Plan*, last amended in 2004, serves as the principal land use planning and policy document for the County. It identifies strategies, policies, and implementation recommendations for land use within its planning area. The Shasta County *General Plan* is a long-range comprehensive plan that governs growth and development in the unincorporated areas of Shasta County, including the proposed project site. The Shasta County *General Plan* consists of three primary groups: public safety, resources, and community development. Contained within these three broad groups are 22 individual sections that address the issues of the seven required general plan elements. Applicable cultural resource policies in the *General Plan* Heritage Resource Element relative to the proposed project within these elements are listed below:

- *Policy HER-a.* Development projects in areas of known heritage value shall be designed to minimize degradation of these resources. Where conflicts are unavoidable, mitigation measures which reduce such impacts shall be implemented. Possible mitigation measures may include clustering, buffer or non-disturbance zones, and building siting requirements.

#### 5.5.4 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

##### SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

In accordance with State *CEQA Guidelines*, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine whether they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. An EIR is required to focus on these effects and offer mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any significant impacts that are identified. The criteria used to determine the significance of impacts may vary depending on the nature of the project. According to Appendix G of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact related to cultural resources, if it would:

- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.* Refer to Impact 5.5-1, below.
- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.* Refer to Impact 5.5-1, below.
- *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.* Refer to Impact 5.5-2, below.
- *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.* Refer to Impact 5.5-1, below.
- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource.* Refer to Section 5.15, TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Based on these standards, the effects of the proposed project have been categorized as either a “*less than significant*” impact or a “*potentially significant*” impact. Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts. If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of mitigation, it is categorized as a “*significant and unavoidable*” impact.

---

## 5.5.5 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

In accordance with CEQA, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine if they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. Cultural resources impacts are analyzed below according to topic. Mitigation measures directly correspond with an identified impact.

---

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b><i>Implementation of the proposed project may cause a significant impact to historic or prehistoric resources.</i></b>
<b>5.5-1</b>	

---

**Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** The results of archival research, comment solicitation, previous surveys adjacent to the project area, and the environmental context all contribute to an assessment of the sensitivity level for a given project area. Based on information from the 2004 report and the proximity of the project site to Clough Creek, sensitivity for cultural resources in the project area are considered to be at least moderate.

Cultural resources significant under Section 106 are evaluated in terms of eligibility for listing of in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). NRHP significance criteria applied to evaluate the cultural resources are defined in 36 CFR 60.4 as described in the Regulatory Settings above. The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) includes buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. To qualify for inclusion in the CRHR, a historical resources must meet the criteria described in Regulatory Settings above. If no eligible resources are identified within a project's APE, then the project is not considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources.

The 2004 survey identified one prehistoric archaeological site (CA-SHA-3721) as a potentially significant cultural resources under CEQA, until test excavations are conducted to determine if the site has an intact subsurface deposit. The 2013 survey conducted limited test excavations on November 14, 2012. Based on this work, CA-SHA-3721 was determined to not be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. The site is a sparse lithic scatter and it does not contain a significant subsurface deposit. Further work at this site would, most likely, not add to the database for the prehistory of this area of Shasta County. Therefore, the site recording and testing conducted to date is believed to have retrieved the information potential of the project site.

As discussed in Section 5.5.2, a second archaeological site was documented on this site, named Chatham Historic. The site includes an old corral and nearby trash scatter. The 2013 report found that the corral is constructed of a mix of materials, probably mostly not historic, but two hand-hewn posts indicate that the original construction most likely occurred prior to 1960. This site is not considered eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, because, if it is "historic," it does not meet any of the four National Register criteria for eligibility. It is not associated with a significant historical event or with a significant historical individual, it has no distinctive construction details, and additional work at this site is not likely to yield important historical information. The site recording documented in this report is believed to have retrieved the significant information potential of this site.

It is expected that the project area will have a moderate likelihood of containing both prehistoric and historic resources, although it is unlikely that any resources would retain a degree of integrity that could allow them to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. To minimize potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources, including Native American cultural resources, **MM 5.5-1a** is required.

Additionally, the project would comply with strict adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code (as amended by Assembly Bill 2641) be followed in the event that human remains are encountered as a result of project development, as addressed in **MM 5.5-1b**. With compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of **MM 5.5-1a** and **MM 5.5-1b**, impacts to cultural resources would be *less than significant*.

### **Offsite Improvements**

Several offsite intersection improvements have been identified for the proposed project (refer to **MM 5.16-1** through **MM 5.16-4** in Section 5.16, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION). These traffic improvements would generally occur at-grade within previously disturbed right-of-way and be constructed in accordance with County and/or City design criteria. Similar to development activities that would occur onsite, implementation of **MM 5.5-1a** and **MM 5.5-1b** would be required during construction of improvements associated with **MM 5.16-1** through **MM 5.16-4**. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

### **Mitigation Measures:**

MM 5.5-1a: Should any additional archaeological discoveries (human skeletal remains, culturally modified lithic materials, structural features or historic artifacts) or paleontological resources be encountered during ground disturbing activities, all such activities shall halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to determine the nature of the find, evaluate its significance, and if necessary, suggest preservation or mitigation measures.

MM 5.5-1b: If human remains are discovered during development of the project, all activity shall cease immediately, the Contractor shall notify the Shasta County Coroner's Office immediately under State law, and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor shall be contacted. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the remains interred as provided for by law.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Impacts would be *less than significant* with mitigation incorporated.

---

<b>IMPACT 5.5-2</b>	<b><i>Implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.</i></b>
-------------------------	---

---

**Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.**

**Impact Analysis:** Pedestrian field surveys of the project area and record searches did not identify any evidence of paleontological resources on or within the vicinity of the proposed project. In addition, the soils found onsite are not old enough to yield significant paleontological resources. Any undocumented

prehistoric resources encountered during project development activities would be protected in accordance with **MM 5.5-1a**, above. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures:** Implement **MM 5.5-1a**.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Impacts would be *less than significant* with mitigation incorporated.

## 5.5.6 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

<b>IMPACT</b> 5.5-3	<i>Implementation of the proposed project, along with any foreseeable development in the project vicinity, could result in the potential cumulative impacts to historic or prehistoric resources or the destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.</i>
------------------------	--

---

**Significance:** Potentially Significant Impact.

**Cumulative Setting:** The geographic scope for cumulative impacts to cultural resources includes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects as identified in Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS. Impacts of the proposed project would be cumulatively considerable if they have the potential to combine with similar impacts of the identified cumulative projects.

**Impact Analysis:** Potential cumulative impacts would be site-specific and would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Each incremental development would be required to comply with all applicable State, federal, and County regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources. In consideration of these regulations, potential cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be considered *less than significant*.

Excavation activities associated with the proposed project in conjunction with other projects in the region could contribute to the progressive loss of fossil remains, as-yet unrecorded cultural or paleontological resources, associated geological and geographic data, and fossil bearing strata. Though not likely, construction activities associated with the proposed project could contribute to the cumulative loss of archaeological and paleontological resources and result in adverse cumulative impacts. However, with implementation of **MM 5.5-1a** and **MM 5.5-1b**, adverse impacts on archaeological resources and buried human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, resulting from the proposed project would be *less than significant* because similar mitigation would also be imposed on other projects in and throughout the County and region to reduce each individual project's impact on cultural resources. Consequently, with implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulatively considerable impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures:** Implement **MM 5.5-1a** and **MM 5.5-1b**.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation:** Cumulative impacts related cultural resources would be *less than significant*.