5.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is to identify the potential for cultural resources to occur on the proposed project site and to assess the significance of such resources. 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 cultural resources is derived from the following sources available for review at the City of Redding Development Services Department, Planning Division:

- City of Redding. *2000 – 2020 General Plan.* October 2000.
- ENPLAN. *Cultural Resources Inventory Report, North State Pavilion, Shasta County, California*. April 2017.
- Natural Investigations Company. *Phase II Subsurface Archaeological Testing and Evaluation of Site CA-SHA-214 (P-45-000214) for the North State Pavilion Project, Shasta County, California*. May 2017.

Information on the specific location of prehistoric and historic sites is confidential and exempt from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the California Public Records Act (CPRA); therefore, this information has been redacted for use in this Draft EIR. Professionally qualified individuals, as determined by the California Office of Historic Preservation, may contact the City of Redding directly in order to inquire about its availability.

5.4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

ETHNOGRAPHIC

At the time of European-American contact (1830-40), the project area was occupied by the Wintu (DuBois 1935; Kroeber 1976; LaPena 1978; Moratto 1984). The Wintu traditionally inhabited most areas of what is now western Shasta County. The following summary is based on the ethnographic work by DuBois (1935); Kroeber (1976); LaPena (1978); Moratto (1984); and Hildebrandt and Darcangelo (2008).

The Wintu belong to the family of Penutian speakers, a linguistic stock whose members are found throughout California within four main language families including Wintun, Maiduan, Yokutsan, and Utian. Wintun language subgroups consist of Wintu (Northern Wintun), Nomlaki (Central Wintun) and Patwin (Southern Wintun). Historical linguists suggest that the Wintun language originated in Oregon, as their language has retained words for certain plants and animals that existed only in Oregon. It is estimated that the Wintu arrived in the Sacramento Valley approximately 1,000 to 1,200 years ago, resulting in the displacement of Hokan-speaking peoples from the area. The pre-contact Wintu population is estimated to have been 14,250 individuals.

Wintu political organization consisted of nine tribelets, each of which was an independent social group that maintained a well-defined territory. Each territory was further divided into villages and camps, with villages being the primary social, political, and economic unit of the tribelet. The villages would contain between five and fifty conical bark houses, which could each accommodate between three to seven family members. The structures were semi-subterranean and were constructed using vertical wood

poles and evergreen boughs/bark for structure coverage. Some of the larger villages also had an earthen lodge, which would serve as a gathering place for men. Unlike many hunter-gatherer groups, the Wintu were socioeconomically stratified, with each tribelet having a chief or headman.

The Wintu practiced a semi-sedentary subsistence/settlement strategy. Year-round villages were common, as were seasonal camps. A seasonal subsistence strategy focused on the collection of plant foods, hunting, and fishing. During the winter, most people lived in villages along the river, eating stored foods such as dried salmon, acorns, and a variety of small seed crops. In the spring and summer, people would establish ephemeral campsites in upland areas where they gathered clover, tubers, berries, and various seed crops; hunted deer and rabbit; collected grasshoppers; and fished for salmon and steelhead. In the autumn, the Wintu would harvest acorns and pine nuts, hunt black bear, and fish for salmon.

The Wintu utilized a wide variety of resources in the production of tools and other utilitarian items. Woodland, grassland, and riverine environments provided a variety of materials suitable to a wide range of economic activities. Many utilitarian and non-utilitarian implements were crafted including bows, arrows, spears, clubs, slings, ropes, nets, rafts, basketry, clothing of hides and pelts, pipes, and other items. Extensive trade existed within and between various Wintu villages, and limited trade existed with adjacent groups such as the Shasta, Pomo, and Chimariko.

Relationships between European-American settlers and the Wintu during the 1850s were largely described in terms of violent conflict. It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of the Wintu population living along the Sacramento River was lost to malaria and influenza epidemics brought about by the arrival of European-American trappers and settlers in the early to mid- 1800s (LaPena, 1978). In 1910, there were an estimated 395 Wintu remaining (LaPena, 1978).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL

The earliest systematic archaeological investigations in northern California were conducted during the 1930s and 1940s and were associated with the construction of Shasta Dam and other Central Valley Project features (CVP). A large number of prehistoric midden sites were recorded along the Sacramento, Pit, and McCloud Rivers, and Squaw Valley Creek, with artifact assemblages suggesting that habitation of the sites by Penutian-speaking Wintu occurred about 1,000 years ago. These assemblages were referred to as the Redding Aspect of the Augustine Pattern, or the Shasta Complex. The Shasta Complex was characterized by a sedentary settlement/subsistence pattern with year-round emphasis on riverine resources.

Later work at Squaw Valley Creek suggested occupation of the area began about 6,500 years ago. Cultural constituents from this early period suggest cultural affiliation with the Borax Lake area, and the artifact assemblages suggest that Hokan-speaking peoples inhabited these sites. More recent work in Northern California at Clear Lake near Borax Lake provides clear evidence that the region was first colonized at the end of the Pleistocene and associated with the “Western Clovis Tradition,” dating around 13,500 years ago. Obsidian data collected in that area indicates use may have begun as early as 16,000 to 20,000 years ago, although this has not been absolutely confirmed.

Subsequent work in Northern California and Shasta County has resulted in a very complex, and somewhat inconsistent, local and regional archaeological record consisting of various temporal and cultural sequences. The best supported chronological sequence for the region recognizes four cultural

patterns, each corresponding to a specific temporal interval: Borax Lake Pattern (ca. 8,000-5,000 Before Present [B.P.]), Squaw Creek Pattern (ca. 5,000-3,000), Whiskeytown Pattern (ca. 4,000-1,700 B.P.), and the Augustine Pattern/Shasta Complex (ca. Post-1,700 B.P.).

HISTORIC

The first recorded historic use of the region by European-Americans occurred during the late 1820s and early 1830s, when the trapping expeditions of Jedediah Strong Smith, Peter Skene Ogden, and the Hudson Bay Company entered the Sacramento Valley (Petersen 1965). European-American population increases occurred within Shasta County in excess of 100 percent from 1850-1860, 1870-1880, and 1930-1940 (Shasta County, 1975). Five key episodes contributed to European-American settlement and population increases in Shasta County: (1) the acquisition of the Rancho Buenaventura land grant by Pearson B. Reading in 1844, his discovery of gold on Clear Creek in 1848, and the subsequent California Gold Rush that began in late 1849; (2) the Homestead Act of 1862; (3) the arrival of the Central Pacific Railroad in 1872; (4) the copper mining boom that began in the late 1880s; and, (5) the Central Valley Project of 1935, which provided relief from the Great Depression throughout the Sacramento Valley region, especially at Shasta Dam.

The project area was once owned by Major Pierson B. Reading who owned a large swath of land in Shasta County known as Ranch San Buenaventura. Ranch San Buenaventura was a land grant given by the Mexican Government to Major Reading in December 1844 (Smith, 1999). Reading received a patent for this grant from the United States government in 1854, which consisted of six square leagues of land on the west side of the Sacramento River, extending from Salt Creek in Redding south to the mouth of Cottonwood Creek (Smith, 1999). Rancho San Buenaventura supported many different pastoral and agricultural activities over time, including cattle, grapes, olives, pears, grain, cotton, and vegetables. More famously, Clear Creek on Rancho San Buenaventura is where gold was first discovered in Shasta County.

Floodplains and raised uplands adjacent to local creeks provided prime agricultural lands suitable for farming, ranching, and cattle grazing. The production of agricultural goods for the local economy played a vital role in supporting population increases within the Redding area and at various Shasta County gold fields and towns, especially prior to the arrival of the railroad. With the arrival of the railroad in 1872, agricultural goods could also be produced for export to the wider California and national economies. This allowed for the continuance and growth of Shasta County's agricultural economy despite the boom-and-bust nature of the mining economy.

The California and Oregon Railroad (owned by the "Big Four" – Crocker, Hopkins, Huntington, and Stanford) established the town of Redding in 1872 at Poverty Flat, where the construction of the California segment of the Transcontinental Railroad (TCR) from Marysville to Redding terminated. Rail construction commenced north of Redding through the Sacramento River canyon in 1882, and in 1887 joined the rail in Ashland, Oregon, which was already connected to Portland. Between 1872 and 1882, Redding served as the northernmost termination point for the TCR in California, allowing travelers from the Atlantic Coast and Midwest to travel and settle in the area, and economic goods to be imported and exported. Redding was incorporated in 1887, and in 1888 became the Shasta County seat over the objections of the town of Shasta (Petersen 1965; Smith 1999).

Shasta County and the City of Redding benefited from the construction of the Shasta Dam and related flood control systems when work began in 1937. Workers and their families inundated the area during the years of the Great Depression, and settled there as work continued on the dam until its completion in 1944. The Trinity River Project and the construction of Whiskeytown Dam provided needed jobs in the 1960s, after the demise of the local mining industry. The two dams and their associated lakes created a recreation-related industry for the City of Redding and surrounding areas that has economically supported the region into the twenty-first century.

Site History

A review of historic aerial photographs and historic maps indicate the project vicinity, including the project area, remained undeveloped from 1894 to 1913, with the exception of Free Bridge over the Sacramento River. By 1944, the first Cypress Avenue Bridge replaced Free Bridge, and residential and commercial development occurred in the project vicinity beginning in 1944.

By 1944, residential buildings were located on the southern arm of the project area, although the rest remained undeveloped. From 1964 to 1967, JH Hein Co. occupied this southern arm. By 1969, the buildings were gone, and the land was used as a storage yard. To the west of the southern arm, outside the project area, a lumber mill was present between 1944 and 1988, operated by Calaran Lumber Corporation from 1980 to 1988.

By 1952, a concrete plant had been established in the southern half of the project area, with the predominant land use in the project vicinity commercial. The facility was operated by Redding Transit Mix, Inc. from 1952 to 1997 and also by Kettlewell J. Rexford Ready Mix Concrete in 1959. Other businesses also used the land owned by the concrete facility, including Don's Auto Repair from 1988 to 1997, Hard Rock Construction Inc. Building contactors from 1985 to 1998, and Dan Palmer Trucking in 1989. An abandoned fuel dispensing station with an underground storage tank (UST) was located on the property in 1997, the concrete facility removed by 1998, and one UST removed in 2007. As discussed in the cultural resources inventory for the current project and the appended archaeological site record (McCoy, 2016; Shaw, 2016), most of the structures associated with the plant have been removed or partially demolished. The structural remains of the facility (concrete slab foundations, isolated pillars, and partial retaining walls and loading ramps), recorded as the Henderson Concrete Plant archaeological site, are in poor condition, and were found not eligible for listing in the National Record of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

5.4.2 METHODOLGY AND FINDINGS

LITERATURE REVIEW

A cultural resource literature review was conducted for the proposed project and surrounding area. The following sources were consulted to obtain information concerning known archaeological sites, historic properties, and historic activities within and/or adjacent to the project area:

- Review of maps, aerial photographs, and records for archaeological surveys, sites, and other cultural resources in this portion of Shasta County, as well as a review for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

- A search of the records in the California Historical Resource Information System's (CHRIS) Northeast Information Center for any previous surveys of prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, archaeological resources, or traditional cultural properties within a half-mile radius of the proposed project site.

- A review of historic maps and databases, including federal and state listings of historic places, land patent records from the Bureau of Land Management, and historic aerial photos, to identify any known or suspected cultural properties at or near the proposed project site. Other databases include the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); California Inventory of Historic Resources; California Historical Landmarks; and the California Points of Historical Interest.

- A Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The records search covered an approximately one-half-mile radius around the project area for previously recorded archaeological sites and previous archaeological surveys. The size and scope of the search area was determined to be sufficient based on the results.

- Requests to the Shasta County Historical Society, City of Redding, and past owners of the site to obtain any information about events, people, or resources of historical significance on the property. Research of properties in the Historic Property Data Files for Shasta County (2012).

Findings

The various searches and investigative efforts to identify cultural resources at the project site yielded the following results.

- A records and literature search revealed that fourteen archaeological surveys have previously been conducted within a half-mile radius of the project area, four of which included portions of the proposed project area. There are eight previously recorded historic and prehistoric archaeological sites within a half-mile radius of the project area. One prehistoric site presumed eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) has been previously recorded within the project area. The *Cultural Resources Inventory Report* and the *Phase II Subsurface Archaeological Testing and Evaluation of Site CA-SHA-214 (P-45-000214) for the North State Pavilion Project* are available at the City of Redding Planning Division to qualified professionals.

- Review of the NRHP, CRHR, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and the California Points of Historical Interest identified four Historic Properties in the project vicinity. The Cascade Theater, Old City Hall, Pine Street School, and the Edward Frisbie House are all located in the project vicinity. These four Historic Properties are all located in downtown Redding between 1.8 and 2.5 miles northwest of the project area.

- The earliest map of the area is the 1855 USGS original survey plat, which shows the project area as undeveloped at the time. Patent records for the project area indicate that the land was owned by Pierson B. Reading starting in 1857 and later by Andrew Hughes starting in 1890. No additional information could be found about Andrew Hughes, but additional information regarding the importance of Pierson B. Reading to the region can be found in the Section 4.4 of

the Phase II Subsurface report. Other maps reviewed included the 1890 and 1894 topographic maps which indicate that a bridge over the Sacramento River was present in the project vicinity. No other features are noted in the project area or wider vicinity.

- The search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC did not identify any Native American cultural resources at the proposed project site. The Wintu Tribe of Northern California was designated by the NAHC as the MLD for the project area.

- The field survey found evidence of a concrete plant, which is not considered a cultural resource, as it is not a distinctive item and not associated with any distinct person, location, or event of historical significance.

- A Request for Comment letter was sent to the Shasta Historical Society on September 15, 2016. No response was received.

Site CA-SHA-214

CA-SHA-214 was originally identified by Dotta (1959) and described as a proto-historic Wintu village site. No other information was provided on the original Site Record, except that the soil was dark and it would be a good site to sample. The site was revisited by Clewett in 1977 and approximate boundaries were delineated. Clewett (1977:4) states that the site is a large, rocky, grey midden site and a local, unnamed historian is credited with stating that human burials have been exposed at this site during past construction activities. The original site boundaries place this site to the north of the current project APE, and a note dated 1977 attached to the Site Record states that the "site is now partly under a car dealership and the remainder of the area has been terraced for development" (handwritten note is by L. Roberts and M. Banta). Clewett states that the exact boundaries of the site are unknown, and the map in Clewett's report shows the "approximate limits of the buried site" with the southern boundary as Cypress Avenue, the eastern boundary as Hemsted Drive, and the western boundary as the top edge of the bank above the Sacramento River. Clewett also states that the site is buried under a minimum of five feet of sterile fill, based on a study conducted by CH2M-Hill (1977:4).

A subsurface component of CA-SHA-214 was identified within the current project's APE during the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project, which resulted in the implementation of an emergency archaeological data-recovery and monitoring program (Jones and Stokes 2008). The emergency data recovery field efforts focused on those areas that had been previously excavated: Trench 1 (350 ft. long trench for utility line), Trench 2 (excavation area for new wall/bridge construction), Trench 3 (small area excavation trench located on the south side of staging yard), and the Abutment 6 excavation area. Work was conducted over three days and included excavating two possible hearth features visible in Trench 1, defining the extent of the prehistoric 'midden' layer associated with the site at Trench 2, and profiling and describing the historic-era materials encountered in the Abutment 6 excavation area. Prehistoric midden, characterized by whole and fragmentary freshwater shell and dark blackish-brown organic soils, was observed in Trenches 1, 2, and 3. Midden was not observed in the Abutment 6 excavation, which was characterized as being within historic-era fill.

The sections of the site identified during data recovery efforts were found to contain a prehistoric midden deposit likely associated with the Late Prehistoric Period Wintu occupation of the area. Excavations yielded a collection of 282 artifacts, consisting of mostly flaked stone tools and debitage. Isolated human remains were also recovered during project excavations. Efforts undertaken for the

project were limited to 'emergency' or 'salvage' data recovery in the areas that had been disturbed by construction-related activities. Methods for the emergency data recovery and monitoring were determined in consultation with the City of Redding, Caltrans, Parson Brinkerhoff, and interested Native American individuals. Work was limited to those areas within the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project's APE. Based on the presence of human remains, CA-SHA-214 was assumed eligible for listing, but it was outside the scope of the emergency data recovery project to conduct a formal evaluation. Jones and Stokes (2008) recommended that if further ground disturbance is proposed to take place within or adjacent to the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project APE that archaeological monitoring and/or a testing and evaluation program be implemented prior to any ground disturbance and/or construction.

FIELD SURVEY

A pedestrian survey was conducted on September 27, 2016. The entire site was surveyed with transects spaced approximately fifteen meters apart; duff was cleared at 10-meter intervals where needed to facilitate visual access to the ground surface. Areas with exposed subsurface soil, including rodent burrows and ditches, were thoroughly inspected for evidence of any possible buried cultural deposits and/or soil differentiation. The purpose of the survey was to identify cultural resources that would be potentially affected by the proposed project.

Findings

Based on the criteria outlined in Subsection 5.4.4, *Regulatory Setting*, below, the Henderson Concrete Plant Site is not eligible for either the NRHP or the CRHR. Namely, the Henderson Concrete Plant is in very poor condition and therefore lacks integrity. Moreover, it is not associated with events making a significant contribution to the National or California's history and cultural heritage or with lives of persons important in the past; does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; and it has not yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. One new historic-era site was identified and recorded during survey. The newly recorded site does not meet the eligibility criteria of the NRHP of CRHR and requires no further consideration.

Much of the project area has been subject to prior disturbance and is currently under pavement or aggregated base. During the survey, numerous homeless camps were encountered, which partially constrained survey coverage, partially in the area of the cement works site. Notably, the project area found within the boundary of CA-SHA-214 (as recorded by Jones and Stokes, 2000) is covered by aggregate base, thereby rendering it impossible to verify the presence and recorded boundaries of the site within the project area from survey alone. As a result, a Phase II study was recommended and initiated as documented below.

PHASE II STUDY

The Phase II study entailed subsurface testing, data analysis, and evaluation of the portion of archaeological site CA-SHA-214 within the project area. The previously recorded site has been characterized as primarily a single-component, prehistoric occupation site dating to the Late Prehistoric Period. A prior emergency data recovery effort, accomplished in 2007 within a limited portion of the site in the northern extent of the project area, considered the site as being eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR under Criterion D/4. That study also substantially expanded the site boundaries in the area

south of Cypress Avenue, including the project area. Due to the limitations of the previous emergency data recovery effort, however, the horizontal and vertical extent of the site remained unclear.

The objectives of the field investigation were to define the vertical and horizontal extent of any intact archaeological deposits of CA-SHA-214 within the proposed project area, to characterize the nature of such deposits (e.g., physical integrity and richness), and to recover artifacts and other data with which to address identified research issues and facilitate NRHP and CRHR eligibility recommendations.

Findings

The Phase II testing determined that the portion of CA-SHA-214 within the project area south of Cypress Avenue does not contribute to any potential eligibility of the portion of the site north of the project area for listing in the NRHP or CRHR under any significance criteria.

The Phase II study also uncovered additional remnants of a former concrete plant, previously recorded in a portion of the southern extent of the project area and found it not eligible for NRHP or CRHR listing, affirming the field survey assessment by Shaw in 2016. The boundaries of the Henderson Concrete Plant archaeological site have been redrawn as a result of the Phase II study and the site record updated. No further work or protection was recommended for the NRHP- and CRHR-ineligible structural remains of the Henderson Concrete Plant site.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

A request for a Sacred Lands Search and a Native American contact list was sent to the NAHC on June 13, 2016. The NAHC responded on June 15, 2016, noting that their records did not indicate the presence of sacred lands in the project vicinity.

The Wintu Tribe of Northern California was designated by the NAHC as the MLD for the project area. A request for comment letters were sent on September 6, 2016, to Keli Hayward, Wintu Tribe of Northern California; Marilyn Delgado, Chairperson, Nor-Rel-Muk Nation; Caleen Sisk-Franco, Tribal Chair, Winnemem Wintu Tribe; Mickey Gemmill, Chairperson, Pit River Tribe; Tribal Historic Preservation Office, Pit River Tribe; Jack Potter Jr., Chairperson, Redding Rancheria; and James Hayward Sr., Cultural Resources Program Manager, Redding Rancheria. No responses were received. Refer to Section 5.15, TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES, for a discussion of Tribal consultation conducted pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52.

5.4.3 REGULATORY SETTING

The following is a description of federal, State, and local environmental laws and policies that are relevant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process.

FEDERAL

National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP is the official list of sites deemed worthy of preservation due to their importance to American history, architecture, archeology, or culture. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 authorizes the list.

The 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 (36 CFR Section 60.4) to evaluate significance, developed by the National Park Service (NPS) as per provisions of the NHPA:

> *"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)."*

Additionally, listed sites must be at least 50 years old, although this may be waived for exceptional cases. A resource must retain integrity to be considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. Integrity is the authenticity of the physical identity that is evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Resources must retain enough of their character or appearance to be recognizable as resources and to convey the reasons for their significance.

Section 101(d)(6)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) allows properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to a Native American tribe to be determined eligible for NRHP inclusion. In addition, a broader range of Traditional Cultural Properties (TRPs) is also considered and may be determined eligible for or listed in the NRHP. A TCP is a property associated with the cultural practices or beliefs of a living community; TCPs are rooted in that community. In the NRHP programs, "culture" is understood to mean the traditions, beliefs, practices, life-ways, arts, crafts, and social institutions of any community, be it an Indian tribe, a local ethnic group, or the nation as a whole.

STATE

California Register of Historical Resources

In 1992, the Governor signed Assembly Bill 2881 (AB 2881) into law establishing the CRHR. As provided in California Public Resources Code Section 5020.4, the California legislature established the CRHR in 1992. The CRHR is used as a guide by a state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state historical resources and properties to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from

substantial adverse change. The CRHR, as instituted by the California Public Resources Code, automatically includes all California properties already listed in the NRHP and those formally determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, State Landmarks, and State Points of Interests. The CRHR may also include various other types of historical resources that meet the criteria for eligibility, including the following:

- *Individual historic resources.*
- *Resources that contribute to a historic district.*
- *Resources identified as significant in historic surveys.*
- *Resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through Category 5 in the State Inventory (Categories 3 and 4 refer to potential eligibility for the NRHP; Category 5 indicates a property with local significance).*

The CRHR follows the lead of the NRHP in utilizing the 50-year threshold: a resource is usually considered for its historical significance only after it reaches the age of 50 years. This threshold is not absolute, but was selected as a reasonable span of time after which a professional evaluation of historical value/importance can be made.

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 NRHP and the CRHR.

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 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 CPRA 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 CHRIS maintained by the OHP 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 CRHR, 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.*

California Native American Heritage Commission

The NAHC is the primary state agency responsible for identifying and cataloging Native American cultural resources. It works to prevent irreparable damage to designated sacred sites and interference with expressions of Native American human remains found outside of a dedicated cemetery, who can then make recommendations on the treatment and disposition of the remains. The NAHC is also responsible for mediating disputes that may arise during the disposition of any remains. The guidelines also establish the NAHC to identify the most likely descendent of any remains and to mediate disputes regarding the disposition.

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.

California Health and Safety Code

Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code makes it a misdemeanor to intentionally disturb, mutilate, or remove interred human remains. It also requires that if human remains are discovered outside of a dedicated cemetery, any excavation or disturbance of the site stop until the county coroner make a report. Under this section, if the county coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours. Additionally, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, Section 15064.5(d) of the state *CEQA Guidelines* outlines the procedures to be used if Native American human remains are unexpectedly found on non-federal land. The guidelines protect the remains from accidental or deliberate destruction or disturbance, and establish procedures to appropriately and sensitively address such a discovery.

LOCAL

City of Redding General Plan

A general plan is a community's long-range blueprint for growth and development. The City of Redding adopted its current *2000-2020 General Plan*, in 2000 and has made occasional updates since. Cultural resources are addressed through various goals and policies of the Natural Resources Element. Applicable goals and policies relative to the proposed project site are listed in Table 5.4-1, CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE CITY OF REDDING GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES, followed by a brief explanation of how the proposed project complies with the goals and policies.

Table 5.4-1
CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE CITY OF REDDING GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES

General Plan Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis
GENERAL PLAN GOAL NR12 *PROTECT AND ENHANCE HISTORICAL AND CULTURALLY SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES WITHIN THE PLANNING AREA.*	
Policy NR12A: Ensure protection of prehistoric, cultural, and archaeological resources during the development process.	**Consistent.** Mitigation Measures **MM5.4-1a** through **MM5.4-1e** ensure the protection of prehistoric, cultural, and archaeological resources during the development process. Of particular note is **MM5.4-1c** that requires that the project applicant provide written evidence to the City's Development Services Department that a tribal (Wintu) monitor has been retained to be present during construction, specifically during initial ground disturbance, in the instance that any prehistoric artifacts, midden soils, or human remains are encountered.
Policy NR12B: Refer development proposals that may adversely affect archaeological sites to the California Archaeological Inventory, Northeast Information Center, at Chico State University	**Consistent.** A search of the records in the California Historical Resource Information System's (CHRIS) Northeast Information Center for any previous surveys of prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, archaeological resources, or traditional cultural properties within a half-mile radius of the proposed project site was undertaken by the applicant's consultant. All the information was provided to the City's Planning Division.
Policy NR12C: Encourage public and private efforts to identify, preserve, protect, and/or restore historic buildings, structures, landmarks, and important cultural resources.	**Consistent.** Former building foundations were found on the project site, however, the integrity of these foundations have been severely compromised and no historic value remains.
Policy NR 12D: The City shall not knowingly approve any public or private project that may adversely affect an archaeological site without first consulting the Archaeological Inventory, Northeast Information Center, conducting a site evaluation as may be indicated, and attempting to mitigate any adverse impacts according to the recommendations of a qualified archaeologist. City implementation of this policy shall be guided by Appendix "K" of the *CEQA Guidelines*.	**Consistent.** Refer to Subsection 5.4.2, *Methodology and Findings*, which identifies the sources that were consulted to obtain information concerning known archaeological sites, historic properties, and historic activities within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area. Findings are presented based on the various searches and investigative efforts undertaken to identify cultural resources at the project site. Within the project area was a recorded site where human remains were found adjacent to the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). Environmental documentation for that project recommended that if further ground disturbance was proposed within or adjacent to the Cypress Bridge Replacement APE that archaeological monitoring and/or a testing and evaluation program be implemented prior to any ground disturbance and/or construction. An initial survey by a qualified archaeologist was conducted in September 2016. Due to much of the area being covered by aggregate base, it was deemed impossible to verify the presence and recorded boundaries of the site within the project area from the pedestrian survey alone. As a result, a Phase II study was initiated. The Phase II testing determined that the portion of the recorded site within the project area south of Cypress Avenue does not contribute to any potential eligibility of the portion of the site north of the project area for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources under any significance criteria. Regardless, as noted in the Consistency Analysis for Policy NR12A, **MM5.4-1a** through **MM5.4-1e** ensure the protection of prehistoric, cultural, and archaeological resources during the development process.

Source: City of Redding. *2000 – 2020 General Plan*. October 2000.

Redding Municipal Code

The Redding Municipal Code (RMC) includes Chapter 18.23, *Historic/Architectural Preservation*, dedicated to the preservation of historic and architectural resources throughout the City. This section has the express purpose of identifying and maintaining historically important sites, and implementing various programs to ensure that these resources are protected. This section establishes a Local Register of Qualified and Candidate Historical Properties, to determine sites that are of historical significance. Public properties are placed on the Local Register if they are listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP, the CRHR, the list of California Historical Landmarks, or the list of State Points of Historical Interest. Private properties may be eligible if they meet at least one of nine criteria:

- *Have significant inherit character, interest or value as part of the development or heritage of the community, state, or nation.*
- *Are the site of an event significant in local, state, or national history*.
- *Are associated with a person or persons who contributed significantly to the culture and development of the community, state, or nation.*
- *Exemplify the cultural, political, economic, social, ethnic, or historic heritage of the community, state, or nation.*
- *Embody distinguishing characteristics of a type, style, period, or specimen in architecture or engineering.*
- *Are the work of a person whose work has influenced significantly the development of the community, state, or nation.*
- *Contain elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation.*
- *Represent an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood or community.*
- *Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history.*

The municipal code also allows owners of sites listed on the Local Register to participate in the Mills Act Historical Property Tax Incentive Program, which allows owners to enter into contracts with the City to potentially pay lower property taxes if they agree to maintain (and if needed, restore) their properties.

5.4.4 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. The following significance thresholds related to cultural resources have been derived from Public Resources Code §21084(e) and State *CEQA Guidelines* §15064.5(b):

- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.* Refer to Impact 5.4-1, below.
- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.* Refer to Impact 5.4-1, below.
- *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.* Refer to Impact 5.4-2, below.
- *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.* Refer to Impact 5.4-3, below.

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.

5.4.6 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 resource impacts are analyzed below according to topic. Mitigation measures directly correspond with an identified impact.

IMPACT 5.4-1	***Implementation of the proposed project may cause a significant impact to historic, unique archaeological or prehistoric resources.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: Cultural resources are evaluated under Section 106 in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The NRHP significance criteria were previously described in Subsection 5.4.3, *Regulatory Setting,* above. Relative to eligible CRHR resources, such resources can include 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, historical resources must meet the criteria described in Subsection 5.4.3. If no eligible resources are identified within the project area, then the project is not considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources.

In addition, State regulations require that measures be taken to protect any resources that are uncovered during construction, and compliance with State *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(f) requires that construction activities halt if potentially significant resources are discovered until the resources can be assessed by a qualified person. The findings from the *Cultural Resources Inventory Report* (ENPLAN, 2017) have been referenced when determining potential impacts of the proposed project.

Prehistoric Resources

The soils in the project area are mapped as Reiff fine sandy loam along with the eastern margin, simply as River-wash adjacent to the river, and Cobbly alluvial land in between (California Soil Resource Lab, 2017; Soil Survey Staff, 2017). Reiff soils and the Cobbly alluvial land are found on floodplains, while the River-wash unit is present in drainageways. As found by recent geo-archaeological research in this region, Cobbly alluvial land dates to the Historic-Modern era (<150 years before present [BP]) and has a very high potential for buried cultural deposits (Meyer, 2013). The River-wash unit found in active or recent channels is also Historical-Modern in age but has a very low potential for buried cultural deposits. Dating to the Recent Holocene (1000-150 BP), the Reiff soil series has a very high potential for buried cultural deposits.

The results of archival research, 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. The records search and historic research identify extensive prehistoric sites nearby. The immediate vicinity of the project area has been occupied by humans for at least the past six millennia. Although the project area does not lie in the most sensitive area for prehistoric village sites, the project area was certainly utilized as part of a catchment area. Evidence for prehistoric occupation and use likely to be found in the area would include, but is not limited to, chipped stone tools of basalt, meta-volcanics, obsidian, and chert; stone cores from which flakes have been expediently removed; associated chipped stone debitage; and ground stone, including basalt or andesite manos and metates or mortars and pestles.

As previously discussed above, Phase II testing conducted on the onsite portion of CA-SHA-214 south of Cypress Avenue does not contribute to any potential eligibility of the portion of the site north of the project area for listing in the NRHP or CRHR under any significance criteria. Considering the results of this Phase II study and the lengthy history of extensive disturbance within the project area (grading, leveling, commercial and residential development, roads or parking lots, removal of buildings and structures, mechanical compaction of historic-era fill and petroleum-based road material, and recent trenching for the Cypress Bridge Replacement Project staging area), combined with the results of the previous limited data recovery, the potential for discovery of intact archaeological deposits or features by implementation of this project is considered low (NIC, 2017).

Historic Resources

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it caused a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Based on the results of the investigations described in this section under “existing conditions,” there are no known historical resources at the proposed project site. The project site has remained predominantly underdeveloped and uninhabited in pre-modern history, and the few items that have been found on the property are not considered culturally significant.

Based on the criteria outlined in Subsection 5.4.3, *Regulatory Setting,* the Henderson Concreate Plant Site is not eligible for either the NRHP or the CRHR. Namely, the Henderson Concrete Plant is in very poor condition and therefore lacks integrity. Moreover, it is not associated with events making a significant contribution to the National or California’s history and cultural heritage or with lives of persons important in the past; does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; and it has not yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. As this former facility is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR, it is not considered a historic

property for the purpose of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act or a historical resource for the purpose of CEQA.

It is expected that the project area will have a high 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 NRHP or the CRHR. Natural Resources Element Goal 12 of the *General Plan* was developed to, "protect and enhance historical and culturally significant resources within the planning area." Policy NR12A implements this goal by establishing the City's policy to, "ensure protection of prehistoric, cultural, and archaeological resources during the development process." The *General Plan* EIR states that this policy and related policies mitigate the potential impacts of new development in areas which may contain important archaeological, historical, or prehistoric resources.

Although the potential for discovery of intact archaeological deposits or features by implementation of this project is considered low, and the portion of the site within the project area is considered ineligible for NRHP or CRHR inclusion, isolated human remains were found near Cypress Avenue at depths of 1.4 and 2 feet during the emergency data recovery effort in 2007. Construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Part 61) is thus recommended for ground-disturbance activity within the redrawn boundaries of CA-SHA-214. Although no human remains were found during the Phase II study, monitoring will ensure that any additional human remains that may be discovered are fully protected during implementation of the project. Based on the results of the excavations coupled with the evidence for extensive disturbance of the land, archaeological monitoring is recommended only within the portion of the site boundary in which ground-disturbing activities would exceed a depth of 40 cm (1.3 feet). Measures such as testing any resources found as a result of project development would reduce potential impacts on undocumented resources to *less than significant* levels. To minimize potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources, including Native American cultural resources, **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e** are required. With compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e**, 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 5.14-1, MM 5.14-3** and **MM 5.14-4** in Section 5.14, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION). These improvements would generally occur at-grade similar to existing roadway elevations within previously improved City roadway right-of-way and would be constructed in accordance with City design criteria. Similar to development activities that would occur onsite, implementation of **MM 5.4-1a** through **5.4-1e** would be required during construction of all offsite improvements associated with **MM 5.14-1, MM 5.14-3** and **MM 5.14-4**. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 5.4-1a: In the event that cultural resources including paleontological resources are inadvertently discovered during the project activities, work shall be halted in that area within 100 feet (30 meters) of the find until a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Part 61) can assess the significance of the find (i.e., whether it includes any historical resources, unique archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, or unique paleontological resources). Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to include historical resources, unique archaeological resources, and/or unique paleontological resources, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be

warranted and would be discussed in consultation with Dignity Health or their authorized representative, the City, or any other relevant regulatory agency. This stipulation does not apply to those cultural resources evaluated and determined not Historical Resources/Historic Properties.

MM 5.4-1b: Should any previously unevaluated prehistoric artifacts, midden soils, human remains, etc. be encountered, the project applicant shall notify the Native American community, specifically, the Wintu Tribe.

MM 5.4-1c: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and/or action that would permit project site disturbance (whichever occurs first), the project applicant shall provide written evidence to the City of Redding Development Services Department that the project applicant has retained a tribal (Wintu) monitor to be present during construction, specifically during initial ground disturbance, in the instance that any prehistoric artifacts, midden soils, or human remains are encountered.

MM 5.4-1d: If human remains are discovered during development of the project, as per State law, all activity within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease immediately, the Contractor shall immediately notify the Shasta County Coroner's Office, 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 §5097.98. Public Resources Code §5097.98(c) specifically states: "The descendants may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods."

MM 5.4-1e: In the event that the project plan changes to include areas not surveyed, additional archaeological reconnaissance may be required.

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

IMPACT 5.4-2	***Implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: Pedestrian field surveys of the project area, record searches, and the Phase II investigation 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 5.4-1a**, above. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement **MM 5.4-1a**, as described above

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

IMPACT 5.4-3	***Implementation of the proposed project could potentially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: As previously discussed under Impact 5.4-1 above, buried human remains that were not identified during field surveys could be inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, which could result in damage to these human remains. The project would comply with strict adherence to California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code (as amended by Assembly Bill 2641) should human remains be encountered. Pursuant to the codes, all work in the immediate vicinity of the burial must cease, and any necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area must be taken, as addressed in **MM 5.4-1d**. Impacts would therefore be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement **MM 5.4-1d**, as described above.

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

5.4.6 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of cumulative impacts focuses on those effects that, when combined together with other similar activities or projects could result in a large enough effect or impact that would be considered cumulatively significant. If the individual project's contribution is substantial enough, it may be considered cumulatively significant. In some instances, a project-specific impact may not combine with effects from other activities, in which case, the project's contribution to a cumulative effect would be less than considerable.

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. This geographic limitation is appropriate as cultural resource impacts are generally localized, site specific and either individually impacted in a way that changes the significance of the resource or avoided.

IMPACT 5.4-4	***Implementation of the proposed project, combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could result in potentially cumulative impacts to historic, unique archaeological or prehistoric resources.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: As described in Impact 5.4-1, with implementation of **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e**, direct and indirect impacts to known archaeological sites would be mitigated to a *less than significant* level. In addition, the potential for discovery of buried unknown resources is considered to be low and **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e** would ensure that significant impacts to unknown resources are reduced to a *less than significant* level. The proposed project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts related to archaeological resources, however, would be cumulatively considerable.

Projects identified in Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, would be expected to have mitigation measures, as necessary that would reduce potential impacts on archeological resources through avoidance or mitigation and, therefore, not contribute to a significant cumulative impact. Compliance with CEQA for all projects would be expected to reduce impacts on archaeological resources. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project would not have the potential to combine with impacts from past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects to result in a significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources. Impacts would be cumulatively *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e**, as described above.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Through implementation and compliance with **MM 5.4-1a** through **MM 5.4-1e**, the proposed project's incremental contribution to this impact would be *less than cumulatively considerable*. Successful implementation of mitigation measures identified for this proposed project, combined with individual environmental reviews and adherence with applicable federal, State, and local environmental laws related to historic, unique archaeological or prehistoric resources on a project-by-project basis, would result in cumulatively *less than significant* impacts.

IMPACT 5.4-5	***Implementation of the proposed project, combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: With regard to impacts to paleontological resources, the proposed project would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts within the region as the soils found onsite are not old enough to yield significant paleontological resources. Although undocumented fossils may be discovered during excavation for construction, through implementation of **MM 5.4-1a**, direct impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a level that is *less than significant*. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project related to paleontological resources are not cumulatively considerable.

Project identified in Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, would also be expected to reduce potential impacts on paleontological resources to a *less than significant* level through avoidance or mitigation and, therefore, not contribute to a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project would not have the potential to combine with impacts from past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects to result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources. Impacts would be cumulatively *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement **MM 5.4-1a**, as described above.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Through implementation and compliance with **MM 5.4-1a**, the proposed project's incremental contribution to this impact would be *less than cumulatively considerable*. Successful implementation of mitigation measures identified for this proposed project, combined with individual environmental reviews and adherence with applicable federal, State, and local environmental laws related to paleontological resources on a project-by-project basis, would result in cumulatively *less than significant* impacts.

IMPACT 5.4-6	***Implementation of the proposed project, combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could potentially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.***

Significance: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: Although no human remains have been identified within the project site, to date, there is potential for their discovery during project construction. If human remains were to be discovered during construction, **MM 5.4-1d** would ensure that the remains are treated in accordance with the California Public Resources Code and would not represent a significant unmitigable impact. The project's incremental contribution is therefore not cumulatively considerable. The potential impacts of the other projects identified in Section 4.0, BASIS OF CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS, would also be expected to be reduced by compliance with the Public Resources Code and would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project, combined with impacts from past present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would be cumulatively *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement **MM 5.4-1d**, as described above.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Through implementation and compliance with **MM 5.4-1d**, the proposed project's incremental contribution to this impact would be *less than cumulatively considerable*. Successful implementation of mitigation measures identified for this proposed project, combined with individual environmental reviews and adherence with applicable federal, State, and local environmental laws related to the discovery of human remains on a project-by-project basis, would result in cumulatively *less than significant* impacts.