

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section considers the potential for historical, cultural, and paleontological resources within the Planning Area. This section also evaluates the potential for development within the Planning Area to impact such resources. Definitions of terms used to describe cultural resources are provided. Key issues addressed in this section include potential destruction or damage to any historical, cultural, and paleontological resources resulting from the General Plan Update. Relevant federal, state, and local authorities and plans are identified. The analysis in this section is based on review of applicable published documents, record searches, and consultations with appropriate agencies and individuals. Abbreviated citations for each information source are provided in the text, with full references provided at the end of this section.

CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

The following definitions are common terms used to discuss the regulatory requirements and treatment of cultural resources:

Cultural resources is the term used to describe several different types of properties: prehistoric and historical archaeological sites; historic architectural properties such as buildings, bridges, and infrastructure; resources of importance to Native Americans, and paleontological resources.

Historic properties is a term defined by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property.

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

Listed structure refers to a building that has been formally listed on a historic registry, such as a local list of historic buildings, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places.

Eligible for listing refers to a building, district, site, structure, or object that has been determined, through written analysis, to be eligible for listing on a list of historic resources, at the local, state, or federal level, but not actually listed.

Potentially historical refers to a building, district, site, structure, or object that may be considered historical under local, state, or federal criteria if more documentation or analysis supporting such a conclusion were prepared.

Paleontological resource is defined as including fossilized remains of vertebrate and invertebrate organisms, fossil tracks and trackways, and plant fossils. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil-bearing rock strata.

4.8.1 EXISTING SETTING

PREHISTORY

In the past, only a small number of archeological studies had been conducted in the Planning Area region. This is because earlier archaeological excavations had focused either on the large village sites in the San Joaquin Delta region and along the larger waterways in the Central

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Valley or on the higher elevation areas in proposed reservoir sites, along major waterways in the Sierra Nevada. There is no established pattern of human development through time, as defined by studies of actual archaeological excavation for the Planning Area. The City of Rocklin is located between three areas with defined patterns of human development: the Oroville locality to the north, the Central Sierra area to the east, and the Central Valley/Delta area to the west. These prehistorical areas include many similar artifact types and dates for major cultural changes, but there are also significant differences between them. At this time, it has not been defined which of these nearby patterns of early development best reflects the prehistory of the Planning Area or whether a separate local prehistorical description is necessary to adequately describe the area. It appears that the prehistoric cultures in the Planning Area may have been more closely related to the Sierra Nevada native cultures than those of either the Delta or Oroville area (City of Rocklin 2008).

ETHNOGRAPHY

Prior to the arrival of Euroamericans in the region, California was inhabited by groups of Native Americans speaking more than 100 different languages and occupying a variety of ecological settings. Kroeber (1925) and others recognized the uniqueness of California Native Americans and classified them as belonging to the California culture area. Kroeber (1925) further subdivided California into four subculture areas: Northwestern, Northeastern, Southern, and Central. The Central area encompasses most of the current Planning Area and includes the Nisenan, which were the southern linguistic group of the Maidu tribe. Kroeber (1925) indicated that the range of the Maidu tribe may be described as being "the region from the Sacramento River east to the crest of the Sierra Nevada" and that the Maidu are the second branch of the Penutian family. The Nisenan spoke a dialect which identified them from the Northern Maidu and they diverged into two distinct cultural groups known as the Valley Nisenan and the Foothill (or Mountain and Hill) Nisenan (Placer County Historical Society 2009). Kroeber (1925) distinguished three dialects of Nisenan: Northern Hill Nisenan, Southern Hill Nisenan, and Valley Nisenan.

The Foothill Nisenan peoples, which were found in the Planning Area, were distinctive from the Valley Nisenan and were loosely organized into tribelets or districts with large central villages, surrounded by smaller villages. These are often referred to as winter villages by older Native Americans. These central villages and their leaders seemed to have had power or control over the surrounding smaller villages and camps and specific surrounding territory. The Nisenan depended on activities attuned to the seasons and the accompanying growth of plant foods, the seasonal movements and migration of the animals, and the runs of fish (Wilson and Towne 1978; City of Rocklin 2008).

While the Foothill Nisenan to the east in the foothills carried on trade with the valley peoples and shared some of the cultural traits, their culture was said to lack the complexity and richness of the Valley Nisenan. The Foothill Nisenan had a different natural resource base to utilize, which required more movement and more intense use of the available resources. They developed a local culture that was more closely related to the gathering, storage, and year-round use of the acorn, continual foraging of resources by everyone in the village group, and specialized hunting methods. The foothill people relied more on foraging for food than the Valley people, for immediate use or short-term storage, and did not gather for future needs. As a result, they were required to travel in their use of the land. The Foothill Nisenan people had lower population densities and a higher number of campsites than Valley people, which reflected their more limited ability to acquire and use the fewer available resources (City of Rocklin 2008).

As a result of this continual movement, the Foothill people did not have large year-round villages, in contrast to the Valley permanent village sites and population densities. Instead, there

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

are hundreds of small campsites and villages scattered across the foothills. One of these villages in the City of Rocklin can be identified as "*Ba ka cha*," apparently occupied at the time of contact with non-Native Americans. The location of this site is a recorded location of a prehistoric site in the southeastern section of the city (City of Rocklin 2008). Few villages existed on the valley plain area between the Sacramento River and the foothills, as this area provided only a hunting and gathering ground for the Valley people. The San Joaquin portion of the valley was unknown to the Nisenan (Wilson and Towne 1978).

It appears that the Foothill people were more socially organized around the extended family than the village, and they would often camp in informal family groups around the central village. One village usually played a dominant role in this social-political organization. Most villages had bedrock sites, and other sites included seasonal camps, quarries, ceremonial grounds, trading sites, fishing stations, cemeteries, river crossings, and battlegrounds. The Nisenan gave most physical features in their areas place-names (Wilson and Towne 1978). Since they did some foraging and extensive fishing and hunting in the winter, they needed to have some access to a resource base at all times. However, due to the ability to store acorns and other dried foods and take advantage of the winter concentrations of game, birds, and fish, they could congregate in larger villages in the wintertime. There is some evidence that these winter villages were relocated at times if the local resources were largely depleted. Over a long period of time, a center village may have been abandoned and moved and then reoccupied at a later time. Many place-names refer to these old or unoccupied sites (Wilson and Towne 1978; City of Rocklin 2008.)

The technology of the Nisenan included stone objects, such as knives, arrows and spear points, club heads, arrow straighteners, scrapers, pestles, mortars, pipes, and charms. Materials such as basalt, steatite, chalcedony, jasper, and obsidian were used. Wood was also used for simple bows and grass knives and animal skin-preparation tools. Balsa canoes were made using logs, tule provided material for mats, and baskets were created using willow and rosebud (Wilson and Towne 1978).

HISTORIC CONTEXT

Euroamerican contact with Native American groups living in the Central Valley of California began during the last half of the eighteenth century. The Spanish period in California lasted from about 1769 to 1821. This was a time when the Spanish missions dominated lives of both the Spanish and the Native Americans in California. The Nisenan had brief contact with the Spanish when Moraga traveled through the valley in 1806, Father Duran in 1818, and with the Spanish and Mexican expeditions and escaping missionized Indians. This early contact with the Spanish was said to be limited to the southern edge of Nisenan territory. No record exists of the Nisenan being removed to the missions. They did experience the pressures of Miwoks displaced from their lands on their southern borders (Rocklin Historical Society 2009a; Wilson and Towne 1978).

The Mexican Period (ca. 1821–1848) in California is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system. The Nisenan's first real contact with the Anglos came with the trappers such as Jed Smith and the Hudson Bay Company men after 1828. The trappers established camps in the Nisenan territory and these contacts were peaceful. A devastating epidemic, said to be malaria, spread through the Sacramento Valley in 1833. This epidemic was disastrous to the Valley Nisenan. It is estimated that 75 percent of the native population died in this epidemic. The Foothill Nisenan were not largely affected by the epidemic or early settlers until the discovery of gold and the ensuing Gold Rush. The end of the Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Hidalgo in 1848 marked the beginning of the American period (ca. 1848–Present) in California history.

James Marshall discovered gold, while working for John Sutter, near the settlement of Coloma in 1848. The persecution of the Nisenan began and their culture soon was no longer viable (Wilson and Towne 1978). The Gold Rush of the mid-nineteenth century permanently disrupted the culture of the Nisenan as the gold rush settlers killed many of them or chased them from the land. Descendents of the nineteenth century Nisenan still reside in south Placer County, but the traditional lifeways have not been seen in Rocklin since 1904 (Rocklin Historical Society 2009b).

The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed a growing immigration of Euroamericans into the area. The population growth in the area was accompanied by regional cultural and economic changes. These changes are highlighted by the development of Sacramento and other towns in the area.

Placer County was formed three years after the discovery of gold—the fast-growing county was formed from portions of Sutter and Yuba counties on April 25, 1851, with Auburn as the county seat. Placer County was named from the Spanish word for sand or gravel deposits containing gold. Miners washed away the gravel, leaving the heavier gold, in a process known as “placer mining.” Gold mining was a major industry through the 1880s, but gradually the new residents transitioned to farming the fertile foothill soil and harvesting lumber, as well as finding employment with the Southern Pacific Railroad (Placer County 2009).

Chinese workers had been brought in to work on the construction of the railroad after the Central Pacific had completed 40 miles and federal funding became available. At that point, the rail had reached a point about 4 miles east of Auburn. The Rocklin-Roseville Chinatown was reportedly situated between the communities of Rocklin and Roseville, although other locations have also been reported. On September 16, 1877, the Chinese living in the community were forced to leave, and their buildings were destroyed after an incident in which three non-Chinese were killed by a Chinese individual.

The commercial fruit industry expanded rapidly in western Placer County in the late 1870s and early 1880s, with the Central Pacific Railroad providing a wide market in the east for California’s agricultural products. A wide variety of fruits and nuts were raised, including citrus, apples, peaches, pears, plums, cherries, olives, almonds, and walnuts. Chinese laborers were reportedly used in the agricultural fields because they seemed to endure the malaria, while the white laborers did not. In 1894, Japanese laborers began to move into the region, eventually providing all of the fruit orchard labor.

Rocklin was incorporated in 1893, with an initial population of approximately 550 residents. Prior to then, however, Joel Parker Whitney established Spring Valley Ranch in the late 1850s. The ranch was a vast holding of land of over 20,000 acres accumulated and held by the Whitney family from the late 1850s until 1949. Over the years, 25 miles of crushed stone roads, 12 granite bridges, stables, barns, and housing for 200 ranch hands and their families were all constructed on their land, now considered the first developed property in Rocklin. The planned communities of Stanford Ranch and Whitney Oaks now occupy much of the former Spring Valley Ranch. Most of the original granite bridges on the ranch land used to cross creeks on the Spring Valley Ranch are now included in parks. Farmers and miners originally settled in Rocklin, in addition to Chinese immigrants who were primarily railroad workers (City of Rocklin 2008, 2009a; Rocklin Historical Society 2009a).

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Various theories exist about the origin of the name “Rocklin” and, according to the Rocklin Historical Society, where the name comes from remains a mystery. The name Rocklin may have been a derivation of rock land, because of the extensive rock outcroppings in the area and the granite quarrying beginning to take place. It has also been speculated that early Irish settlers or Finnish settlers influenced the name. Research on the origin of the name is said to continue by volunteer historians (City of Rocklin 2008; Rocklin Historical Society 2009b).

The Central Pacific Railroad arrived in Rocklin in May of 1864, making Rocklin an important transportation center. A major locomotive terminal was established in Rocklin in 1866 due to its location at the “bottom of the hill.” The terminal in Rocklin served as the railroad’s roundhouse until 1908 when it was moved to Roseville. Trains were cut into two sections at Rocklin in order to ascend the grade of the Sierra Nevada. The first shipment from Rocklin consisted of three carloads of granite (City of Rocklin 2008.)

The city originally became widely known due to the mining of granite. In 1910, 22 quarries operated in Rocklin and in 1912, nearly 2,000 train carloads of granite were transported from town. Granite for the California state capitol in Sacramento and many of the buildings in San Francisco came from Rocklin’s quarries. Rocklin became the principal granite-producing point in the Sacramento Valley. The first quarry opened in 1863, and the stone was used in construction work on the Central Pacific for culverts. The Rocklin quarries were comparatively close together, occurring in an area less than a mile square on a gently rolling plain that borders the railroad. Granite is still quarried in the Rocklin area (City of Rocklin 2008, 2009a).

The Finnish-American community has played an important role in the City of Rocklin. Migration of large numbers of Finns to Rocklin started in 1880 when Finn John Mantyla established a granite quarry near the corner of today’s Rocklin Road and Pacific Street and encouraged Bay Area Finnish immigrants to join him here as quarry workers. By 1887, nine Finnish families and dozens of single Finnish men had located here as the granite industry boomed. High demand for Rocklin’s granite and machine-powered quarrying technology brought the quarries to their peak of activity by 1895. Finnish immigrants continued to migrate here at the turn of the century, many directly from Finland with the sponsorship of Rocklin relatives. By 1900 Finns were said to own more than half of the Rocklin’s quarries and were prominent in Rocklin’s politics, retail enterprises, and social life (Rocklin Historical Society 2009c).

Historical archaeological resources found in the Rocklin area are representative of its history. Such resources that are typical to quarry areas include quarry pits, waste rock piles, derricks, derrick bases, derrick tie-downs, various outbuilding and shed remnants, rock alignments, and granite fence posts. In addition, remnants of the Spring Valley Ranch can be found throughout the area. Some of these resources are rock fences, old buildings and foundations, and bridges (City of Rocklin 2008). A more detailed accounting of this history can be found in the Rocklin General Plan Update itself.

KNOWN CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE PLANNING AREA

An updated records search at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Sacramento, for the City of Rocklin was completed on October 15, 2008. This records search focused on the entire city. According to the records search, 72 archaeological sites and 22 historic points of interest have been recorded within the Planning Area. The record searches revealed that a variety of prehistoric and historic archaeological sites have been discovered in the city. The prehistoric sites include those containing midden, bedrock mortars, ground stones, and chipped stone tools. The historic archaeological sites include foundations, pits, standing structures, rock walls, and ditches. It

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

should be noted that the archaeological resource sites in the Clover Valley area have been determined as a district eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (City of Rocklin 2006, pg. 4.7-21).

Historical Buildings

The records search indicated that five properties are listed in the Office of Historic Preservation, Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File in Rocklin. These properties are described below.

State Historical Landmark No. 780-2 is known as the First Transcontinental Railroad-Rocklin. In 1864, the Central Pacific railroad reached Rocklin 22 miles from its Sacramento terminus and the railroad established a major locomotive terminal in that location. Trains moving over the Sierra were generally cut in two sections at this point in order to ascend the grade. The first Central Pacific freight movement was three carloads of Rocklin granite pulled by the engine Governor Stanford. The terminal was moved to Roseville on April 18, 1908. This historical landmark is located at the southeast corner of Rocklin Road and First Street. California Historical Landmarks #770 and above are automatically listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.

The Finnish Temperance Hall (or Finn Hall), located at 4090 Rocklin Road, is listed as California Point of Historical Interest No. PLA-016. It has also been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This building was constructed in 1905 by the Finnish Temperance Society and has served Rocklin and the surrounding area as a social center since that time. It is said to be the last remaining structure of its type in the area which remains unaltered from its original condition.

The California Granite Company Store building, located at 3980 Rocklin Road, is a potentially historical building. It was constructed in 1912 and was identified in a reconnaissance-level historical building survey and listed as 7R under the California Resource Status Codes. This code indicates that the building could warrant evaluation, as it was not evaluated for the National Register or California Register.

Two other properties are listed on the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File within Rocklin. These are 5400 2nd Street, constructed in 1930, and 5140 4th Street, constructed in 1951. Both of these buildings were listed as 6Y under the California Resource Status Codes, which indicates that they were determined ineligible for [the National Register] by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CR or Local Listing.

Other buildings and sites are identified by the Rocklin Historical Society as points of interest. These points of interest include the following:

- Braday's Quarry – The quarry is located on the west side of Pacific Street. It was established in 1861 by Charles Brigham and Elisha Hawes and was the first granite quarry in Rocklin.
- St. Mary's of the Assumption Catholic Church – The church was originally located at 5240 Front Street and is now at a new location at 5251 Front Street. The church was constructed between 1882 and 1883.
- Joseph Barundoni Building – The building is located at the intersection of Front and B streets and was erected by Swiss-born Joseph Barundoni in 1905 where he operated the

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Placer Meat Market. This was the only building on Front Street to survive a disastrous fire in 1914.

- Rocklin's Railroad Depot – The depot was located on Railroad Avenue, between Bush Street and Rocklin Road. The original depot was constructed around 1867 but was totally burned in 1891 and rebuilt. All services were terminated in 1933, and the depot was demolished in 1940.
- Rocklin City Hall – The building is located on the south side of Rocklin Road at High Street. In 1912, Adolph Pernu, an important Rocklin granite operator of the period, erected this building as a company store. Later, the building housed a general merchandise store operated by Ah Moon. In 1941, it was sold to the City of Rocklin for use as a City Hall, and it remains so today.
- Union Granite Company – The quarry site is located on the southeast corner of Rocklin Road and Pacific Street and was started by John Nay Taylor in 1870. It was in continuous operation for 117 years. Located at this site is a granite quarry shed that was erected in 1903.
- Rocklin Cemetery – The cemetery is located at 4090 Kannasto Street on the southwest corner of South Grove and Kannasto streets. The cemetery may have been started when a local character fell dead on the site after a day of celebrating. The earliest headstone is that of Olive Van-Tresse, who died on October 30, 1864,
- Old Finnish Picnic Grounds – The picnic grounds were located about 200 yards past the end of China Garden Road, adjacent to Interstate 80. During the early Rocklin days, these picnic grounds were a gathering place for the Finnish habitants of the town.
- Old Quinn Quarry – The quarry is located on Winding Way, north of Kannasto Street. William Quinn began operating his pioneer granite quarry business here in 1873 on "squatted land" owned by the federal government.
- Finnish Temperance Hall – "Finn Hall" as it is commonly known, located on the southwest corner of Rocklin Road and South Grove Street, was built by the Finnish Temperance Society in 1905. The building was used for many of Rocklin's social functions in the early days.
- Trott Hotel – The hotel, considered by some to be Rocklin's finest, was located on the northwest corner of Rocklin Road and Front Street. It was built in 1868 by Samuel Trott and although one of Rocklin's many fires claimed the hotel in 1869, it was quickly rebuilt and served the community until it burned down again on February 20, 1979.
- Central Pacific Roundhouse – The roundhouse was located on the northeast corner of Front Street and Rocklin Road. Construction was started in August 1866 on this 28-stall roundhouse with machine shops and repair facilities. It was completed during the summer of 1867 and was destroyed by fire in November 1873. It was quickly rebuilt and remained in use until 1908 when Roseville became the railroad center. Demolition of the roundhouse started in 1810, but some remnants of the roundhouse are still apparent.
- The Wickman-Johnson Home – The home is located on the southwest corner of Fifth Street and Rocklin Road. It was once the residence of James Bolton, who acquired the

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

land in 1852. In 1886, Mr. Bolton obtained a federal land grant and laid out the "Bolton Plat," which is the original Rocklin townsite.

- Victorian Homes – These homes are located near the intersection of Rocklin Road and Fifth Street. There are four Victorian-style homes at this location that were built between 1890 and 1910.
- Whitney Mansion Stained-Glass Windows and Front Doors – The Whitney Mansion, also known as "The Oaks," was built in 1885 but has since been demolished. The windows and doors from the mansion were preserved and are located at the Sunset Whitney Country Club, corner of Midas Avenue and Rawhide Drive. The doors can be viewed upon entering the country club, and the hand-made windows are located in the lounge bar.
- Granite Stone Bridge – The bridge is located at the northwest corner of Midas Avenue and Clover Valley Road. The bridge spans Clover Valley Creek and was constructed in about 1900 by Chinese laborers from the Whitney Ranch as one of twelve granite bridges along the "Eight Mile Drive" from the center of Rocklin to Spring Valley Ranch to the northwest.
- Rocklin Skating Rink (Pleasure Hall) – The skating rink is located on the east side of Pacific Street between Grove Street and Jamerson Drive. Pleasure Hall flourished as the finest ballroom between Sacramento and Reno during the early 1900s and was operated by Steve Subotich. The Rocklin Owls baseball team played their games on a diamond behind the hall. During the 1930s, this building housed a roller skating rink.
- Aitken Ranch – The ranch was located on the east side of Pacific Street between Americana Way and Dominguez Road. The ranch site was established in 1850 by Will Dana Perkins, one of Rocklin's earliest and foremost citizens.
- Racetrack – The racetrack was located at Racetrack Circle and Racetrack Road on property that now comprises the Racetrack housing development. The land for the racetrack was donated in 1893 by Dana Perkins, and the racetrack featured buggy racing, horse racing, and later, motorcycle racing.

KNOWN PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN THE PLANNING AREA

Paleontology is defined as a science dealing with the life of past geological periods as known from fossil remains. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations that have produced fossil material. Such locations and specimens are important nonrenewable resources. CEQA offers protection for these sensitive resources and requires that they be addressed during the environmental impact report process.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database indicated that the fossilized remains of mammalian vertebrates have been discovered in the Rocklin General Plan Update Planning Area. In addition, the search identified 37 other locations in the county where fossils have been discovered. These paleontological resources consist mostly of plant and invertebrate fossil specimens, but also mammalian vertebrates (University of California, Berkeley 2009).

NATIVE AMERICAN COORDINATION

As of March 1, 2005, Senate Bill 18 (Government Code, Sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction. The City of Rocklin initiated the consultation process as required under these provisions of the Government Code on December 4, 2008. This process was begun by mailing a letter with information regarding the General Plan update process and the opportunity for consultation to the tribal representatives of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians. The 90-day period consultation request period ended on March 7, 2009, and the City has not yet received a response.

PMC requested a sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts from the NAHC. The results of the sacred lands search were received on October 16, 2008, and did not identify any Native American sacred lands within the General Plan Update Planning Area. However, the NAHC noted that "the absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area." PMC contacted all tribal representation groups on the list provided by the NAHC, through written correspondence. PMC, to date, has not received any comments regarding the updated General Plan or EIR.

4.8.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

Structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects over 50 years of age can be listed in the NRHP as significant historic resources. However, properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included in the NRHP. The criteria for listing in the NRHP include resources that:

- a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;
- b) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- c) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- d) have yielded or may likely yield information important in prehistory or history.

Eligibility requirements for the NRHP are discussed under Concepts and Terminology for Evaluation of Cultural Resources above.

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

STATE

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both historical resources and unique archaeological resources. Pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21084.1, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on unique archaeological resources.

Historical resource is a term with a defined statutory meaning (PRC, Section 21084.1; determining significant impacts to historical and archaeological resources is described in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [a], [b]). Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), historical resources include the following:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1).
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource will 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 (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1), including the following:
 - a) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - b) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - c) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - d) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code),

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

Historic resources are usually 50 years old or older and must meet at least one of the criteria for listing in the California Register, described above (such as association with historical events, important people, or architectural significance), in addition to maintaining a sufficient level of physical integrity.

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

For historic structures, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(3) indicates that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995) shall mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant.

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact unique archaeological resources. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that " 'unique archaeological resource' means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

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

Treatment options under Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a unique archaeological resource).

Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety Code (CHSC) specifies protocol when human remains are discovered. The code states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (e), and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 require that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the appropriate Native Americans, if any, as timely identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

In addition to the mitigation provisions pertaining to accidental discovery of human remains, the CEQA Guidelines also require that a lead agency make provisions for the accidental discovery of historical or archaeological resources, generally. Pursuant to Section 15064.5, subdivision (f), these provisions should include "an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation should be available. Work could continue on other parts of the building site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place."

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by state statute (Public Resources Code Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5, Archeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites, and Appendix G). No state or local agencies have specific jurisdiction over paleontological resources. No state or local agency requires a paleontological collecting permit to allow for the recovery of fossil remains discovered as a result of construction-related earth-moving on state or private land in a project site.

LOCAL

City of Rocklin, Front Street Historical Area Master Plan

This Master Plan was prepared in 1982 and is described as being "the result of the recognition that preservation and enhancement of the city's past is an important part of planning for its future." The City designated the three blocks along Front Street from Rocklin Road to Farron Street as a historic district. Front Street was the original business street in Rocklin. The Zoning Ordinance, as the Historic District Ordinance, was amended to adopt the district and establish the permitted uses within the district, an architectural review committee, and the powers and duties of the review committee. The Front Street Historic Committee consists of five members appointed to alternating terms by the City Council. Responsibilities of the Front Street Historic Committee include review of plans for the Front Street area, long-term planning for the older, historic portion of Rocklin, and proposals for future development criteria. The committee's specific power and duties are set forth in Section 17.61.090 of the Rocklin Municipal Code.

4.8.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Following Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and Section 15064.5 and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, cultural resource impacts are considered to be significant if implementation of the project considered would result in any of the following:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively.
2. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines “substantial adverse change” as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(2), defines “materially impaired” for purposes of the definition of substantial adverse change as follows:

The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

- (A) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- (B) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- (C) demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

CEQA requires that if a project would result in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, or would cause significant effects on a unique archaeological resource, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered. Therefore, prior to assessing effects or developing mitigation measures, the significance of cultural resources must first be determined. The steps that are normally taken in a cultural resources investigation for CEQA compliance are as follows:

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Identify potential historical resources and unique archaeological resources;
- Evaluate the eligibility of historical resources; and
- Evaluate the effects of the project on eligible historical resources.

METHODOLOGY

An updated records search at the North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Sacramento for the City of Rocklin was completed on October 15, 2008, by PMC. In addition, PMC requested a sacred lands search and a list of Native American contacts from the NAHC. The results of the sacred lands search were received on October 16, 2008, and did not identify any Native American sacred lands within the Planning Area. PMC contacted all tribal representation groups on the list provided by the NAHC, through written correspondence. PMC, to date, has not received any comments regarding the updated General Plan or EIR. PMC also consulted the Rocklin Historical Society website and other published sources of cultural and historic information for the Planning Area.

The potential impacts of the proposed General Plan Update on cultural resources were evaluated by considering both potential future construction activities as well as the operational impacts of potential proposed projects which could occur under the updated General Plan.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Adverse Change in Significance of an Archaeological Resource or Historical Resource

Impact 4.8.1 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could potentially cause a direct substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological or historical resource or structure. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

Future development allowed under the proposed General Plan Update could destroy or alter historic buildings resulting in the loss of historic character-defining features of buildings. Indirect impacts could also occur from conflicts resulting from placing new, modern development next to historic structures. Future development under the proposed General Plan Update could also directly and indirectly impact archaeological resources. To avoid compromising historic and archaeological resources in the Planning Area, the General Plan Update includes policies to preserve or mitigate impacts to historically significant resources, significant archaeological resources, and paleontological resources. Adherence to these policies would prevent destruction or compromise in the character of these resources. Therefore, impacts from direct destruction or damage to historic resources are considered to be **less than significant**.

As part of the proposed project, the City plans to amend the Redevelopment Plan to increase tax increment limitations, increase the limit on the principal amount of bonded indebtedness secured by tax increment revenue, and extend the time limit for the commencement of eminent domain proceedings to acquire non-residential property. These amendments are intended to provide the City's Redevelopment Agency with the financial and administrative resources necessary to continue assisting projects that implement its program of blight elimination within the Redevelopment Project Area. While the extended time and financial limits authorized by the Sixth Amendment may foster and encourage new development that might not occur without the Sixth Amendment, or may occur faster than had the Sixth Amendment not

been adopted, all development would be consistent with the City's General Plan and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this DEIR. Any future development resulting from amending the Redevelopment Plan would occur in areas designated for such development by the General Plan as the land uses permitted by the Redevelopment Plan are the allowable uses under the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan would not result in impacts to archaeological or historical resources or structures beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

In addition to the activities identified above, the project includes a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address climate change and identify greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction measures. The City of Rocklin CAP augments the objectives, goals, policies, and actions of the City of Rocklin General Plan Update related to the reduction of GHG emissions; however, the CAP is intended to be updated on a more frequent basis than the General Plan, ensuring that implementation of City efforts to reduce GHG emissions is in compliance with current regulation. The CAP determines whether implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be consistent with the state's ability to attain the goals identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 32, identifies GHG emission reduction measures, and provides monitoring of the effectiveness of GHG emission reduction measures. The CAP would not result in impacts associated with archaeological or historical resources or structures beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation

The following proposed General Plan policies would assist in avoiding or minimizing impacts to archaeological or historical resources within the city resulting from the proposed project:

- Policy LU-38 Maintain development standards, including off-site parking provisions, unique to the Downtown Rocklin Plan Area along streets such as Pacific Street from Midas Avenue to Farron Street, Front Street, Rocklin Road and Railroad Avenue.*
- Policy LU-41 Encourage development of vacant lands and rehabilitation of existing buildings within the Historical District of Rocklin along Front Street between Rocklin Road and Farron Street.*
- Policy LU-52 Ensure that residential infill development in the Civic Center area takes into consideration preservation of unique natural features and historic resources.*
- Policy LU-54 Ensure that the spacing, scale, mass, height, exterior materials and architectural design of new residential uses in Central Rocklin complement existing residential structures and the Civic Center Plan.*
- Policy OCR-62 Preserve historically significant resources in place if feasible, or provide mitigation (avoidance, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures) prior to further disturbance.*
- Policy OCR-63 Encourage preservation and incorporation of existing rock quarries and major rock outcroppings and geologically unique areas in future development projects.*

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Policy OCR-64 Encourage reuse rather than demolition/replacement of historic structures where feasible.

Policy OCR-65 Preserve significant archaeological resources (including Native American remains) and paleontological resources in place if feasible, or provide mitigation (avoidance, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures) prior to further disturbance.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policies listed above would preserve archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources whenever feasible. Other means of mitigating impacts would be used if preservation in place is not feasible. Likewise, infill developments are encouraged to consider the historic context and complement existing historic structures. Based on review of known locations of cultural resources, no significant impacts are anticipated from implementation of the proposed project after application of the above policies. Thus, impacts involving an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological or historic resource are considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Potential Destruction or Damage to Known and Undiscovered Prehistoric Resources and Human Remains

Impact 4.8.2 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could result in the potential disturbance of cultural resources such as prehistoric archaeological sites, historical archaeological sites, and isolated artifacts and features. Human remains could also be impacted. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this would be a **less than significant** impact.

Cultural resources have been identified by previous investigations in the city, and it is anticipated that additional cultural resources may be discovered in other areas within the city during construction and buildout of land uses allowed under the proposed General Plan Update. Development which could occur per the General Plan Update could destroy and/or degrade known and unknown prehistoric resources, historic resources, or human remains. However, the General Plan Update includes policies to preserve cultural resources whenever feasible. Likewise, it should be noted that there are approved projects in the city including large-scale developments that have adopted mitigation measures for cultural resources impacts.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and under Impact 4.8.1 above, the project includes the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan and the CAP, both of which would be consistent with the proposed General Plan Update and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this DEIR. As these project components would not result in land use activities or growth beyond what is identified in the General Plan Update, and as future development under these plans would be required to comply with proposed General Plan Update policies, they would not result in destruction or damage to prehistoric resources and human remains beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation

The following proposed General Plan policies would assist in avoiding or minimizing potential destruction or damage to prehistoric resources, including human remains:

OCR-65 Preserve significant archaeological resources (including Native American remains) and paleontological resources in place if feasible, or provide mitigation (avoidance, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures) prior to further disturbance.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update policy listed above would be effective in protecting and preserving known and undiscovered prehistoric resources and human remains whenever feasible. This policy encourages preserving resources in place. If that is not possible, other appropriate measures must be used. Thus, impacts involving known and undiscovered prehistoric resources and human remains are considered **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Potential Destruction or Damage to Known and Undiscovered Paleontological Resources

Impact 4.8.3 Subsequent development activities under the proposed project could result in the direct or indirect destruction of unique paleontological resources (i.e., fossils and fossil formations) within the Planning Area. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this would be a **less than significant** impact.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology collections database indicated that the fossilized remains of mammalian vertebrates have been discovered in the Rocklin General Plan Update area. In addition, the search identified 37 other locations with the county where fossils have been discovered (University of California, Berkeley 2009). Development under the proposed General Plan Update and its associated project components could impact undiscovered paleontological resources in areas encompassed by the Planning Area. However, the General Plan Update includes Policy OCR-65 to preserve or mitigate impacts to paleontological resources by protecting and preserving the paleontological resources. Compliance with the provisions of this policy would result in **less than significant** impacts regarding destruction or damage to known and undiscovered paleontological resources.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and under Impact 4.8.1 above, the project includes the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan and the CAP, both of which would be consistent with the proposed General Plan Update and with the development assumptions analyzed throughout this DEIR. As these project components would not result in land use activities or growth beyond what is identified in the General Plan Update, and as future development under these plans would be required to comply with proposed General Plan Update policies, they would not result in destruction or damage to undiscovered paleontological resources beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Measures

None required.

4.8.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting associated with the proposed project includes existing, proposed, planned, and reasonably foreseeable projects and growth in the region (see **Table 4.0-1** and associated assumptions in Section 4.0). Continued growth in the region would contribute to potential conflicts with cultural and paleontological resources. These resources include archaeological resources associated with Native American activities and historic resources associated with settlement, farming, and economic development.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cumulative Impacts on Historic Resources, Prehistoric Resources, and Human Remains

Impact 4.8.4 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources, including human remains, in the region. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and its associated project components, in combination with cumulative development in the surrounding region, would increase the potential to disturb historic resources and known and undiscovered cultural resources. The project might contribute to the cumulative loss of cultural resources in the region. This contribution might be considerable when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region. This impact is considered **cumulatively considerable**.

As previously discussed, neither the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan nor the CAP would result in impacts on historic resources, prehistoric resources, and human remains beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation

The proposed General Plan policies listed under Impacts 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 address this impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of proposed General Plan Update Policies LU-38, LU-41, LU-52, LU-54, OCR-62, OCR-63, OCR-64, and OCR-65 (as described above under Impacts 4.8.1 and 4.8.2) would mitigate the General Plan Update's contribution to cumulative impacts to cultural resources (including prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) and human remains to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Cumulative Impacts to Historic Character

Impact 4.8.5 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to historic character in the region. The proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps would reduce the severity of impacts to historic character. However, the policies would not completely mitigate this impact. Therefore, this impact is considered **cumulatively considerable**.

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update and its associated project components, in combination with cumulative development in the region, would alter the historic character of the City of Rocklin. Proposed General Plan Update policies LU-38, LU-41, LU-52, LU-54, OCR-62, OCR-63, and OCR-64 (as described above under Impacts 4.8.1 and 4.8.2) allow new development while encouraging preservation of historic areas and structures. However, while preservation is encouraged if feasible, alteration, disturbance, modification, or removal is not entirely prohibited. Under certain circumstances, historic structures may be impacted to some degree either through physical alteration or the introduction of new structures. This would contribute to the region's loss of historic character.

As previously discussed, neither the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan nor the CAP would result in impacts to historic character beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation

The proposed General Plan policies listed under Impacts 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 address this impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of proposed General Plan Update policies LU-38, LU-41, LU-52, LU-54, OCR-62, OCR-63, and OCR-64 would serve to offset the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts to historic resources. However, because total preservation of historic resources and their context cannot be ensured, impacts to historic character are considered **cumulatively considerable** and **significant and unavoidable**.

Cumulative Impacts on Paleontological Resources

Impact 4.8.6 Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources, including unique geological features, in the region. However, the proposed General Plan Update's mitigating policies and their associated action steps ensure the impact will be less than significant. Therefore, this impact would be **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development in the surrounding region, would increase the potential to disturb known and undiscovered paleontological resources in the region. The project may contribute to the cumulative loss of paleontological resources in the region. This contribution could be considerable when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region. However, the General Plan Update includes Policy OCR-65 to preserve or mitigate impacts to

4.8 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

paleontological resources (as described under Impact 4.8.3). Compliance with the provisions of this policy would result in a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact regarding destruction or damage to known and undiscovered paleontological resources.

As previously discussed, neither the Sixth Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan nor the CAP would result in impacts on paleontological resources beyond what is analyzed for the General Plan Update above.

Proposed General Plan Update Policies That Provide Mitigation

The proposed General Plan Update contains Policy OCR-65 that addresses paleontological resources within the city. Implementation of Policy OCR-65 would serve to offset the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts to paleontological resources, including potentially significant impacts resulting from inadvertent damage or destruction to known and undiscovered paleontological resources, to **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

REFERENCES

- City of Rocklin. 1982. *City of Rocklin, Front Street Historical Area Master Plan*.
- . 2006. *Clover Valley Large and Small Lot Tentative Subdivision Maps. Recirculated Draft EIR. Volume 1 of 2*.
- . 2008. *Draft General Plan, Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element*.
- . 2009a. History of Rocklin. <http://www.rocklin.ca.gov/residents/history/default.asp> (accessed March 9, 2009).
- . 2009b. <http://www.rocklin.ca.gov/residents/history/landmarks.asp> (accessed March 23, 2009).
- Kroeber, A. V. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, D.C. Reprinted in 1976 by Dover Publications, Inc., New York, New York.
- Placer County. 2009. History of Placer County. <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Facility/Museums/history.aspx> (accessed March 9, 2009).
- Placer County Historical Society. 2009. "The Nisenan." Article by Norman Wilson, <http://www.placercountyhistoricalsociety.org/Histories/nisenan.htm> (accessed March 6, 2009).
- Rocklin Historical Society. 2009a. "Rocklin: Prosperous and Growing in the 19th Century." Article by Gary Day. http://www.rocklintoday.com/news/templates/history_news.asp?articleid=2408&zoneid=31 (accessed March 9, 2009).
- . 2009b. "Where did 'Rocklin' come from?" Article by Gary Day. http://www.rocklintoday.com/news/templates/history_news.asp?articleid=2438&zoneid=31 (accessed March 13, 2009).
- . 2009c. "Finn Hall." Article by Gary Day. http://www.rocklintoday.com/news/templates/history_news.asp?articleid=2448&zoneid=31 (accessed March 20, 2009).
- University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology. 2009. <http://ucmpdb.berkeley.edu/loc.html> (accessed January 27, 2009).
- Wilson, Norman L., and Arlene Towne. 1978. "Nisenan." In *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, Volume 8, edited by Robert F. Heizer. William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

