

7.1 Affected Environment

This section describes the regulatory setting for cultural resources as well as the types of cultural resources identified within the Plan Area.

7.1.1 Regulatory Setting

Federal

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies, or those they fund or permit, to consider the effects of their actions on cultural resources that may be eligible for listing or that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Such resources are referred to as *historic properties*.

To determine whether an undertaking could affect historic properties, cultural resources (i.e., archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be identified and evaluated to determine if they are eligible for listing in the NRHP. The NRHP eligibility criteria are presented in the next section.

Although compliance with Section 106 is the responsibility of the lead federal agency, the work necessary to comply may be undertaken by others.

The Section 106 process entails six basic steps, listed below.

- Initiate consultation and public involvement.
- Identify and evaluate historic properties.
- Assess effects of the project on historic properties.
- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding adverse effects on historic properties, resulting in a memorandum of agreement (MOA).
- Submit the MOA to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).
- Proceed in accordance with the MOA.

A Programmatic Agreement (PA) may be negotiated when effects on historic properties cannot be fully determined prior to approval of the undertaking and when effects on historic properties are similar and repetitive or regional in scope (36 CFR Part 800.4[b][2]). USACE and BCAG are in the process of developing a PA to comply with Section 106 for the BRCP.

National Historic Preservation Act Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility criteria for listing in the NRHP are defined as the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:

- A. are associated with events that have made a contribution to the broad pattern of our history;
- B. are associated with the lives of people significant in our past;
- C. embody the distinct characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. have yielded, or are likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4).

As mentioned above, eligibility for listing in the NRHP also requires that a resource not only meet one of the four significance criteria, but also that it possess integrity. *Integrity* is the ability of a property to convey its significance. The evaluation of a resource's integrity must be grounded in an understanding of that resource's physical characteristics and how those characteristics relate to its significance.

State

California Environmental Quality Act

Actions that require funding, approval, or permits from a state agency, such as the action alternatives, are subject to CEQA. The CEQA statutes and State CEQA Guidelines require that agencies responsible for funding, permitting, or approving projects assess the potential impacts of the project on the environment, including historical resources. Under CEQA, a *historical resource* is defined as a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or in a local register or survey pursuant to Sections 5020.1(k) and 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

Under the State CEQA Guidelines, an impact on a cultural resource is considered significant if a project would result in an effect that may change the significance of the resource (Public Resources Code Section 21084.1). Demolition, replacement, substantial alteration, and relocation of historic properties are actions that would change the significance of a historic resource (14 CCR 15064.5). The following steps are normally taken in a cultural resources investigation to comply with CEQA.

1. Identify cultural resources.
2. Evaluate the significance of the cultural resources to determine if they meet the CEQA definition of a historical resource.
3. Evaluate the effects of a project on all historical resources.
4. Develop and implement measures to mitigate the effects of the project on historical resources.

Historical Resources

The State CEQA Guidelines define three ways that a cultural resource may qualify as a historical resource (i.e., significant cultural resource) for the purposes of CEQA review.

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

California Register of Historical Resources

A cultural resource may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR if any of the following apply.

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

To be considered a *historical resource* for the purpose of CEQA, the resource must also have *integrity*, which is the authenticity of a resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Resources, therefore, must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance (14 CCR 4852[b]). Integrity is generally evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is eligible for listing in the CRHR.

Unique Archaeological Resources

A *unique archaeological resource* is defined in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria.

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

In most situations, resources that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource also meet the definition of *historical resource*. Consequently, it is current professional practice to evaluate cultural resources for significance based on their eligibility for listing in the CRHR. For the purposes of this CEQA cultural resources study, a resource is considered significant if it meets the CRHR eligibility (significance and integrity) criteria.

Discovery of Human Remains

With respect to the potential discovery of human remains, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Human Safety Code (CHHSC) states the following:

- (a) Every person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law is guilty of a misdemeanor, except as provided in Section 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code [PRC]. The provisions of this subdivision shall not apply to any person carrying out an agreement developed pursuant to subdivision (l) of Section 5097.94 of the [PRC] or to any person authorized to implement Section 5097.98 of the [PRC].
- (b) 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 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 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the 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 [PRC]. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains.
- (c) If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission [NAHC]. (CHHSC §7050.5)

Of particular note to historical resources is subsection (c), requiring the coroner to contact the NAHC within 24 hours if discovered human remains are thought potentially to be of Native American origin. After notification, NAHC will follow the procedures outlined in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, which include notification of most likely descendants (MLDs), if possible, and recommendations for treatment of the remains. Also, knowing or willful possession of Native American human remains or artifacts taken from a grave or cairn is a felony under California law (Public Resources Code Section 5097.99).

Public Resources Code 5097.9

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

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

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

Local

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

County and City General Plans

The Local Agencies' general plans include cultural resources preservation elements that contain some mechanism pertaining to cultural resources in those communities. In general, the sections pertaining to archaeological and historical properties are put in place to afford the cultural resources a measure of local protection. The policies outlined in the individual general plans should be consulted prior to any undertaking or project. These policies are shown in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1. BRCP Plan Area Cultural Resources Policies

Document	Section
City of Biggs General Plan Update (2014)	Maintain and enhance the historic resources, qualities, and character of the City of Biggs, Goal CE-8
Butte County General Plan 2030 (2012)	Preserve important cultural resources, Goal COS-14; Ensure that new development does not adversely impact cultural resources, Goal COS-15; Respect Native American culture and planning concerns, Goal COS-16
Chico 2030 General Plan (2011a)	Protect and preserve archaeological, historical and other cultural resources to serve as significant reminders of the City's heritage and values, Goal CRHP-1; Reinvest in the archaeological, historical and other cultural resources that frame Chico's character and identity, Goal CRHP-2; Engage in and facilitate preservation efforts with local preservation and cultural entities, Goal CRHP-3
City of Gridley 2030 General Plan (2010)	To retain and improve Gridley's historic buildings for ongoing residential, retail, civic, and other uses and activities, Design Goal 1
Oroville 2030 General Plan (2009a)	Preserve Oroville's cultural resources, including archaeological, historic and paleontological resources, for their aesthetic, scientific, educational and cultural values, Goal OPS-14; Protect the City of Oroville's Native American heritage, Goal OPS-15

Butte County Code

Historic resources are not separately addressed in the Butte County Code but are incorporated into various sections of it. The County Code provides for the protection of cultural resources in Chapters 24 and 26. The Zoning chapter 24-82(2) requires the preservation of important cultural resources. More pointedly, it requires the preservation of sensitive archaeological sites and requires that historic areas be regarded as open space [(24-82[g]1a.4.)], [24-82(g)1b.3], and requires certain business zones to either provide a buffer around sensitive historic features or preserve and incorporate historic elements as design features [24-167(12)a, c].

Certified Local Governments

In 1980 the NHPA was amended to include the Certified Local Governments (CLG) program. The purpose of this program was to support local governments in efforts to identify, evaluate, and register historic resources within their province and integrate preservation into local planning. A CLG is a local government whose historic preservation program and/or ordinance has been certified pursuant to Section 101(c) of the NHPA. The CLG program is a partnership among local governments, the California Office of Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service, which is responsible for administering the National Historic Preservation Program. CLGs must be included in the process of nominating properties within their jurisdictions to the NRHP. They are also eligible to apply for a portion of the state's annual federal allotment of Historic Preservation Funds, which are designated for historic preservation projects.

Of the four cities within the Plan Area, Chico is the only CLG, and maintains by means of city code (Ord. 2410 Section 18) its historic preservation plan, including, but not limited to, designation criteria, the public hearing process, maintenance and relocation requirements for historic properties, and incentives for maintenance and development of historic properties.

7.1.2 Environmental Setting

The County General Plan EIR setting section for cultural resources includes a detailed discussion of the Prehistoric Setting, the Ethnographic Setting, and the Historical Setting of Butte County on pages 4.5-1 through 4.5-10 (Butte County 2010). The following is a summary of that detail, focusing on content pertinent to the BRCP Plan Area. The cultural resources setting section of the County General Plan EIR is incorporated into this document by reference.

Prehistoric Setting

The history of human occupation and use of the Sacramento Valley and northern Sierra Nevada foothills is characterized by a number of related trends taking place throughout the last 10,000 years. Archaeologically visible cultural patterns can be attributed to responses to gradual changes in climate, resource availability, and human population growth. The cultural responses to these changes include technological specialization, resource intensification, sedentism, and the development of regional economic networks. The prehistory of these two geographic areas follows similar but varying temporal outlines, depending on the geographic area under consideration.

Sacramento Valley

It is probable that humans have inhabited the Sacramento Valley for the last 10,000 years. However, evidence of early occupation is likely deeply buried under alluvial sediments deposited during the late Holocene, although rare archaeological remains of the early period have been identified in and around the Central Valley. Early archaeological manifestations are categorized as the Farmington Complex, which is characterized by core tools and large, reworked percussion flakes.

Later periods are better understood because of more abundant representation in the archaeological record. Fredrickson (1973:7-6) identified three general patterns of cultural manifestations for the period between 4500 B.P. and 2000 B.P.: the Windmiller Pattern (4500–3000 B.P.), the Berkeley Pattern (3500–2500 B.P.), and the Augustine Pattern (2500–2000 B.P.).

Northern Sierra Nevada

The current cultural chronology for the northern Sierra Nevada consists of five phases. The Washoe Lake Phase (before 10,000 B.P.) is the earliest known evidence of human occupation of the region and is represented by fluted projectile points. Presumably, groups during this phase were highly mobile. The Tahoe Reach Phase (10,000–8000 B.P.) is characterized by large stemmed points used to hunt a variety of mammals and the occasional use of ground stone artifacts used for plant resources. Little is known about the subsequent Spooner Phase (8000–5000 B.P.) because temporally diagnostic artifacts are lacking. The Early (5000–3000 B.P.) and Late (3000–1300 B.P.) Martis Phases are both highly visible in the archaeological record, implying a significant increase in human population in the region. They are distinguished by changes in projectile point styles while grinding artifacts, house pit features, and storage features are present throughout these phases. The Early Kings Beach Phase marks the introduction of the bow and arrow to the region and specialization in flaked-stone tool production. The Late Kings Beach Phase is represented by a decrease in archaeological sites and features, possibly indicating a change in settlement patterns.

Ethnographic Setting

Generally, western Butte County lies in the traditional territory of the Konkow, or Northwestern Maidu. Konkow territory encompassed the lower Feather River drainages from west of Richbar almost to the Sutter Buttes, and the Sacramento River area from Butte City in the south to Butte Meadows in the north. Neighboring tribes consisted of the Yana to the north, the Northeastern Maidu to the east, the Nisenan to the south, and the Nomlaki to the west. The Konkow language is classified as part of the Penutian linguistic stock. Penutian speakers appear to have entered California relatively late, settling nearly half the state by approximately 200 years ago.

Historic Setting

Although Spaniards and trappers explored areas within Butte County in the early nineteenth century, Euroamerican influence was not significant in the region until the California Gold Rush (1848–1852). During this time, the influx of miners and those who offered support services overwhelmed the indigenous people and natural resources. Mining camps were established throughout the region along gold-bearing streams and rivers, and some developed into economic hubs. When California was admitted as the thirty-first state in 1850, Butte County was among the original counties. Ten years later the county's first official city, Chico, was incorporated. After the Gold Rush, people who stayed in the region focused their economic pursuits on agriculture, which was boosted as the railroads connected the county to other regions in the state and across the country. Today, agriculture remains a mainstay of the regional economy, with such lucrative crops and livestock as rice, almonds, walnuts, peaches, cattle, swine, and poultry.

7.1.3 Cultural Resource Types and Sensitivity

Archaeological Resources

Previous studies in the general region provide reasonable expectations for the range of archaeological property types likely to occur in Butte County. Recorded prehistoric site types include habitation (long-term occupation) sites, limited occupation sites, hunting/processing camps, lithic reduction stations, quarries, rock art sites, bedrock milling features, and burial locations. Sites may be classified as more than one type. For example, habitation sites may be associated with rock

art. The most common prehistoric sites found in the Butte County area are temporary occupation sites. Ethnographic site types mirror prehistoric site types but display artifacts or features that indicate contact and interaction with Euroamerican populations. Historic period archaeological site types and features include the remains of mining camps, farmsteads, ranches, railroad features, structures and linear features (e.g., roads and trails), camps, privies, and refuse scatters.

The prehistoric archaeological sensitivity of Butte County is generally considered high, particularly in areas near water sources or on terraces along watercourses. In particular, major watersheds in the Sierra Nevada foothills possess river terraces that are rich in archaeological resources. In the Sacramento Valley, land along the margins of the Sacramento River and other major waterways are rich in prehistoric archaeological resources, although such resources are usually found on natural rises that would have protected the inhabitants from frequent floods. Additional prehistoric deposits may be buried in similar locations—in natural buried contexts such as under alluvial deposits and in cultural buried contexts such as below constructed levees or mixed in as a portion of levee fill material.

The locations of historic period archaeological sites are more difficult to predict because historical populations had greater ease of transportation and were not dependent on proximity to water and vegetal resources as prehistoric populations. Nevertheless, historic period sites are likely to be located near areas that were used for farming, ranching, mining, settlement, or transportation corridors.

Of the 2,982 archaeological sites recorded in Butte County, 1,430 sites are prehistoric archaeological resources, 1,463 sites are historic period sites, and 89 sites contain both a prehistoric and a historical archaeological component. According to the California Office of Historic Preservation, 129 archaeological sites are listed in, or have been formally recommended eligible for, listing in the NRHP, and are therefore considered eligible for listing in the CRHR. Of these 129 NRHP-eligible or listed sites, 98 are prehistoric archaeological sites, 25 are historic period archaeological sites, and six are archaeological sites that contain both prehistoric and historic period components.

Historic Resources

Historic period cultural resources are associated with the themes represented by the historic events summarized above (mining, transportation, agriculture, municipalities). Concentrations of historic resources are expected adjacent to transportation corridors (historic highways, railroads, navigable waterways); on rural ranch lands (irrigations features such as ditches and canals); in areas of natural resources extraction (rock, soil, mineral, and timber); and within historic neighborhoods and business districts. A broad-brushed characterization of the historic resources in the county is provided below, based on a review of the California Historic Resources Inventory and listings of California State Historical Landmarks and California Points of Historical Interest.

California Historic Resources Inventory

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

protections for federally funded projects as listed properties. Properties listed or found eligible for listing in the NRHP are also automatically eligible for the CRHR. The HRI also includes buildings that have been identified as historically significant by local government agencies. The property types listed in the HRI are typically non-archaeological in nature (for confidentiality reasons) and encompass numerous architectural and engineering features.

It should be noted that because the HRI is frequently updated as new resources are continuously located through survey work and other means, the following tables should not be considered the final or the most comprehensive listings.

A total of 846 resources have been recorded in Butte County, as summarized in Table 7-2. Twenty-six NRHP-listed properties, listed in Table 7-3, are located in Butte County.

Table 7-2. Butte County Historic Period Resources Listed In or Eligible for the NRHP

Vicinity	Quantity
Oroville	184
Chico	511
Paradise	23
Gridley	42
Biggs	10
Other	76
Total	846

California State Historical Landmarks

The State of California began memorializing sites of statewide historic importance in 1932 with what is now known as the California State Historical Landmarks program. The criteria for consideration have been refined over the long history of this program; today a State Historical Landmark (SHL) must be the first, last, only, or most significant of a type in a large geographical area. Eight resources in Butte County have been designated as California Historical Landmarks (Table 7-3).

California Points of Historical Interest

California Points of Historical Interest are sites, buildings, features, or events that are of local (city or county) significance and must be one of the following.

- The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within the local geographic region (city or county).
- Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of the local area.
- A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction.
- One of the more notable works or the best surviving work in the local region of a pioneer architect, designer, or master builder.

If a Point of Historical Interest is subsequently granted status as a Landmark, the Point designation will be retired. Twenty-one resources in Butte County are Points of Historical Interest (Table 7-3 below).

Table 7-3. Butte County Historic Period Resources by Designation

Resource	Vicinity	NRHP Listed	State Historical Landmark	Point of Historical Interest
14-Mile House Site	Chico			X
A.H. Chapman House	Chico	X		X
Allen-Sommer-Gage House	Chico	X		
Berkeley Olive Association Historic District	Oroville	X		
Bidwell Mansion	Chico	X		
Bidwell Mill Site	Chico			X
Butte County Railroad Depot	Paradise			X
California-Oregon Railroad Depot	Gridley			X
Centerville Schoolhouse	Chico	X		X
Cherokee Townsite and Spring Valley Mine	Oroville			X
Chico African Methodist Episcopal Church South	Chico			X
Chico Forestry Station and Nursery	Chico		X	
Chinese Cemetery	Oroville			X
Chinese Temple	Oroville		X	
Discovery Site of Last Yahí Indian	Oroville		X	
Dogtown Nugget Discovery Site	Magalia		X	
Fagan House	Gridley			X
Fong Lee Company	Oroville	X		
Forks of Butte	Paradise	X		
Garrott's Sawmill	Oroville			X
Gianella Bridge site	Hamilton City			X
Hazel Hotel	Gridley	X		
Honey Run Covered Bridge	Paradise	X		X
Hooker Oak	Chico		X	
Inskip Hotel	Stirling City	X		
Jewish Cemetery	Oroville			X
Long's Bar	Oroville			X
Lot Museum-Sank Park	Oroville			X
Manzanita School	Gridley			X
Mud Creek Canyon	Chico	X		
Old Chinese Cemetery	Oroville			X
Old Suspension Bridge	Oroville		X	
Oregon City	Oroville		X	
Oroville Carnegie Library	Oroville	X		
Oroville Cemetery	Oroville			X
Oroville Chinese Temple	Oroville	X		

Resource	Vicinity	NRHP Listed	State Historical Landmark	Point of Historical Interest
Oroville Commercial District	Oroville	X		
Oroville Inn	Oroville	X		
Oroville Odd Fellows Home Site (Bella Vista Hotel)	Oroville			X
Patrick Ranch House	Chico	X		
Patrick Rancheria	Chico	X		
Rancho Chico and Bidwell Adobe	Chico		X	
Richardson Springs Resort Hotel	Chico			X
Silberstein Park Building	Chico	X		
South of Campus Neighborhood	Chico	X		
Southern Pacific Depot	Chico	X		
St. John's Episcopal Church	Chico	X		
Stansbury House	Chico	X		
State Theatre	Oroville	X		
US Post Office – Chico Midtown Station	Chico	X		
US Post Office – Oroville Main	Oroville	X		
W.W. Durham House	Durham	X		

Local Historical Societies

Local historical societies, museums, and organizations throughout the greater Plan Area also work in conjunction with their associated cities or the County toward the identification and protection of cultural resources. These organizations are largely nonprofit organizations that achieve their purpose through educating the public and creating awareness of the historical heritage of their communities. They are also involved in protecting the history of the area through the documentation, publication, and/or preservation of historical materials and artifacts pertaining to the community.

7.2 Environmental Consequences

This section incorporates by reference the impact determinations presented for cultural resources in the Local Agencies' general plan EIRs (as described in more detail in Chapter 3, Section 3.3, *Resource Chapter Organization and NEPA/CEQA Requirements*).¹ The significance findings and mitigation measures of each of the general plan EIRs are compiled in Appendix C. The Lead Agencies have reviewed these analyses and found them to be appropriate for the purposes of this EIS/EIR.

¹ These previous CEQA documents are available collectively for public review at the BCAG offices (2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100 Chico, CA 95928-8441). Individual general plans and EIRs are also available at each of the respective land use agencies.

7.2.1 Methods for Impact Analysis

Impacts on cultural resources were assessed on the basis of the proposed action and alternatives, consultation with County planning staff, and review of applicable documents such as the Local Agencies' general plans.

The BRCP would not provide individual project approvals or entitlements for any private or public development or infrastructure projects. Accordingly, this EIS/EIR does not provide CEQA or NEPA coverage for individual covered activities and does not function as a *programmatic* or *umbrella* CEQA or NEPA document for regional development and infrastructure projects. The BRCP EIS/EIR evaluates only the adverse and beneficial environmental effects associated with the decisions of the Local Agencies, water and irrigation districts, and Caltrans to approve, permit, and implement the BRCP. Accordingly, the methods for analyzing direct impacts on cultural resources are tailored to evaluate the decisions of the Local Agencies, water and irrigation districts, and Caltrans to approve, permit, and implement the BRCP. This EIS/EIR also incorporates the impact determinations of the Local Agencies' general plan EIRs to analyze indirect impacts on cultural resources.

In adopting the EIRs for the local general plans, each participating jurisdiction determined that the programmatic impacts on cultural resources would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of general plan policies and the adoption of identified mitigation measures (City of Gridley 2009; City of Oroville 2009b; Butte County 2010; City of Chico 2011b; City of Biggs 2013). It is assumed that all covered activities approved by the participating Local Agency would be consistent with the policies of the respective general plan and would be subject to all applicable mitigation measures identified, such that impacts would be adequately mitigated. For development-related activities, no additional mitigation measures are identified in this EIS/EIR chapter beyond the policies identified in the general plans. Water and irrigation district activities have not been analyzed in previous CEQA documents. These activities include: rerouting of existing canals, replacement of water delivery structures, replacement of large weirs, mowing and trimming vegetation along service roads, and removing aquatic vegetation from canals. Potential impacts on cultural resources could occur primarily during construction or maintenance of these activities. The methodology for evaluating impacts to cultural resources also incorporates standard best management practices (BMPs) required by Caltrans during construction of transportation projects and summarized in Appendix D. The analysis assumes that Caltrans would incorporate these BMPs where appropriate on transportation projects within the Plan Area. USACE, SHPO, and BCAG are developing a PA for the BRCP. The PA will define how the agencies will complete management steps necessary to satisfy Section 106 of the NHPA. This document will provide a mechanism for identifying historic properties that may be adversely affected by the NCHP/NCCP and resolving adverse effects.

7.2.2 Significance Criteria

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the action alternatives would be considered to have a significant effect if they would result in any of the conditions listed below.

For the purposes of this analysis, and based on the implementation guidelines for NEPA, CEQA, and Section 106 of the NHPA, an impact was considered to be significant and to require mitigation if it would result in any of the following.

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, as defined as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- Alteration of characteristics of a property that may qualify it for listing in the NRHP.
- Effects that would diminish the integrity of an NRHP-listed or eligible property, as defined in this chapter in Section 7.1, *Affected Environment*.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

7.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)

As discussed in Section 2.3.1, *Alternative 1—No Action (No Plan Implementation)*, under Alternative 1, project proponents would apply for permits on a project-by-project basis, without a coordinated and comprehensive effort to minimize and mitigate impacts to cultural resources through the BRCP. Under the Alternative 1, urban development and public infrastructure projects would continue to occur pursuant to the approved general plans of the Local Agencies and BCAG's regional plan(s). These include residential, commercial, and industrial development as well as construction, maintenance, and use of urban infrastructure, parks, recreational facilities, public services, and similar types of urban land uses. Other activities that would occur under Alternative 1 are construction and maintenance of public infrastructure projects outside of urban areas, including public infrastructure projects in and over streams (e.g. bridge replacements). With respect to cultural resources, projects subject to federal jurisdiction would be required to comply with Section 106. Projects subject to CEQA review would require compliance with the cultural resources regulations contained in CEQA. No regional conservation strategy or conservation measures would be implemented; therefore, benefits to and impacts on cultural resources associated with the conservation strategy and conservation measures would not occur.

Impact CUL-1: Cause alteration of characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 1 have the potential to adversely affect or significantly impact NRHP-eligible historic properties. Activities that could adversely affect NRHP-eligible archaeological resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Activities that could adversely affect NRHP-eligible built resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 1 (e.g., implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, and water and irrigation district projects). The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans and those BMPs identified in Appendix D related to Caltrans projects provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Some ground disturbing activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts have the potential to occur in jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (e.g., maintenance activities to remove aquatic vegetation from canals or replacement of weirs) and may require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or another federal agency. As part of the permitting process the federal agency would require Section 106 consultation on a project-by-project basis to ensure alterations of characteristics of known or unknown archeological resources or identified or not yet identified historic built resources would not occur. For other ground disturbing activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts (e.g., mowing vegetation or

replacement of water structures) it is anticipated that these activities would occur in areas that were already disturbed and thus would have a very low potential to alter characteristics of a known or unknown cultural resource.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1 would result in ground-disturbing activities and other development-oriented activities that could alter the characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, and Section 106 consultation requirements, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1 would result in ground disturbing activities and other development oriented activities that could alter the characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs,, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-2: Cause a change in the significance of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 1 have the potential to alter the CRHR eligibility of known and unknown cultural resources. Any alteration of characteristics of archaeological resources that could affect their CRHR eligibility would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Alterations to the characteristics of built-environment resources that could affect their CRHR eligibility could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 1, as described in Impact CUL-1. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Water and irrigation district ground disturbing activities would either require Section 106 consultation if a federal permit is required and need to satisfy those requirements on a project-by-project basis, or would have a very low potential to affect known and unknown cultural resources.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1 would result in ground-disturbing activities and other development-oriented activities that could change a CRHR-eligible known or unknown resource. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs and Section 106 consultation requirements, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1 would result in ground-disturbing activities and other development-oriented activities that could change a CRHR-eligible known or unknown resource. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-3: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 1 have the potential to cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known and unknown cultural resources. Any such change of integrity of archaeological

resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Any change of integrity of built-environment resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 1, as described in Impact CUL-1. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Water and irrigation district ground disturbing activities would either require Section 106 consultation if a federal permit is required and need to satisfy those requirements on a project-by-project basis, or would have a very low potential to affect known and unknown cultural resources.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1 could result in a change in the NHPA-defined integrity of known or unknown cultural resources through ground disturbing activities or other development oriented activities. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs and Section 106 consultation requirements, are expected to reduce those changes to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1 could result in a change in the NHPA-defined integrity of known or unknown cultural resources through ground disturbing activities or other development oriented activities. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce those changes to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-4: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 1 have the potential to cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known and unknown cultural resources. Any change of integrity, as defined by CEQA, on archaeological resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Any change of integrity of built-environment resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 1, as described in Impact CUL-1. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Water and irrigation district ground disturbing activities would either require Section 106 consultation if a federal permit is required and need to satisfy those requirements on a project-by-project basis, or would have a very low potential to affect known and unknown cultural resources.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1 could change the CEQA-defined integrity of known or unknown cultural resources through ground-disturbing activities or other development-oriented activities. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs and Section 106 requirements, are expected to reduce those changes to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1 could change the CEQA-defined integrity of known or unknown cultural resources through ground-disturbing activities or other development-oriented activities. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce those changes to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-5: Disturb known or unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 1 have the potential to disturb known or unknown human remains. Disturbance of human remains under Alternative 1 would most likely occur during ground-disturbing activities. The locations of known human remains are often obtained from government documents, archival data, oral histories, or CHRIS data on previously recorded cultural resources or previous cultural resources studies. Unknown human remains are typically identified during archaeological construction monitoring, field surveys, testing, or data recovery. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPS, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on human remains to a less-than-significant level. Water and irrigation district ground disturbing activities would either require Section 106 consultation if a federal permit is required and need to satisfy those requirements on a project-by-project basis, or would have a very low potential to affect known and unknown cultural resources.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 1 could disturb known or unknown human remains through ground-disturbing activities from development. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs and Section 106 consultation requirements, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 1 could disturbance known or unknown human remains through ground-disturbing activities from development. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Alternative 2—Proposed Action

Under Alternative 2, covered activities would include the existing, planned, and proposed land uses over which the Permit Applicants have land use authority; state and local transportation projects; maintenance of water delivery systems (e.g., WCWD canals and similar delivery systems); habitat restoration, enhancement, and management actions (conservation measures); and adaptive management and monitoring activities. Covered activities relevant to cultural resources are those that involve construction or those that involve earthmoving activities. Covered activities that would involve construction (including earthmoving activities) are all development activities consistent with the Local Agencies' general plans, state and local transportation projects, and water district canal installation. Conservation measures that involve earthmoving activities are certain restoration actions under the conservation strategy (CM4–CM11, CM13, CM14 and Activities to Improve Urban Stormwater Water Quality). Most covered activities would require individual permits and approvals pursuant to the Local Agencies' general plans and land use regulations or the requirements of the implementing agency (such as Caltrans and irrigation districts) and would undergo subsequent project-level CEQA review and relevant NEPA review for construction and operations-related impacts; some covered activities, however, may be exempted from environmental review requirements due to project characteristics including small projects or infill projects.

Impact CUL-1: Cause alteration of characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 2 have the potential to adversely affect or significantly impact NRHP-eligible historic properties. Activities that could adversely affect NRHP-eligible archaeological resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Activities that could adversely affect NRHP-eligible built resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 2: implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, and water and irrigation district projects and the establishment and management of conservation areas under the proposed BRCP could result in the loss of important previously identified built-environment and unknown archaeological resources. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level (as described under Alternative 1). Additionally, implementation of the PA would provide measures to ensure that these cultural resources are identified, evaluated, and appropriately treated. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts may have a federal nexus, such as requiring a federal permit as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1, would be covered by the PA. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts that do not have a federal nexus as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1 would occur in areas that are currently disturbed and therefore would have a very low potential to alter characteristics of a known or unknown resource.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2 could adversely affect known and unknown NRHP-qualified cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2 could alter characteristics of known and unknown NRHP-qualified cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-2: Cause a change in the significance of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 2 have the potential to alter the CRHR eligibility of known and unknown cultural resources. Any alteration of characteristics of archaeological resources that could affect their CRHR eligibility would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Alterations to the characteristics of built-environment resources that could affect their CRHR eligibility could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 2: implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, water and irrigation district projects and establishment and management of conservation areas under the proposed BRCP could result in the loss of important previously unknown built-environment and archaeological resources. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans

BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, implementation of the PA would provide measures to ensure that these cultural resources are identified, evaluated, and appropriately treated. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts may have a federal nexus, such as requiring a federal permit as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1, and these activities would be covered by the PA. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts that do not have a federal nexus as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1 would occur in areas that are currently disturbed and therefore would have a very low potential to alter characteristics of a known or unknown resource.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2 could change cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2 could change cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-3: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 2 have the potential to cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known and unknown cultural resources. Any such change of integrity of archaeological resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Any change of integrity of built-environment resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 2: implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, and water and irrigation district projects and the establishment and management of conservation areas under the proposed BRCP could result in the loss of important previously unknown built-environment and archaeological resources. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans, as well as Caltrans BMPs, provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, implementation of the PA would provide measures to ensure that these cultural resources are identified, evaluated, and appropriately treated. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts may have a federal nexus, such as requiring a federal permit as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1, and these activities would be covered by the PA. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts that do not have a federal nexus as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1 would occur in areas that are currently disturbed and therefore would have a very low potential to alter characteristics of a known or unknown resource.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2 could change NHRA-defined integrity of cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2 could change NHRA-defined integrity of cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-4: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 2 have the potential to cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known and unknown cultural resources. Any change of integrity, as defined by CEQA, on archaeological resources would typically, though not exclusively, include ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Any change of integrity of built-environment resources could result from a wide range of activities under Alternative 2: implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, water and irrigation district projects and establishment and management of conservation areas under the proposed BRCP could result in the loss of important previously unknown built-environment and archaeological resources. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, implementation of the PA would provide measures to ensure that these cultural resources are identified, evaluated, and appropriately treated. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts may have a federal nexus, such as requiring a federal permit as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1, and these activities would be covered by the PA. Activities undertaken by the water and irrigation districts that do not have a federal nexus as described in Alternative 1 Impact CUL-1 would occur in areas that are currently disturbed and therefore would have a very low potential to alter characteristics of a known or unknown resource.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2 could change CEQA-defined integrity of cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2 could change CEQA-defined integrity of cultural resources as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-5: Disturb known or unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

Activities under Alternative 2 have the potential to disturb known or unknown human remains. Disturbance of human remains under Alternative 2 would most likely occur during ground-disturbing activities. Implementation of the general plans, Caltrans projects, water and irrigation district projects, and establishment and management of conservation areas under the proposed BRCP could result in the loss or disturbance of previously unknown human remains. The locations of known human remains are often obtained from government documents, archival data, oral histories,

or CHRIS data on previously recorded cultural resources or previous cultural resources studies. Unknown human remains are typically identified during archaeological construction monitoring, field surveys, testing, or data recovery. The cultural resources policies and actions outlined in the Local Agencies' general plans and Caltrans BMPs provide measures that would adequately reduce potential impacts on human remains to a less-than-significant level. Moreover, activities under Alternative 2 would comply with the California Health and Human Safety Code (Section 7050.5) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, which govern the procedures for discovery of and treatment of human remains.

NEPA Determination: Alternative 2 could disturb known or unknown human remains as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing plus the requirements of the California Health and Human Safety Code (Section 7050.5) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: Alternative 2 could disturb known or unknown human remains as described for Alternative 1. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing plus the requirements of the California Health and Human Safety Code (Section 7050.5) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill

Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2 except that it uses the various general plan EIR reduced development alternatives as described in Chapter 2, *Proposed Action and Alternatives*, to create a single reduced development footprint. Covered activities under this alternative would be similar to those described in the BRCP but would be limited to the reduced development footprint for a reduced permit term of 30 years. The reduced footprint and reduced land conservation would result in fewer built structures and less ground disturbance.

It is anticipated that under Alternative 3, fewer acres of natural communities would be conserved because reduced development would provide reduced funding for the conservation strategy. However, it is anticipated that the conservation measures would be the same because the reduction of fill would be achieved through the reduced development footprint of the Local Agencies' general plans rather than through modification of the conservation measures. Consequently, the impacts related to implementation of the conservation strategy and conservation measures would be the same as under Alternative 2. Therefore, the impact mechanisms related to cultural resources under Alternative 3 would be the same as those under Alternative 2.

Impact CUL-1: Cause alteration of characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could alter characteristics of known and unknown NRHP-qualified cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-2: Cause a change in the significance of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-3: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change NHPA-defined integrity of cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-4: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change CEQA-defined integrity of cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-5: Disturb known or unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. General plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing plus the requirements of the California Health and Human Safety Code (Section 7050.5) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Alternative 4—Greater Conservation

Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 except that under Alternative 4, the conservation strategy would include the conservation of an additional 9,850 acres of grassland and 35,310 acres of rangeland. Alternative 4 would include the same conservation measures as Alternative 2, and all other acreage protection targets for natural communities/land types would be the same as described under Alternative 2. Conservation of lands currently in open space or agriculture would not increase the potential for effects on cultural resources, because there would be no change in the uses of the land that would result in more ground disturbance or effects on structures. Therefore, impact mechanisms related to cultural resources would be similar to those described for Alternative 2. All NEPA and CEQA impact determinations for Impacts CUL-1 through CUL-5 would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-1: Cause alteration of characteristics of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the NRHP (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could alter characteristics of known and unknown NRHP-qualified cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-2: Cause a change in the significance of known or unknown cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change cultural resources that may qualify for listing in the CRHR. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that

are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-3: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by NHPA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change NHRA-defined integrity of cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-4: Cause a change in the integrity, as defined by CEQA, of known or unknown cultural resources (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. This alternative could change CEQA-defined integrity of cultural resources. However, general plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, are expected to reduce potential alterations to levels that are below significance. Further, measures implemented through the PA would reduce potential impacts of the conservation strategy and other activities that have a federal nexus.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact CUL-5: Disturb known or unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (NEPA: less than significant; CEQA: less than significant)

The impact under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 2. General plan policies and measures, as well as Caltrans BMPs, that require construction monitoring, field surveys, and testing plus the requirements of the California Health and Human Safety Code (Section 7050.5) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are expected to reduce disturbances to levels that are below significance.

NEPA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA Determination: The impact determination would be the same as under Alternative 2; the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

7.2.4 Cumulative Analysis

Methods and Approach

The cumulative analysis for cultural resources is a qualitative evaluation using the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects listed in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, under *Cumulative Impacts*. In addition, for cultural resources, the HRI, the Determinations of Eligibility, and relevant county and city general plans were the primary sources used to gather information on known significant archaeological and built-environment properties in the Plan Area. In general, these data were gathered at the county and city level. The exact locations of significant cultural resources in or near the Plan Area are not fully known at this time. This analysis considered urban development projects, including roadway projects, and water supply development projects; the general plan EIR impact determinations for cumulative impacts, where applicable; and the impact determinations identified above for the various alternatives. This analysis determines whether the covered activities not analyzed in previous environmental documents would result in cumulatively considerable incremental contribution that, when combined with the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a cumulatively significant impact.

Cumulative Impacts

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are identified in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, under *Cumulative Impacts*. Such projects have resulted in an increase in agricultural uses and urban uses in the Plan Area and thus represented an overall change, alteration or loss of cultural resources. This has generally resulted in cumulatively significant effects on cultural resources within the Plan Area.

Alternative 1—No Project (No Plan Implementation)

The County and Cities of Oroville, Chico and Biggs determined that cumulatively considerable and significant impacts on cultural resources would not result from the implementation of the general plans. However, the city of Gridley identified that implementation of the general plan would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. Although there would be no additional activities (i.e., conservation strategy or conservation measures) beyond implementation of the general plans, the No Action Alternative would contribute to cumulative impacts as determined in the Gridley general plan EIR. Accordingly, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects—including implementation of the general plan—would result in cumulatively considerable and significant impacts. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts.

Alternative 2—Proposed Action

Establishment and management of conservation areas under Alternative 2 could result in the loss of important previously unidentified built-environment and unknown archaeological resources or in the disturbance of human remains. Furthermore, the City of Gridley determined implementation of the general plan would result in cumulatively considerable and significant impacts to cultural resources. However, any cumulative loss of cultural resources from covered activities, including

implementation of general plans, would be partially offset by Alternative 2 and other large-scale conservation efforts that place lands in open space and remove the development potential, thereby avoiding substantial disturbance and loss of cultural resources in those areas. Therefore, it is anticipated Alternative 2 would not result in an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts.

Alternative 3—Reduced Development/Reduced Fill and Alternative 4—Greater Conservation

Although the extent of the ground disturbing activities, development activities, and establishment and management of conservation areas varies among these two alternatives, the mechanism and implications are the same as under Alternative 2. Neither Alternative 3 nor Alternative 4 would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources.

7.3 References

- Butte County. 2010. *Butte County General Plan 2030 Final Environmental Impact Report*. August 30. Oroville, CA. Available: <http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2010-08-30_FEIR/default.asp>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.
- . 2012. *Butte County General Plan 2030*. Adopted October 26, 2010. Amended November 6, 2012. Oroville, CA. Available: <http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/products/2012-11-06_GPA_ZO_Adopted/ButteCountyGP2030_Amended.pdf>. Accessed: February 25, 2013.
- City of Biggs. 2013. *Biggs General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. October. Prepared for the City of Biggs. Prepared by PMC, Chico, CA.
- . 2014. *City of Biggs General Plan*. Biggs, CA. March. Prepared for City of Biggs. Prepared by PMC, Biggs, CA.
- City of Chico. 2011a. *Chico 2030 General Plan*. April. Chico, CA. Available: <http://www.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/documents/CompleteGeneralPlan.pdf>. Accessed: April 30, 2013.
- . 2011b. *2030 General Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report*. January. SCH# 2008122038. Chico, CA. Prepared by PMC, Chico, CA.
- City of Gridley. 2009. *2030 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. November. Gridley, CA. Prepared by EDAW/AECOM, Sacramento, CA.
- . 2010. *2030 General Plan*. February 15. Gridley, CA. Available: <<http://www.gridley.ca.us/city-departments/planning-department/documents>>. Accessed: April 30 and May 2, 2013.
- City of Oroville. 2009a. *Oroville 2030 General Plan*. June 2. Oroville, CA. Prepared by Design, Community & Environment, Berkeley, CA, in association with Fehr & Peers Associates and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. Available: <<http://www.cityoforoville.org/index.aspx?page=451#1>> Accessed: April 30 and May 1, 2013.

———. 2009b. *2030 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. March 31. SCH# 2008022024. Oroville, CA. Prepared by Design, Community & Environment, Berkeley, CA, in association with Fehr & Peers Associates and Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. Available: <<http://www.cityoforoville.org/index.aspx?page=452>>. Accessed: February 22, 2013.

Fredrickson, D. A. 1973. *Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.