

4.12 Cultural Resources

Introduction

This section of the DEIR addresses potential impacts to a variety of cultural resources (i.e., paleontological, archaeological, and historic) within the County. The regulatory setting provides a description of applicable federal, State, and local regulatory policies. The environmental setting provides a summary of known resources in the County. A description of the potential impacts of the proposed project is also provided and includes the identification of feasible mitigation (where applicable) to avoid or lessen the impacts.

Summary of NOP Comments

NOP comment letters from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Native American Heritage Commission were received, and addressed in this section, as appropriate.

Summary of Impact Conclusions

A summary of the cultural resource impacts described in this section are provided below in **Table 4.12-1**.

**TABLE 4.12-1
SUMMARY OF CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS**

Impact Number	Impact Topic	Impact Conclusion	Impact After Mitigation
Impact 4.12-1	Historical Resources	Potentially Significant	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 4.12-2	Archaeological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Impact 4.12-3	Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Impact 4.12-4	Burial Sites	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant

Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

Most applicable Federal regulations concerning historic resources have been established to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. The NHPA established guidelines to “preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and to maintain, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and a variety of individual choice.” The NHPA includes regulations specifically for Federal land-holding agencies, but also includes regulations (Section 106) which pertain to all projects that are funded, permitted, or approved by any Federal agency and which have the potential to affect cultural resources. All projects that are subject to NEPA are also subject to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA requirements concerning cultural resources can be addressed through compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA process. Provisions of NHPA establish a National Register of Historic

Places (The National Register) maintained by the National Park Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Offices of Historic Preservation, and grants-in-aid programs.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Native American Graves and Repatriation Act

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act recognizes that Native American religious practices, sacred sites, and sacred objects have not been properly protected under other statutes. This act establishes as national policy that traditional practices and beliefs, sites (including right of access), and the use of sacred objects shall be protected and preserved. Additionally, Native American remains are protected by the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1990.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing professional standards and providing guidance related to the preservation and protection of all cultural resources listed in, or eligible for, listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties apply to all grant-in-aid projects assisted through the National Historic Preservation Fund, and are intended to be applied to a wide variety of resource types, including buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts. The treatment standards, developed in 1992, were codified as 36 CFR 68 entitled, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects." The standards address four treatments:

- Preservation focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time (protection and treatment are also considered under this treatment).
- Rehabilitation as a treatment focuses on the repair and replacement of deteriorated features; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when a depiction of a property at a particular point in time is not appropriate.
- Restoration is the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time through the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the reconstruction period.
- Reconstruction addresses those aspects of treatment necessary to re-create an entire non-surviving building with new material.

Certified Local Government Program (CLG)

The Certified Local Government (CLG) Program is a national program designed to encourage the direct participation of a local government in the identification, registration, and preservation of historic properties located within the jurisdiction of the local government. A local government may become a CLG by developing and implementing a local historic preservation program based on federal and State standards.

The CLG program encourages the preservation of cultural resources by promoting a partnership among local governments, the State of California, and the National Park Service (NPS). Becoming

a CLG can provide local staff and commissions with the tools, technical training, and more meaningful leadership roles in the preservation of a community's cultural heritage. Local interests and concerns are integrated into the official planning and decision-making processes at the earliest possible opportunity.

According to the July 10, 2012 CLG contact list provided by the California Office of Historic Preservation (California Office of Historic Preservation 2012), Plumas County is not a Certified Local Government.

Other Federal Legislation

Historic preservation legislation was initiated by the Antiquities Act of 1966, which aimed to protect important historic and archaeological sites. It established a system of permits for conducting archaeological studies on Federal land, as well as setting penalties for noncompliance. This permit process controls the disturbance of archaeological sites on Federal land. New permits are currently issued under the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979. The purpose of ARPA is to enhance preservation and protection of archaeological resources on public and Native American lands. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 declared that it is national policy to "Preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance."

State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires that lead agencies determine whether projects may have a significant effect on archaeological and historical resources. This determination applies to those resources which meet significance criteria qualifying them as "unique," "important," are listed on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or are eligible for listing on the CRHR. If the agency determines that a project may have a significant effect on a significant resource, the project is determined to have a significant effect on the environment, and these effects must be addressed in the appropriate environmental document. If a cultural resource is found not to be significant or unique under the qualifying criteria, it need not be considered further in the planning process.

CEQA emphasizes avoidance of archaeological and historic resources as the preferred means of reducing potential significant environmental effects resulting from projects. If avoidance is not feasible, an excavation program or some other form of mitigation must be developed to reduce the impacts. In order to adequately address the level of potential impacts, and thereby design appropriate mitigation measures, the significance and nature of the cultural resources must be determined. The following are steps typically taken to assess and mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources for the purposes of CEQA:

- Identify cultural resources;
- Evaluate the significance of the cultural resources found;
- Evaluate the effects of the project on cultural resources; and

- Develop and implement measures to mitigate the effects of the project on cultural resources that would be significantly affected.

California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)

California State law also provides for the protection of cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources identified in CEQA documents. Under CEQA, a cultural resource is considered an important historic resource if it meets any of the criteria found in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Criteria identified in the CEQA Guidelines are similar to those described under the NHPA. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) maintains the CRHR. Historic properties listed, or formally designated for eligibility to be listed, on The National Register are automatically listed on the CRHR. State Historical Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest are also automatically listed. The CRHR can also include properties designated under local preservation ordinances or identified through local historic resource surveys.

State Laws Pertaining to Human Remains

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the county coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. CEQA Guidelines (Public Resources Code Section 5097) specify the procedures to be followed in case of the discovery of human remains on non-Federal land. The disposition of Native American burials falls within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission.

Tribal Consultation Guidelines (Senate Bill 18)

Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), authored by Senator John Burton and signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in September 2004, requires local (city and county) governments to consult with California Native American tribes when amending or adopting a general plan or specific plan, or designating land as open space, in order to aid in the protection of traditional tribal cultural places (“cultural places”). SB 18 also requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to include in the General Plan Guidelines advice to local governments for how to conduct these consultations. The intent of SB 18 is to provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early stage in the planning process, for the purpose of protecting or mitigating impacts to cultural places. These consultation and noticing requirements apply to the adoption and amendment of both general plans (defined in Government Code Section 65300 et seq.) and specific plans (defined in Government Code Section 65450 et seq.).

Environmental Setting

Prehistoric Setting

As glaciers receded from the Sierra Nevada and the Cascades, humans migrated into the foothills and higher elevations’ protected valleys. Humans have been utilizing the Sierra and Cascade

ranges for thousands of years, and have been an integral part of its ecology for 2,000 to 5,000 years. This is particularly apparent through documented use of fire to facilitate propagation and gathering of plant species preferred for foodstuffs, basketry materials, medicinal uses and other needs. Harvesting extraction and processing of stone, acorn, pine nut, basketry fiber, and other resources by native peoples resulted in alterations to the land resources in many locations across Plumas County

The Mountain Maidu is the tribal group whose people were present in Plumas County when European migrants started to settle. Depending on what source is relied upon, the Mountain Maidu people have lived in various locations in Plumas County from hundreds to thousands of years and still do today. Other tribes, such as the Washoe, and the Paiute most likely utilized the area while not settling permanently. When weather permitted, the Maidu maintained permanent villages along the timbered edges of glacial valleys. From early Spring to late Fall, smaller groups traveled to upper Sierra ridge tops and valleys, setting up open air brush shelters. Villages were occupied during winter months and relied mostly on stored and preserved food. The Mountain Maidu people most likely existed in small, scattered, familial groups in the valleys of Plumas County.

Their existence was suddenly disturbed in the spring of 1850 when a flood of gold-seeking miners poured into the canyons and valleys of the region in search of a fabled “Gold” Lake. Overnight, mining camps sprang to life. Rivers were turned from their beds, ditches were dug to bring water from distant sources to the diggings and the land was turned upside down.

Historic Setting

As agricultural areas were later established in Plumas County, Mountain Maidu dispersed to live on portions of ranch properties and, in many cases, adopted the name of the ranching family associated with the ranch on which they resided. While there were no official extermination programs in the Plumas County area during the European Settlement period, the population of Maidu declined significantly due to illness.

A sizable Chinese population took up residence here and remained until the early 1900s when, with the decline in mining, most left the area.

The North, Middle and South forks of the Feather River were named in 1821 by Captain Luis Arguello as the Rio de las Plumas (“River of Feathers”) after the Spanish explorer saw what looked like bird feathers floating in the water. “Plumas”, the Spanish word for “feathers”, later became the name for the county. The river and its forks were the primary sites of early mining activity, with many smaller camps located on their tributaries. Over the next five decades gold mining remained the main industry of the county.

Ranching operations in the area also began during the Gold Rush years, with several large ranches established in the valleys of Plumas County. Dairies provided milk, butter, and cheese to the gold fields and later provided dairy products to the silver mining operations in northern Nevada. Many of the Swiss and Italian families who settled and worked the local meadows and

valleys have third and fourth generations living and ranching their agricultural lands in the county today.

In 1850, the famous mountain man James P. Beckwourth, discovered the lowest pass across the Sierra Nevada and the following year navigated a wagon trail for California-bound emigrants from western Nevada, through Plumas County, to the Sacramento Valley.

Several years later, in March of 1854, Plumas County was formed from the eastern and largest portion of Butte County with the town of Quincy chosen as the county seat after a heated election. In 1864, a large part of northern Plumas County was carved off to form present day Lassen County. Following this, Plumas County annexed a small portion of Sierra County, which included the town of La Porte.

A favorite winter activity of miners was competitive skiing on 12 to 14 foot “longboards” or “snowshoes,” the name first given to skis. Beginning around the gold towns of Johnsville, La Porte and Onion Valley, these activities are now documented as the first competitive downhill skiing events in the world.

Approximately 1862, Greenville came into existence as a mining and farming community at the head of Indian Valley; Chester, near Lake Almanor, was born as a result of damming Big Meadows and the lumber potential from the timber stands blanketing the area. Soon after the turn of the century, and with the construction of the Western Pacific Railroad in 1910, Portola came into existence.

With the railroad for transportation, the timber industry began to emerge as the primary economic force in the county. Until that time lumber was milled strictly for local use. Finished lumber could now be shipped nationwide from Plumas forests. Realizing the importance of the area’s forests, President Theodore Roosevelt established the Plumas National Forest in March 1905, with boundaries that roughly encompassed the branches of the Feather River. The national forests produced significant timber for the nation from around World War II up to the 1980s. The private timber industry contributed enormously to the growth and prosperity of Plumas County and continues to do so to this day.

Along with the railroad’s construction up the Feather River Canyon came some of the earliest tourists to the county. Resorts and lodges popped up at intervals along the “Feather River Route” to accommodate fishermen, hikers and sightseers. The last passenger train ran in 1970, and the line is now devoted to freight traffic only. In 1937, the Feather River Highway, touted as an “all weather route”, was completed through the Feather River Canyon from Oroville to Quincy, linking Plumas County year-round to the Sacramento Valley. Although railroads are no longer a key component of the local transportation infrastructure, they have left a legacy of notable bridges and other railway features in the area.

Hydroelectric power was first brought to the Feather River Canyon in 1908 when the Big Bend Powerhouse was built by the Eureka Power Company. This powerhouse is now under Lake Oroville. Steps to gain control of land and water rights, and smaller power companies, to create

Lake Almanor took several years. By 1912, Great Western Power had secured title to the necessary lands for this project. Construction took until 1914 to complete and, in another four years, Lake Almanor was initially filled. Additional hydropower projects would be completed elsewhere in Plumas County and on the North Fork of the Feather River in a network known as the “Stairway of Power”.

Records Search

Preliminary investigation for the proposed project included a request by cultural resources staff to the Northeast Information Center (NEIC) for a records search of the County. The search performed by NEIC included a review of their resource maps, the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, the California Historical Landmarks, the California Points of Historical Interest, the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, the Caltrans State and Local Bridge Survey, the Survey of Surveys, GLO Plats, and other pertinent historical data available at the NEIC.

Known Cultural Resources within Plumas County

The term “cultural resources” is often broadly used to include paleontological, archaeological, and historic resources. These individual resources can be defined as follows:

- **Paleontological Resources:** Paleontology is the study of plant and animal fossils. Generally, paleontological resources are more than 10,000 years old.
- **Archaeological Resources:** Archaeology is the study of prehistoric human activities and cultures. Archaeological resources are generally associated with indigenous cultures and are less than 10,000 years old.
- **Historic Resources:** Historic resources are associated with the more recent past. In California, historic resources are typically associated with the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods in the state’s history and are usually less than 200 years old.

According to the records search conducted with the Northeast Information Center, the County includes a number of historic and prehistoric resources. **Table 4.12-2** provides a summary of previously recorded historic and prehistoric resources/sites and identifies several of the more common types of resources found within the County.

**TABLE 4.12-2
SUMMARY OF RECORDED SITES WITHIN PLUMAS COUNTY**

Recorded Sites by Category	Number of Sites
Prehistoric Sites	
- Flaked Stone Scatters	1,263
- Bedrock Mortar/Groundstone	288
- Petroglyph	13
- Burial	6
- Architectural Feature (House Pit)	47
- Hearth (Midden)	22
Historic Sites	
- Water Conveyance Ditch	538
- Historic Cemetery	36
- Standing Structure	186
- Mine/Mining Related Feature	511

Source: NEIC, 2012

A summary of National Register, State Landmark, and Point of Interest listed properties is provided in **Table 4.12-3**. Brief descriptions of these properties follow the table.

**TABLE 4.12-3
SUMMARY OF CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCES WITHIN PLUMAS COUNTY**

Landmark (Plaque Number)	National Register	State Landmark	Point of Interest	Date Listed	Nearest Community
Beckwourth Pass (336)	Yes	Yes		8/8/1939	Chilcoot
Bucks Lake (197)		Yes		6/20/1935	Quincy
Ch'ichu'yam-bam (N2213)	Yes			9/25/2003	Crescent Mills
Chinese American Cemetery, Plumas County Memorial Park (P770)			Yes	5/11/1992	Quincy
Drakesbad Guest Ranch (N2216)	Yes			10/ 22/ 2003	Chester
Elizabethtown (231)		Yes		6/20/1935	Quincy
James P. Beckwourth Ranch & Trading Post (P183)			Yes	9/24/1970	Beckwourth
Jamison City, Eureka Mills, Johnstown, and the Famous Eureka Mine (196)		Yes		6/ 20/1935	Blairsden
Lakes Basin Petroglyphs (N85)	Yes			5/ 6/1971	Gold Lake
Marysville-Carson City Trail (P620)			Yes	8/16/1983	Plumas National Forest
Peter Lassen Marker (Site of Lassen Trading Post) (184)		Yes		6/20/1935	Greenville
Pioneer Grave (Grizzly Creek) (212)		Yes		6/ 20/1935	Quincy
Pioneer Schoolhouse (625)		Yes		1/13/1958	Quincy
Pioneer Ski Area of America, Johnsville (723)		Yes		1/18/1960	Blairsden
Plumas-Eureka Mill, Jamison Mines District (N249)	Yes			7/16/1973	Blairsden
Rabbit Creek Hotel Monument (213)	Yes	Yes		6/20/1935	La Porte

TABLE 4.12-3 (continued)
SUMMARY OF CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCES WITHIN PLUMAS COUNTY

Landmark (Plaque Number)	National Register	State Landmark	Point of Interest	Date Listed	Nearest Community
Rich Bar (337)		Yes		8/8/1939	Quincy
Site of American Ranch and Hotel (479)		Yes		11/ 9/1950	Quincy
Site of Plumas House (480)		Yes		11/ 9/1950	Quincy
Spanish Ranch and Meadow Valley (481)		Yes		11/9/1950	Quincy
Taylorville Schoolhouse (P742)			Yes	5/8/1991	Taylorville
Town of Taylorville (P318)			Yes	9/12/1973	Taylorville
Warner Valley Ranger Station (N579)	Yes			4/3/1978	Chester

Beckwourth Pass. Beckwourth Pass, at an elevation of 5,221 feet, the lowest pass in the Sierra Nevada, was discovered in 1851 by James P. Beckwourth. The monument is dedicated to the discoverer and to the pioneers who passed along this trail.

Bucks Lake. This was the site of a ranch established by Horace Bucklin and Francis Walker in 1850. Later became a large hotel, post office, and express office. The site is now inundated by Buck’s Dam and Reservoir.

Ch’ichu’yam-bam. Also called Chuchuya, Tsu’tuyem, or Soda Rock, Ch’ichu’yam-bam features prominently in Northeastern Maidu creation myths and today is important to the Maidu as a physical manifestation of events in the myths.

Drakesbad Guest Ranch. Drakesbad Guest Ranch is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, at the state level of significance, for its direct and significant association with regional conservation and with the development of the northern California tourism industry as it evolved near and within Lassen Volcanic National Park.

Elizabethtown. Tate’s Ravine was named in the spring of 1852, when Alex and Frank Tate discovered gold there. Lewis Stark and his family came across the plains to settle here in September 1852. A very rich mine was opened up and the location grew in population. Soon the miners wanted a new name for the settlement, so they called it Elizabethtown in honor of Stark’s daughter, the village’s only unmarried woman.

Jamison City, Jamison City, Eureka Mills, Johnstown, And the Famous Eureka Mine. Along the Pioneer Trail lies Jamison City and mine, large producer and famous for its 52-pound nugget. Eureka Mill and mine yielded \$17 million to Cornish miners and others. Johnstown, now Johnsville, is a well-preserved ‘49er town.

Lakes Basin Petroglyphs. Prehistoric petroglyphs within the Maidu historic territory, thought to represent religious beliefs, territory boundaries, and other cultural values.

Peter Lassen Marker (Site of Lassen Trading Post). In the summer of 1850, Lassen and a companion, Isidore Meyerwitz, went to Indian Valley and selected a suitable location for a ranch,

where they erected a log cabin in 1851 to house their trading post. In 1855 Lassen moved to Honey Lake Valley, Lassen County, where he resided as a miner and farmer until he was killed from ambush while prospecting in 1859.

Pioneer Grave (Grizzly Creek). The legend, as told by the pioneers: “The lad was returning to Marysville from a trip to the mines, he, having packed a trainload of provisions to the mines, was returning with gold dust. He was murdered and robbed. Later a comrade carved his name, age, etc., on a tree. P. Linthiuh, died September, 1852, age 19.

Pioneer Schoolhouse. In 1857 the residents of the eastern end of American Valley built a school, the first schoolhouse in Plumas County. On July 2, 1857, Mr. S. A. Ballou was engaged as teacher for 19 children. The building is now used for kindergarten purposes (1957).

Pioneer Ski Area of America, Johnsville. The first sport ski area in the western hemisphere was in the Sierra Nevada, and by 1860 races were being held in the Plumas-Sierra region. The mining towns of Whiskey Diggings, Poker Flat, Port Wine, Onion Valley, La Porte, Jamison City, and Johnsville organized the earliest ski clubs and annual competitions.

Rabbit Creek Hotel Monument. La Porte, first known as Rabbit Creek, was one of the most important settlements in the southern part of Plumas County. In the fall of 1852, Eli S. Lester built the Rabbit Creek Hotel, the first house in town.

Rich Bar. Gold was first found here in July 1850 by miners coming over the mountains from the Yuba Diggings, and there was much production during early 1850s along this east branch of the Feather River’s north fork. Here ‘Dame Shirley’ (Louise Amelia Knapp Smith Clappe) wrote her “Letters from the California Mines”, one of the classics of the gold rush.

Site of American Ranch and Hotel. James H. Bradley in 1854 built the American Hotel, the first sawed-lumber house in Quincy. On March 18, 1854, three commissioners met there to form a new county from a portion of Butte County, and the hotel became the county seat of Plumas County until a more suitable location could be found. Plumas Lodge No. 60, F. & A.M., instituted May 1, 1854, met in an upstairs room in the hotel until their new Quincy temple was completed in 1855.

Site of Plumas House. The first and second Plumas Houses were built on this site. The second was built in 1866 by James and Jane Edwards. This hotel, the center of Quincy’s social and business life for more than thirty years, burned to the ground on June 23, 1923.

Spanish Ranch and Meadow Valley. Miners going to the East Branch, Middle Fork, or North Fork of the Feather River separated at Spanish Rancho, established in July 1850 by two Spaniards, and at Meadow Valley, 2.5 miles from Spanish Ranch.

Warner Valley Ranger Station. The Warner Valley Ranger Station is of local significance in the categories of architecture and the history of conservation. Originally built in 1926, it had the distinction of being the first building constructed by the National Park Service in the newly

created Lassen Volcanic National park, and was constructed by adapting the methods of building a log cabin to a structure built of milled lumber.

Historic Resources of Local Importance

The County's existing General Plan identifies the following resources as candidate historic buildings or trails:

- Genesee Valley – Hand hewn Log Cabin and Stone House (built 1870 – 1880).
- Stump Ranch Barn and Milkhouse.
- Quincy Elementary Schoolhouse.
- Taylorsville – Mt. Jura Trail.
- Montgomery Creek Trail.
- Hinchman Trail.
- Hosselkus Trail.
- Hosselkus Ranch and Home.
- Mt. Ingalls Trail.
- Nye Creek Trail.
- Ward Creek Trail.
- Lee Ranch.
- Martin Dairy.
- Bidwell House.
- Chester Library.
- Old Town Grocery.
- Olsen Hotel.
- Cate/Hail Home.
- Clinch Building.
- Courthouse.
- Forest Stationers.
- Goodwin House.
- Borden Log Cabin, built by Fred Borden after the Yukon Gold Rush.
- Community United Methodist Church.
- Crescent Mills School House.
- Wesleyan Methodist Church.
- Stover Ranch.
- Old Chester School.
- Baccala Ranch.
- Ruffa Ranch.
- Fanani Ranch.
- Keffer Ranch.
- Miller House.
- Lemm Ranch.
- Tobin Resort.
- Eyraud Home.
- Rich Bar.
- Piazzoni Cabin.
- McMillan House.
- Paxton Lodge.
- Cervantes House.
- Masonic Temple.
- Miller Store.
- Scheiser Ranch.
- Mormon Pole Barn, built in 1852, at Mormon Station.
- American Ranch and Hotel Site.
- Plumas County Bank Building.
- Methodist Episcopal Church.
- Rainbow Lodge.
- Knoll Ranch.
- Clary Home.
- Cooke Home.
- Hyden Home.
- Jackson Home.
- Old Taylorsville Creamery.
- Herring Home.
- Fork Marker.
- Bucks Lake.
- Bucks Ranch Hotel Site.
- Meadow Valley.
- Meadow Valley School.
- Spanish Ranch.
- Elizabethtown.
- Capitol Club.
- Rabbit Creek Hotel.
- 20 Mile House.

- Goodwin Law Office.
- Huskinson Home.
- Kaulback/Beyer Home.
- Kellog Home.
- Masonic Temple.
- Whitney House.
- Summit School.
- Clinch Ranch House.
- McKenzie Ranch.
- Beckwourth Cabin.
- Murray Home.
- Warehouse.
- Madigan House.
- Miller Home.
- Sheehan House.
- Plumas House Site.
- Town Hall Theater.
- White Home.
- Whitlock House.
- Thompson Ranch.
- Haddick Ranch.
- Feather River Prep School.
- Johnsville Hotel.
- Mohawk Bridge.
- Mohawk Hotel and Tavern.
- Creamery.
- Clio General Store.
- White Sulphur Springs Ranch.
- Onion Valley Townsite.

Native American Consultation

A request to the NAHC was made by County staff in October 2010 to conduct a search of their sacred lands database to determine if any Native American cultural resources are present on or in the vicinity of the County. The NAHC response letter (dated November 30, 2010) included a list of Native American organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the County. Letters to these individuals were sent on December 29, 2010. To date, two responses have been received from the Enterprise Rancheria (letter dated January 13, 2011) and from the Greenville Rancheria (letter dated January 6, 2011). Copies of all correspondence are provided in **Appendix F** of this DEIR.

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and rock or soil formations that have produced fossil material. Fossils are the remains or traces of prehistoric animals and plants. Fossils are important scientific and educational resources because of their use in: (1) documenting the presence and evolutionary history of particular groups of now extinct organisms, (2) reconstructing the environments in which these organisms lived, and (3) determining the relative ages of the strata in which they occur and of the geologic events that resulted in the deposition of the sediments that formed these strata and in their subsequent deformation. CEQA requires that these resources be addressed during the EIR process.

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by federal and state statutes, most notably by the 1906 Federal Antiquities Act. Professional standards for assessment and mitigation of adverse impacts on paleontological resources have been established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Methodology

Research and field methods employed for the cultural resources analysis included a records search of the NEIC of the California Historical Resource Information System, Native American consultation, archival and background research by a qualified historian.

Standards of Significance

The significance criteria for this analysis were developed from criteria presented in Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form”, of the CEQA Guidelines and based on the professional judgment of the County of Plumas and its consultants. The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact 4.12-1: Historical Resources

SU	The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy historic resources.
	Level of Significance Before Mitigation: <i>Potentially Significant</i>
	Required Additional Mitigating Policies and Implementation Measures: <i>No Additional Mitigation Available</i>
	Resultant Level of Significance: <i>Significant and Unavoidable</i>

Implementation of new development under the proposed project could result in the damage, degradation, or alteration of the historic integrity of various sites that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register, State Register, or local inventories of historic places. Significant historical resources are non-renewable and therefore cannot be replaced. The disturbance or alteration of a historical resource causes an irreversible loss of significant information. Two types of typical adverse effects occur in relation to historical resources: direct and indirect impacts. Direct impacts are caused by and are immediately related to a specific project, such as the demolition of an historical building. Indirect impacts are not immediately related to a project, but they are caused indirectly by a project. An example of an indirect impact would involve the construction of a roadway or trail alignment through an area containing historical resources, which then has the potential to impact historical resources indirectly through activities such as vandalism or degradation of the resources from increased access and use. Designated and

potentially significant historical resources could be directly and/or indirectly impacted as a result of new private or public development implemented under the proposed project. New development under the proposed project could result in the destruction of historical resources through development activities such as grading, clearing, demolition, alteration, or structural relocation. The proposed project could also result in an increase in development intensity which could adversely affect historical sites through the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric effects that are out of character with the historical resources or alter the setting of the resources when the setting contributes to the resources' significance. The proposed project may also result in the redevelopment of a historical structure or site that may result in the remodeling, alteration, addition, or demolition of a historical resource, or a change in use that is not compatible with the authenticity of the resource and that would substantially alter its significance. Additionally, infrastructure or other public works improvements associated with development allowable under the proposed project could also result in damage to or demolition of historical features.

As detailed in the Regulatory Setting above, there are a number of federal and state regulations in place to protect historical resources in the County. In addition, proposed project includes numerous policies (see **Table 4.12-4**, below) designed to address these potential impacts to local historic resources. For example, the Conservation and Open Space Element includes Policies COS-7.5.1, COS-7.5.3, COS-7.5.4, COS-7.5.10 and ECON-5.6.11 which promote the preservation, protection and revitalization of historic buildings and areas to preserve the County's unique historic heritage. Policy COS-7.5.5 would require the preparation of assessment of historical resources for all projects involving ground disturbance shall have evaluations to determine cultural and historical significance. Additionally, the Land Use and Conservation/Open Space Elements contain a variety of policies that encourage the preservation of existing historic areas and older neighborhoods (see Policies LU-1.1.2, LU-1.3.3, E-5.6.11, COS-7.5.1, COS-7.5.10, and COS-7.6.4). Policy AG/FOR 8.2.8 encourages the County to maintain, rehabilitate, and restore historic era ranches and farms.

The Land Use, Economics, and Circulation Elements also provide guidance that will serve to protect historic areas and neighborhoods by ensuring the orderly placement of compatible land uses near existing similar land uses (see Policy LU-1.1.1) while promoting a variety of smart growth land use concepts (see policies CIR-4.2.1 and PHS-6.8.2 "Walkable Communities" from the Public Health and Safety Element). The Land Use Element also includes a specific set of policies to encourage compatible development with the neighboring City of Portola (see policy LU-1.3.1 "Working with the City of Portola" and LU-1.3.2 "County and City of Portola's General Plan Consistency").

**TABLE 4.12-4
MITIGATING POLICIES**

Land Use (LU), Economics (E), Agriculture and Forestry (AG/FOR), Conservation and Open Space (COS), Circulation (CIR) and Public Health and Safety (PHS) Element			
Policies designed to minimize this impact through the protection of traditional neighborhoods and historic resources include the following:			
LU-1.1.2	Infill Development	COS-7.6.4	Community Design
LU-1.3.3	Development and Design in City of Portola's Sphere of Influence	COS-7.5.3	Resource Protection with Potential State, Federal, and Local Designations
E-5.6.11	Historic Downtown Area Revitalization	COS-7.5.4	Protection of Potentially Important Historic Sites
AG/FOR-8.2.8	Historic Ranches and Farms	COS-7.5.5	Assessment of Impacts to Cultural and Historical Resources
COS-7.5.1	Cultural and Historic Resource Preservation		
COS-7.5.10	Community Character		
Policies designed to minimize any potential impact of dividing the physical arrangement of an established community by ensuring that growth occurs in an organized manner including the following:			
LU-1.1.1	Future Development	CIR-4.2.1	Complete Street Design
LU-1.1.4	Land Divisions	CIR-4.6.1	Minimizing of Environmental Impacts
LU-1.3.1	Working with the City of Portola	PHS-6.8.2	Walkable Communities
LU-1.5.2	Cost Effective Land Use Pattern	E-5.9.5	Incentives for Use of Existing Infrastructure

Significance Determination

Adoption and implementation of the proposed policies and implementation measures under the proposed project (in addition to current local, state, and federal statutes and regulations) would minimize adverse impacts on historical resources to the maximum extent practicable. Policies are designed to promote historical preservation, such as setting forth measures to encourage the listing of eligible historical sites, the use of land use planning tools such as zoning to protect the integrity of historical sites, and enhance the County's historical programs and documentation. However, implementation of the proposed project could directly or indirectly result in a "substantial adverse change" (physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings) through various development activities for which no possible mitigation may be available to maintain the historic integrity of the affected resource or its surroundings. The County cannot prohibit new development, which would be the only way to reduce these impacts to a historic resource to a less than significant level. Therefore, no mitigation is available to reduce the significance of this impact to a less than significant level. For this reason, impacts to historical resources would still result in a *significant and unavoidable* impact.

Significance Conclusion

Overall, policies included as part of the proposed project have been developed to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historic resources to the maximum extent practicable. However, the potential alteration to a historic resource within designated Planning Areas would be an irreversible consequence associated with implementation of the proposed project through the 2035 Planning Horizon. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce the significance of this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this remains a *significant and unavoidable* impact.

Impact 4.12-2: Archaeological Resources

LTS	The proposed project could potentially damage or destroy archaeological resources.
	Level of Significance Before Mitigation: <i>Less than Significant</i>
	Required Additional Mitigating Policies and Implementation Measures: <i>None</i>
	Resultant Level of Significance: <i>Less than Significant</i>

As detailed in the Environmental Setting section above, the County of Plumas has a long cultural history and is known to have been occupied by Native American groups for thousands of years prior to settlement by non-Native peoples. Areas of high sensitivity for archaeological resources are located within close proximity to valley and regional water courses. Grading, trenching, and other subsurface construction activities associated with buildout of the proposed project have the potential to encounter undiscovered archaeological resources. Undiscovered archaeological resources could potentially be damaged or destroyed.

General Plan Policies COS-7.5.1, COS-7.5.2, COS-7.5.3 and COS-7.5.5 are in place to protect archaeological resources by requiring surveys, research, and testing prior to excavation in projects with discretionary action (see **Table 4.12-5**, below). Additionally, Policies COS-7.5.6, COS-7.5.7 and COS-7.5.8 require the County to encourage the cooperation and education of property owners, the public and the Native American community. Policy COS-7.5.9 requires the County to protect and maintain the confidentiality of previously recorded archaeological sites and resources in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts or other inappropriate uses.

**TABLE 4.12-5
MITIGATING POLICIES**

Conservation and Open Space (COS) Element			
Policies designed to minimize impacts to archaeological resources:			
COS-7.5.1	Cultural and Historical Resource Preservation	COS-7.5.6	Cultural Resource Education Programs
COS-7.5.2	Evaluation of Cultural and Archaeological Resources	COS-7.5.7	Cooperation of Property Owners
COS-7.5.3	Resource Protection with Potential State, Federal, and Local Designations	COS-7.5.8	Local Native American Coordination
COS-7.5.5	Assessment of Impacts to Cultural and Historical Resources	COS-7.5.9	Confidentiality of Archaeological Information

Significance Determination

Buildout of the proposed project within the 2035 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological resources. However, the proposed project includes a number of policies to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that archaeological resources are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on archaeological resources by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already experienced ground-

disturbing activities. Plumas County has also consulted with tribal representatives in accordance with SB18 about the implications of the proposed project on cultural places and sacred sites. This process has provided the County with additional information about areas where potential archeological sites may occur and will enable the County to consider the potential occurrence of these sites. Implementation of these policies would ensure that archaeological resource impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

This impact is considered *less than significant*. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant archaeological impacts and therefore associated impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact 4.12-3: Paleontological Resources

LTS	The proposed project could result in damage or destruction of paleontological resources.
	Level of Significance Before Mitigation: <i>Less than Significant</i>
	Required Additional Mitigating Policies and Implementation Programs: <i>None</i>
	Resultant Level of Significance: <i>Less than Significant</i>

Similar to the impact description provided above for Impact 4.12-2, implementation of the proposed project could result in development-related activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) that could have the potential to damage or destroy paleontological resources.

General Plan Policies COS-7.5.1, COS-7.5.2, COS-7.5.3 and COS-7.5.5 are in place to protect archaeological resources by requiring surveys, research, and testing prior to excavation in projects with discretionary action (see Table 4.12-5, above). Additionally, Policies COS-7.5.6, COS-7.5.7 and COS-7.5.8 require the County to encourage the cooperation and education of property owners, the public and the Native American community. Policy COS-7.5.9 requires the County to protect and maintain the confidentiality of previously recorded archaeological sites and resources in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts or other inappropriate uses.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the proposed project within the 2035 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological and paleontological resources. However, the proposed project includes a number of policies to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on these resources to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that paleontological resources are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on paleontological resources by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already

experienced ground-disturbing activities. Implementation of these policies would ensure that paleontological resource impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

This impact is considered *less than significant*. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant paleontological resource impacts and therefore associated impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact 4.12-4: Burial Sites

LTS	The proposed project could damage or destroy burial sites.
	Level of Significance Before Mitigation: <i>Less than Significant</i>
	Required Additional Mitigating Policies and Implementation Measures: <i>None</i>
	Resultant Level of Significance: <i>Less than Significant</i>

Similar to the impact description provided above for Impact 4.12-2, implementation of the proposed project could result in development-related activities (i.e., subsurface earthmoving) that could have the potential to disturb or destroy burial sites, particularly those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Similar to Impact 4.12-2, General Plan Policies COS-7.5.1, COS-7.5.2, COS-7.5.3 and COS-7.5.5 are in place to protect both above ground and buried cultural resources by requiring surveys, research and testing prior to excavation in projects with discretionary action. Additionally, Policies COS-7.5.6, COS-7.5.7 and COS-7.5.8 require the County to encourage the cooperation and education of property owners, the public and the Native American community. Policy COS-7.5.9 requires the County to protect and maintain the confidentiality of previously recorded archaeological sites and resources in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts or other inappropriate uses.

Significance Determination

Buildout of the proposed project within the 2035 planning horizon could potentially result in adverse impacts on archaeological resources. However, the proposed project includes a number of policies to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on archaeological resources to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of these proposed policies would ensure that archaeological resources are protected from adverse impacts. The proposed policies reduce impacts on archaeological resources by requiring compliance with applicable laws and by implementing a land use concept that will direct new development in areas that have already experienced ground-disturbing activities. Plumas County has also consulted with tribal representatives in accordance with SB18 about the implications of the proposed project on cultural places and sacred sites.

Implementation of these policies would ensure that burial sites and other Native American resource impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

This impact is considered *less than significant*. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Significance Conclusion

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant burial site or other Native American resource impacts and therefore associated impacts would be *less than significant*.
