4.7 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from implementation of the Downtown Roseville Specific Plan, along with recommended mitigation measures to reduce any significant impacts. This section also provides a summary of the cultural resources assessment for the Plan area. To determine whether there are potentially significant prehistoric or historic-era resources in could be adversely affected by future development activities, cultural resource specialists conducted documentary research, an archaeological survey, an architectural inventory and evaluation, and an analysis of historical references and maps depicting the Plan area. The documentary research also included a record search conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS).

This project DEIR has been prepared to meet the requirements of a project-level EIR. The City's intention in preparing this project EIR is that no further environmental review under CEQA would be required for subsequent projects which are consistent with the Specific Plan to provide for the streamlined approval of projects proposed within the Plan area that are consistent with land use designations, adhere to design guidelines (specifically prototype development), or fall within the scope of the Specific Plan and EIR.

4.7.1 Existing Conditions

ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING

The Plan area lies within the territory commonly attributed to the ethnographic Nisenan, sometimes referred to as the Southern Maidu (Dixon 1905, Kroeber 1925). Ethnographers generally agree that Nisenan territory included the drainages of the Bear, American, Yuba, and southern Feather Rivers and extended from the Sacramento River east to the crest of the Sierra Nevada (Beals 1933, Faye 1923, Gifford 1927, Kroeber 1925).

The Nisenan built their villages on low, natural rises along streams and rivers or on gentle slopes with a southern exposure, usually in places protected from flooding. Village populations ranged from 15 to 500 people, with one village usually playing a dominant role in the sociopolitical organization of a particular area. Nisenan settlements varied from three to as many as 50 houses. Structures were dome-shaped, 10 to 15 feet in diameter, and covered with earth, tule mats, or grass. A variety of other structures including sweat houses, dance houses, and acorn granaries were also constructed (Kroeber 1925).

The Sacramento Valley and lower foothills were rich in natural resources, and the Nisenan took advantage of the wide variety of food sources. Waterfowl, fish, and freshwater mussels and clams were readily available in the rivers. Acorns were important to their diet and were supplemented with seeds, nuts, berries, herbs, and fruit. Except for lizards, snakes, and grizzly bears, virtually every animal was a food source including tule elk, deer, and antelope. The Nisenan moved with the seasons, following game and collecting plants. Manzanita berries, pine nuts, black oak acorns, skins, bows, and bow wood were traded with the valley people in exchange for fish, roots, grasses, shells, beads, salt, and feathers (Kroeber 1925).

Because early contact with Spanish explorers and missionaries was limited to the southern edge of their territory, the Nisenan were not directly affected by the Spanish incursions during the late 1700s and late 1800s, although they often sheltered Plains Miwok who had escaped from missions. In 1808, Gabriel Moraga crossed Nisenan territory, but it was not until the Hudson's Bay Company trappers journeyed through the region in the 1820s and 1830s that the first impacts on the native residents were felt. The fur trappers introduced malaria into the Central Valley, leading to an epidemic that decimated the local population in 1833. The Valley Nisenan were particularly affected by the disease with entire villages wiped out. Cook (1975) estimates that 75% of the Valley Nisenan population died during this epidemic.

John Sutter initiated further disruption when he introduced Plains Miwok into the region in the early 1840s as workers which further disrupted traditional Nisenan lifeways. The Nisenan who survived the epidemic and Sutter's working conditions, however, had little chance against the gold miners that poured into the valley and

foothills in the later 1840s. Most of the Nisenan population was eliminated by the mid-1850s. The survivors eked out a living by working in agricultural activities, ranching activities, logging, and/or in the domestic sphere (Cook 1975). The Miwok people survive today, and often celebrate and revive their traditional cultural practices.

HISTORIC SETTING

The following section provides an overview of historic-era development, trends, and events that contributed to the growth and development of the built environment within the Plan area. Unless otherwise stated, this overview is primarily summarized from *A Brief History of Roseville* by Leonard Davis (Roseville Historical Society 1993).

Roseville, 1850-1900

The first Euro-Americans to settle in the area now known as Roseville were gold-seekers who left the placer mining fields to farm on the plains region of southwestern Placer County. Many of these pioneering farmers formed the nucleus of what would become a bustling railroad town.

The first railroad to pass through this rich farming region was the California Central, an extension of the Sacramento Valley Railroad. Construction of the rail line through this area began in late August/early September of 1861. The route of this rail line was circuitous, passing through present-day Roseville Square Shopping Center, then crossing Dry Creek at Folsom Road where it proceeded northerly to Lincoln and Marysville. In 1864, tracklaying crews from the Central Pacific Railroad pushed eastward from Sacramento across the plains on their way to building what would become the western half of the Transcontinental Railroad. In Roseville, the rails of the Central Pacific intersected with those of the California Central. The location of this meeting of the rails was simply labeled as "Junction" on early railroad maps. A small freight and passenger center, soon to be known as Roseville, developed around this junction.

The favorable location of the junction in the heart of a rich agricultural area would make it an important shipping and trading center in years to come. One of the first individuals to capitalize on this was O. D. Lambard, who, in 1864, platted the town-site of a city to be called Roseville. The name Roseville is purported to have been conferred because of the many wild roses growing profusely in and around the area. For the next four decades, Roseville remained a small railroad shipping point of approximately 250 inhabitants, catering to the needs of area farmers and ranchers. The town centered on the railroad depot and a few small businesses which lined the two principal streets of Atlantic and Pacific.

The community that developed was one of the ubiquitous railroad towns that developed in California during the mid to late nineteenth century. Its favorable location in the heart of rich agricultural land made it an important shipping and trading center for local farmers and ranchers.

Roseville, 20th Century

By the turn of the century, Roseville's population was still largely made up of ranchers. However, this setting abruptly changed in 1906 when the railroad roundhouse and repair facilities moved to Roseville from nearby Rocklin which had been the area's major railroad service center. Almost overnight, the quiet ranching town evolved into a bustling city of approximately 3,000 people.

New subdivisions accommodated the new residents. Business and commercial growth during this time was extensive and caused the town to expand outward in all directions. Atlantic Street, which had been one of Roseville two principal business thoroughfares, was moved back approximately 100 feet to accommodate the laying of new track for roundhouse and repair facilities. The business section, which had been limited to Atlantic and Pacific Streets, expanded along Lincoln, Main, Church, and later, Vernon Streets. A Chamber of Commerce was organized to provide needed municipal services such as water, electricity, police, and fire protection.

In 1909, the town was incorporated and steadily grew until it became Placer County's largest city. In one three-year period (1911–1914), more than 110 new buildings were constructed. The population increased from 2,608 in

1910 to 4,477 in 1920, by which time Roseville was divided into two main sections including the North Side centered along Lincoln Street and extending back to and including Church and Main Streets and the rapidly expanding South Side centered along Vernon Street.

The buildings during this time period within the Plan area consisted mostly of commercial properties with the occasional modest-sized dwelling. Roseville continued as a major railroad center well into the post World War II years; however, by the 1950s, interstate trucking and airlines provided stiff competition. The introduction of jet aircraft and the completion of Interstate 80 (I-80) through Roseville in 1956 saw the abrupt decline of the once booming passenger train service.

The town slowly expanded easterly with the completion of I-80. This led to the eventual decline of the Lincoln-Church-Main Street business center and the Vernon Street area. The town's commercial center shifted from downtown to what became known as "East Roseville." By 1968, a significant portion of business activity centered in the Roseville Square-Harding Way and Sunrise Boulevard areas.

A revitalization movement, began in 1977, aimed to restore the physical and economic prominence of Roseville's downtown area to its heyday of the 1920s. Buildings were painted, facades reconstructed, and awnings and overhangs were installed. As part of the revitalization effort, the Plan area also saw new business development and reconstruction efforts during this time. Roseville continues to grow today and has a population of over 100,000 people. The meager beginnings of this ranching village – turned railroad town – blossomed into a vital economic center within Placer County.

FINDINGS

Previous Investigations

Previous cultural resource studies conducted in the vicinity of the Plan area identified several historic-era properties, mostly consisting of early twentieth century commercial and residential buildings. Of the previously recorded resources, three were determined to appear eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR): the City Hall Annex (316 Vernon Street), the Tower Theater (419–425 Vernon Street), and the old Vernon Street School (PAR Environmental Services 2000). The Vernon Street School building was demolished in late 2002 because of hazardous materials concerns and its former location is of no specific concern from a historical resources standpoint.

Old Town Roseville, bordered by Main Street on the north, Pacific Street on the south, Washington Boulevard on the west, and Lincoln Street on the east, is designated by the City of Roseville as a historic district (at the local level). This designation however is not formally listed on the CRHR at this time. The location of the first Transcontinental Railroad (Landmark No. 780-1) is also located within Old Town Roseville at the intersection of Lincoln and Pacific Streets.

Archaeological Resources

Pre-field Research

The records search conducted for the this study included reviews of sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the CRHR, the California Inventory of Historic Resources (1976), California Historical Landmarks (1996), California Points of Historical Interest (1992 and updates), the Historic Property Data File, and the Caltrans State and Local Bridge Survey (1989 and updates), as well as a review of information center maps and files of the findings of previous cultural resource surveys conducted in the Plan area.

Field Methods

Information provided by the records search was supplemented with a pedestrian field survey performed in December 2007. The archaeological survey identified the majority of the proposed Plan area is covered with

impervious surfaces (e.g., concrete, asphalt, gravel) that afford no visibility of the ground surface. Areas immediately surrounding some of the buildings (e.g., residences) are landscaped with manicured lawns.

The NCIC records search and archaeological survey did not result in the identification archaeological resources within the Plan area. As described in Section 4.7.3, there is the potential that archaeological deposits are located beneath buildings and roadways within the Plan area.

Architectural Resources

In December 2007 and January 2008, an architectural historian visited the Plan area to inventory existing architectural resources (see Table 4.7-1). The field visit resulted in the identification of 213 historic-era properties that are currently in excess of 45 years in age. Many of these resources had been previously documented during preceding cultural resources surveys. Only historic-era buildings in the Old Town and Downtown Vernon Districts were evaluated as part of this investigation. In accordance with the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), buildings currently more than 45 years old were photographed in the field and recorded on the appropriate DPR Series 523 forms. Table 4.7-1 provides a list of these buildings and their locations along with Assessor Parcel map reference numbers (APN) corresponding to the location of each property. The 25 buildings within the Plan area that were built after 1963 (referred to as non-historic) were tabulated but not formally documented because of their relatively recent age of construction (see Table 4.7-1). The non-historic-era buildings noted in the Plan area are also listed in Table 4.7-2.

The types of buildings within the Plan area vary in age, style, and function. The majority of resources that were recorded as part of the inventory consist of commercial properties dating from the 1910s to the 1950s. Residential buildings within the Plan area mostly consist of vernacular buildings with the same range of construction dates. Historic-era buildings can sometimes be tangible reminders of distinctive architectural styles or of the foresight of early local businessmen and women who built diversified economic bases that allowed cities to thrive. Such buildings, however, generally require the retention of enough historic integrity to their period(s) of significance in order to reflect that association and meet CRHR eligibility criteria. The majority of buildings within the Plan area have been significantly modified and do not evoke a sense of place and time to their original construction dates. Loss of historic fabric and subsequent infill development over the years has been extensive within the area resulting in a non-cohesive area with a low degree of historic integrity. Of the 213 historic-era buildings located within the Plan area, two appear eligible for listing on the CRHR including the City Hall Annex (located at 316 Vernon Street) and Tower Theater (located at 241 Vernon Street). The Vernon Street Schoolhouse was previously determined eligible for the CRHR but was demolished in 2002. Also, the Old Town Roseville area has been designated as a historic district at the local level by the City of Roseville. The remaining buildings do not appear eligible for CRHR listing due to a lack of significant association and lack of historic integrity.

Certain property types are generally excluded from consideration for listing in the CRHR. One such property type are properties that are less than 50 years old (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4852 (d)(2)). The buildings listed in Table 4.7-2 are currently less than 45 years old and, therefore, are not considered eligible for listing on the CRHR. However, because the Specific Plan is intended to address potential development over the next 20 years, some of these buildings will reach an age of 45 years or older over time and an evaluation under CRHR criteria may be needed within the timeframe of the Plan (see Section 4.7.3).

Table 4.7-1 Pre-1963 Buildings within the Plan Area						
APN	Address	Age	APN	Address	Age	
011-101-002	701 Lincoln Street	1940	011-145-006	205 Grove Street	1959	
011-101-003	110 Elefa Street	1930	011-145-007	308 Washington Blvd.	1956	
011-101-004	114 Elefa Street	1916	011-143-002	119 Pleasant Street	1941	
011-101-005	120 Elefa Street	1941	011-143-003	115 Pleasant Street	1928	
011-101-006	200 Elefa Street	1943	011-143-004	111 Pleasant Street	1923	

Table 4.7-1 Pre-1963 Buildings within the Plan Area						
APN	Address	Age	APN	Address	Age	
011-101-007	202 Elefa Street	1925	011-143-005	109 Pleasant Street	1917	
011-101-009	212 Elefa Street	1924	011-143-009	116 Grove Street	1946	
011-100-003	611 Washington Blvd.	1963	011-143-010	120 Grove Street	1906	
011-102-004	308 Hill Avenue	1940	011-143-011	122 Grove Street	1917	
011-102-007	224 Pleasant Street	1906	011-143-012	126 Grove Street	1920	
011-102-008	228 Pleasant Street	1919	011-143-013	200 Placer Street	1910	
011-102-009	306 Hill Avenue	1927	011-143-014	204 Placer Street	1910	
011-102-010	312 Hill Avenue	1941	011-143-015	210 Placer Street	1910	
011-102-011	316 Hill Avenue	1942	011-146-001	120 Placer Street	1936	
011-103-003	205 Elefa Street	1925	011-146-004	121 Grove Street	1941	
011-103-005	201 Elefa Street	1918	011-146-005	119 Grove Street	1920	
011-103-006	200 Pleasant Street	1920	011-146-006	115 Grove Street	1916	
011-103-007	204 Pleasant Street	1924	011-146-007	109 Grove Street	1908	
011-103-008	208 Pleasant Street	1935	011-146-008	427 Lincoln Street	1918	
011-103-011	500 Washington Blvd.	1920	011-146-016	423 Lincoln Street	1912	
011-103-013	510 Washington Blvd.	1962	011-146-017	419 Lincoln Street	1905	
011-141-001	419 Washington Blvd.	1915	011-146-011	116 Main Street	1939	
011-141-002	413 Washington Blvd.	1908	011-146-012	120 Main Street	1961	
011-141-003	409 Washington Blvd.	1918	011-146-013	124 Main Street	1915	
011-141-004	401 Washington Blvd.	1955	011-146-014	134 Main Street	1920	
011-144-001	315 Washington Blvd.	1909	011-146-020	114 Placer Street	1930	
011-144-002	309 Washington Blvd.	1920	011-146-021	112 Placer Street	1910	
011-142-003	412 Washington Blvd.	1950	011-147-002	506 Lincoln Street	1962	
011-142-004	209 Pleasant Street	1920	011-147-003	502 Lincoln Street	1914	
011-142-005	219 Placer Street	1920	011-147-012	430 Lincoln Street	1926	
011-142-006	217 Placer Street	1938	012-122-001	342 Lincoln Street	1914	
011-142-007	215 Placer Street	1948	012-122-003	302 Lincoln Street	1910	
011-142-008	209 Placer Street	1920	012-121-001	200 Washington Blvd.	1953	
011-142-009	202 Grove Street	1925	012-121-003	120 Church Street	1953	
011-142-010	206 Grove Street	1930	012-121-007	101 Main Street	1925	
011-142-011	210 Grove Street	1920	012-121-009	104 Church Street	1922	
011-145-001	310 Washington Blvd.	1954	012-121-012	113 Main Street, Apt.1	1920	
011-145-003	115 Placer Street	1930	012-121-013	113 Main Street, Apt.2	1920	
011-145-004	113 Placer Street	1930	012-121-014	113 Main Street, Apt.3	1920	
012-123-004	215 High Street	1944	013-164-018	628 Royer Street	1937	
012-123-005	211 High Street	1926	013-152-002	600 Oak Street	1940	
012-123-008	115 Washington Blvd.	1950	013-152-004	608 Oak Street	1943	
012-123-009	109 Washington Blvd.	1951	013-152-005	612 Oak Street	1925	
012-124-001	229 Church Street	1918	013-152-007	624 Oak Street	1916	
012-124-002	227 Church Street	1940	013-152-008	628 Oak Street	1920	
012-124-005	213 Church Street	1938	013-152-009	632 Oak Street	1920	

Table 4.7-1 Pre-1963 Buildings within the Plan Area					
APN	Address	Age	APN	Address	Age
012-124-007	217 Church Street	1927	013-152-010	623 Vernon Street	1946
012-124-008	221 Church Street	1924	013-152-016	110 Judah Street	1930
013-071-006	124 Vernon Street	1926	013-152-018	106 Judah Street	1945
013-072-001	222 Jefferson Street	1936	013-152-020	616 Oak Street	1929
013-072-003	126 Linda Drive	1923	013-153-001	114 Taylor Street	1937
013-072-004	122 Linda Drive	1915	013-153-003	510 Oak Street	1930
013-072-005	116 Linda Drive	1930	013-153-004	514 Oak Street	1935
013-072-007	100 Lincoln Street	1926	013-153-005	518 Oak Street	1930
013-072-009	104 Lincoln Street	1940	013-153-006	522 Oak Street	1914
013-072-010	119 Vernon Street	1935	013-153-007	526 Oak Street	1924
013-072-011	111 Vernon Street	1927	013-153-008	530 Oak Street	1914
013-073-002	205 Jefferson Street	1929	013-153-009	534 Oak Street	1930
013-073-015	213 Jefferson Street	1919	013-153-013	515 Vernon Street	1927
013-073-017	225 Jefferson Street	1935	013-153-014	501 Vernon Street	1950
013-073-020	223 Jefferson Street	1919	013-153-022	500 Oak Street	1936
013-073-021	221 Jefferson Street	1961	013-154-001	500 Royer Street	1930
013-161-001	801 Vernon Street	1945	013-154-002	504 Royer Street	1905
013-161-002	803 Vernon Street	1937	013-154-005	516 Royer Street	1944
013-164-001	214 Judah Street	1907	013-154-006	520 Royer Street	1919
013-164-002	218 Judah Street	1920	013-154-008	528 Royer Street	1926
013-164-003	222 Judah Street	1925	013-154-009	532 Royer Street	1931
013-164-004	612 Royer Street	1943	013-154-010	531 Oak Street	1963
013-164-005	616 Royer Street	1925	013-154-011	527 Oak Street	1919
013-164-009	629 Oak Street	1920	013-154-012	523 Oak Street	1911
013-164-010	211 Bulen Street	1960	013-154-013	519 Oak Street	1927
013-164-011	625 Oak Street	1910	013-154-014	515 Oak Street	1943
013-164-012	621 Oak Street	1925	013-154-015	511 Oak Street	1955
013-164-013	619 Oak Street	1925	013-154-016	509 Oak Street	1935
013-164-014	615 Oak Street	1915	013-154-017	202 Taylor Street	1925
013-164-015	609 Oak Street	1922	013-131-007	427 Oak Street	1930
013-164-016	605 Oak Street	1930	013-131-008	423 Oak Street	1935
013-164-017	212 Judah Street	1915	013-131-013	415 Oak Street	1935
013-131-014	411 Oak Street	1935	013-092-009	246 Vernon Street	1935
013-131-016	417 Oak Street	1939	013-092-010	343 Atlantic Street	1907
013-131-022	419 Oak Street	1941	013-092-011	319 Atlantic Street	1918
013-121-003	524 Vernon Street	1946	013-093-001	103 Lincoln Street	1934
013-121-004	534 Vernon Street	1960	013-093-003	235 Vernon Street	1925
013-121-005	510 Vernon Street	1930	013-093-004	231 Vernon Street	1928
013-122-001	400 Vernon Street	1949	013-093-005	229 Vernon Street	1950
013-122-002	404 Vernon Street	1948	013-093-006	219 Vernon Street	1921
013-122-003	406 Vernon Street	1938	013-093-007	201 Vernon Street	1927

Table 4.7-1 Pre-1963 Buildings within the Plan Area					
APN	Address	Age	APN	Address	Age
013-122-004	408 Vernon Street	1934	013-093-008	103 Lincoln Street	1949
013-122-005	414 Vernon Street	1963	013-171-002	623 Royer Street	1930
013-122-009	432 Vernon Street	1922	013-171-003	619 Royer Street	1930
013-123-014	Taylor Street	1920	013-171-004	615 Royer Street	1930
013-123-018	424 Oak Street	1910	013-171-005	611 Royer Street	1945
013-124-006	329 Vernon Street	1961	013-171-006	417 Douglas Street	1925
013-124-007	325 Vernon Street	1936	013-171-007	300 Judah Street	1943
013-124-008	323 Vernon Street	1960	013-171-009	308 Judah Street	1930
013-101-002	50 Lincoln Street	1950	013-172-007	523 Royer Street	1945
013-101-004	129 Linda Drive	1956	013-172-008	519 Royer Street	1935
013-101-008	307 Sutter Avenue	1923	013-172-009	515 Royer Street	1920
013-101-009	207 Sutter Avenue	1921	013-172-010	509 Royer Street	1945
013-101-014	123 Linda Drive	1963	013-172-016	317 Judah Street	1959
013-101-018	115 Sutter Avenue	1927	013-172-017	313 Judah Street	1950
013-091-002	316 Vernon Street	1936	011-146-024	106 Main Street	1908
013-091-003	320/330 Vernon Street	1935	011-146-025	110 Main Street	1915
013-092-005	214 & 216 Vernon Street	1924; 1978	013-071-001	106 Vernon Street	c.1935
013-092-006	228 Vernon Street	1920	013-072-012	105 Vernon Street	1947
013-092-007	220 Vernon Street	1947	013-123-009	419-425 Vernon Street	1940
013-092-008	240 Vernon Street	1930			

Table 4.7-2 Post-1963 Buildings within the Plan Area						
011-101-008	208 Elefa Street	1985	013-154-004	512 Royer Street	2004	
011-142-014	400 Washington Blvd.	1979	013-154-007	524 Royer Street	2003	
011-143-008	104 Grove Street	1972	013-132-020	165 Park Drive	1996	
012-123-014	123 Washington Blvd.	1983	013-121-002	520 Vernon Street	1976	
012-124-004	213 Church Street	1988	013-121-006	500 Vernon Street	1975	
013-073-011	97 Vernon Street	2000	013-122-010	426 Vernon Street	1966	
013-162-001	725 Vernon Street	2006	013-123-017	401 Vernon Street	1982	
013-163-005	701 Oak Street	1967	013-124-011	115 S. Grant Street	1972	
013-151-004	600 Vernon Street	1991	013-101-013	127 Linda Drive	1974	
013-152-012	605 Vernon Street	1964	013-101-021	140 Folsom Road	1973	
013-153-019	521 Vernon Street	1965	013-172-014	323 Judah Street	1964	
013-153-023	531 Vernon Street	1980	013-172-020	311 Judah Street	1984	
013-154-003	508 Royer Street	1980				
Source: Placer County Assessor's Records						

4.7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

According to CEQA, cultural resources include traces of prehistoric habitation and activities, historic-era sites and materials, places used for traditional Native American observances, or places with special cultural significance. In general, any evidence of human activity over 50 years in age is required to be treated as a potentially significant cultural resource. To allow for adequate time for project planning and approval, resources more than 45 years in age are generally considered for historical significance under CEQA. As build-out for the proposed Plan is projected to occur over the next 20 years, this analysis also considered any property within the Plan area currently more than 25 years in age.

CEQA states that if a proposed project would result in impacts to significant historical resources, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered. However, only significant resources need to be addressed. The State CEQA Guidelines define a significant cultural resource as "a resource listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources" (CRHR) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 5024.1). Those CRHR-eligible sites, features, artifacts, or places are termed "historical" resources. A historical resource may be eligible for inclusion on the CRHR if it:

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

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, historical resources must also contain enough integrity to be recognizable as a historical resource. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association.

State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5) also require consideration of unique archaeological sites. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR, but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource as outlined in PRC Section 21083.2, it may be treated as a significant historical resource.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE GENERAL PLAN 2020

The *City of Roseville General Plan 2020* (City of Roseville 2004) contains the following goals and policies related to archaeological, historic, and cultural resources applicable to the proposed project:

Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Goal: Strengthen Roseville's unique identity through the protection of its archaeological, historic, and cultural resources.

- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 1: When items of historical, cultural or archaeological significance are discovered within the City, a qualified archaeologist or historian shall be called to evaluate the find and to recommend proper action.
- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 2: When feasible, incorporate significant archaeological sites into open space areas.

- ▶ Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 3: Subject to approval by the appropriate federal, state, local agencies, and Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD), artifacts that are discovered and subsequently determined to be "removable" should be offered for dedication to the Maidu Interpretive Center.
- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 4: Preserve and enhance Roseville's historic qualities through the implementation of the Downtown, Old Town, and Riverside Master Plans.
- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 5: Establish standards for the designation, improvement, and protection of buildings, landmarks, and sites of cultural and historic character.
- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 6: Participate in the completion of a countywide inventory of historical sites.
- ► Archaeological, Historic and Cultural Resources Policy 7: Encourage public activities, including the placement of monuments or plaques that recognize and celebrate historic sites, structures, and events.

4.7.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The analysis of potential impacts to cultural resources was based on documentary research, archaeological and architectural inventories, analysis of historical references and Plan area maps, and the records search conducted at the NCIC.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The proposed project would cause a significant effect on cultural resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. A substantial adverse change includes physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resource such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[b]).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

IMPACT 4.7-1

Cultural Resources – Disturbance of Architectural Resources. The architectural inventory and evaluation conducted for the proposed project resulted in the conclusion that 2 of the 213 architectural properties within the Plan area that are at least 45 years old appear individually eligible for listing on the CRHR. In addition, the Old Town Roseville area is designated as a historic district by the City of Roseville at the local level. The remaining buildings in the Plan area are not considered CRHR-eligible. However, 25 additional buildings in the Plan area were built between 1960 and 1980 and will become at least 45 years in age during the 20-year build-out period for the Plan and may be considered eligible for listing in the CRHR when they become of sufficient age. Therefore, the project would have a potentially significant impact on architectural resources.

Of the 213 historic-era buildings located in the Plan area (i.e., built before 1963), most were evaluated and determined to have no significant associations and no distinctive architectural characteristics during this study and in previous investigations. In addition, the majority of these buildings have been heavily modified over the years resulting in a loss of historic integrity. Two buildings in the Plan area appear to meet the criteria for CRHR eligibility due to either a significant association to local history (CRHR Criterion 1) or distinguishing architectural characteristics (CRHR Criterion 3). These buildings consist of the City Hall Annex (316 Vernon Street), and the Tower Theater (419-425 Vernon Street). The City Hall Annex building (316 Vernon Street) has suffered some loss of historic integrity due to a one-story addition placed at the rear of the main building. The first two-thirds of

this addition exhibit the same exterior cladding (i.e., board-form concrete) and window treatment as the main building, and likely dates to the late 1930s. Despite the use of these sympathetic design elements, the addition features an overall utilitarian appearance and is out of character with the main building. However, because the addition is at the rear of the building and not visible from the public-facing façade, its impact on the overall style of the building is considered minimal. Furthermore, because the addition appears to be roughly contemporaneous with the original 1930s construction, its impact on overall integrity is further diminished. As stated in National Register Bulletin 15, if a property's historic character defining physical features are visible and not covered by non-historic material, its integrity is considered sufficient to convey significance. Because the character defining Spanish Eclectic features of this building are readily apparent on its principal façade, the rear addition is not seen as a significant loss of integrity.

The old Vernon Street School was previously determined eligible for CRHR listing, however was demolished in 2002. Although introduction of visual elements in the immediate area, such as a new town square, could be viewed as diminishing the integrity of the "immediate surrounds" (i.e., the setting) of historical buildings, this aspect of integrity has already been compromised as a result of modern development in the immediate vicinity, was already compromised at the time of their nomination to the CRHR, and does not diminish their significance.

The Old Town Roseville Historic District consists of commercial buildings displaying a variety of architectural styles ranging from late nineteenth century Victorian styles to the Deco-Moderne style of the 1930s and 1940s. Implementation of the Plan could allow future development to physically alter historical resources on Vernon Street and in the Old Town Roseville District which would result in substantial adverse changes in a manner affecting the characteristics that make these resources eligible as a historical resource.

An additional 25 buildings in the Plan area were constructed after 1963. Because of their recent age of construction, they are not currently considered eligible for inclusion in the CRHR as individual properties. However, build-out under the Plan is anticipated to occur over a 20-year period, during which time 15 of these 25 buildings would become at least 45 years old. Future developments that would remove or substantially alter these 15 resources after they become 45 years in age could adversely affect significant historical resources. These impacts are considered potentially significant.

IMPACT Cultural Resources – Disturbance of Potential Subsurface Cultural Deposits. No archaeological
 4.7-2 resources are known to occur in the Plan area. However, because of the extensive amount of development in the Plan area, unknown subsurface cultural deposits could be present beneath roads and buildings. Grading and excavation activities associated with the proposed project could disturb buried archaeological deposits. This impact is considered potentially significant.

A records search and an archaeological survey of the Plan area were performed and no archaeological sites were found. However, most of the Plan area is covered by roads, sidewalks, and buildings (i.e., impervious materials). Therefore, unrecorded, buried subsurface cultural deposits could be present within the Plan area beneath these developed areas. Grading, excavation, and trenching activities associated with development activities in the Plan area could potentially disturb intact subsurface cultural deposits in the Plan area. This impact is considered potentially significant.

IMPACT Cultural Resources – Undiscovered / Unrecorded Human Remains. Project-related construction
4.7-3 activities could uncover or otherwise disturb previously undiscovered or unrecorded human remains.

Any disturbance of human remains would be a potentially significant impact.

While no evidence for prehistoric or early historic interments was found in the Plan area, this does not preclude the existence of buried subsurface human remains. California law recognizes the need to protect historic-era and Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American interments from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 7052 and California PRC Section

5097. If any human remains were unearthed during grading, excavation, and trenching activities associated with development activities in the Plan area, particularly those that were determined to be Native American in origin, a potentially significant impact could occur.

4.7.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are provided for potentially significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-1: Cultural Resources – Disturbance of Architectural Resources.

Two of the historic-era resources located within the Plan area to appear to be eligible for CRHR listing. These resources include: 316 Vernon Street and 419-425 Vernon Street. The Old Town Roseville area is designated as a historic district at the local level by the City of Roseville. Consequently, it is recommended that any alterations made to these eligible resources be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and the Design Guidelines for Central Roseville. Generally, under CEQA, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation is considered to have mitigated impacts to a historical resource to a less-than-significant level (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5).

Development within the Plan area could result in new land uses, infill development, and streetscape improvements. Over the 20-year build-out period for the Specific Plan, future developments within the Plan area could result in impacts to 25 buildings built between 1963 and 1983. These buildings and their locations are listed in Table 4.7-2. Prior to the approval of demolition or building permits that would result in substantial alteration of any of the 15 buildings that will reach 45 years in age by the build-out date, the City shall ensure that an evaluation of significance according to CRHR criteria shall be performed. If the evaluation indicates the property is not eligible for listing in the CRHR, no further action is necessary. If any of these buildings are found to be eligible for listing in the CRHR in conjunction with future evaluations, the City shall ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties or develop other methods to avoid significant impacts to these properties in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). This measure would reduce potentially significant impacts to Architectural Resources to a less-than-significant level.

If it is not feasible to retain an eligible historic resource, prior to demolition, documentation similar to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) shall be conducted. A HABS -like recordation would document the site history, construction history, and current appearance of the eligible resource in the context of Roseville's history. The HABS-like recordation shall be completed by an architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualifications standards, and an experienced HABS photographer. The final document shall be filed in a local library / repository. Although this type of documentation eliminates one adverse impact of demolition (i.e., loss of historical information) it does not prevent the physical loss of a historically significant resource.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to disturbance of architectural resources. However, the potential loss of a historically significant resource could occur. While implementation of mitigation measure 4.7-1 would lessen project impacts, demolition of a historical resource would be a significant adverse change and, therefore, considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: Cultural Resources – Potential Subsurface Cultural Deposits.

In the event that unrecorded cultural materials are identified during construction-related ground disturbing activities, potentially destructive work in the vicinity of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can

determine the significance of the find and, if appropriate, provide recommendations for treatment to the City. Treatment approved by the City shall be implemented prior to resuming ground disturbing activities.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to unrecorded cultural deposits identified during construction activities. As a result this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-3: Cultural Resources - Undiscovered / Unrecorded Human Remains.

If human remains are discovered at any project construction site during any phase of construction, work within 50 feet of the remains shall be suspended immediately, and the City of Roseville, the project applicant, and the county coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the county coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The City or the project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) identified by the NAHC. As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the MLD including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The City or the project applicant shall implement any mitigation before the resumption of activities at the site where the remains were discovered.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to the discovery of human remains during project construction. As a result this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

4.7.5 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed project includes the possibility of demolishing a historical resource (i.e., 316 Vernon Street). While implementation of mitigation measure 4.7-1 would lessen project impacts to architectural resources to the extent feasible, demolition of a historical resource would be considered a significant adverse change and, therefore, a significant and unavoidable impact.