BACKGROUND INFORMATION

REGULATORY SETTING

The project is subject to the provisions of CEQA, as well as Section 106 of the NHPA.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

CEQA includes provisions that specifically address the protection of cultural resources. CEQA requires consideration of impacts of a project on unique archaeological resources and historical resources. A unique archaeological resource, as defined in PRC Section 21083.2(g), is an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it:

(1) contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;

(2) has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or

(3) is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines generally defines a historical resource as:

(1) a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR);

(2) a resource included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a historical resource survey; and

(3) any other object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant, provided that the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The CRHR includes resources that are listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP (see below), as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest (PRC Section 5024.1, 14 CCR Section 4850). Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be significant resources for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a][2]). The eligibility criteria for listing in the CRHR are similar to those for NRHP listing but focus on the importance of the resources to California history and heritage. A cultural resource may be eligible for listing in the CRHR if it:

(1) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(2) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(3) 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

(4) has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(See 14 CCR Section 4852.)

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION**

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) identifies and catalogs places of special religious or social significance to Native Americans and known graves and cemeteries of Native Americans on private lands, and performs other duties regarding the preservation and accessibility of sacred sites and burials and the disposition of Native American human remains and burial items.

**NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT**

Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800, as amended in 2004) require federal agencies to consider the potential effects of their proposed undertakings on historic properties. Historic properties are cultural resources that are listed on, or are eligible for listing on, the NRHP (36 CFR 800.16[l]). Undertakings include activities directly carried out, funded, or permitted by federal agencies. Federal agencies must also allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to comment on the proposed undertaking and its potential effects on historic properties. Implementation of the proposed project would require permitting under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 408 approval from the USACE. Therefore, USACE compliance with Section 106 is required in relation to the proposed project.

**SECTION 106 PROCESS**

The implementing regulations for Section 106 of the NHPA require consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the ACHP, federally recognized Indian tribes and other Native Americans, and interested members of the public throughout the compliance process. The four principal steps are:

- Initiate the Section 106 process (36 CFR Section 800.3).
- Identify historic properties, resources eligible for inclusion in the NRHP (36 CFR Section 800.4).
- Assess the effects of the undertaking to on historic properties within the area of potential effect (APE) (36 CFR Section 800.5).
- Resolve adverse effects (36 CFR Section 800.6).

Adverse effects on historic properties are often resolved through preparation of a memorandum of agreement or PA developed in consultation between the federal agency, the SHPO, Indian tribes, and interested members of the public. The ACHP is also invited to participate. The agreement describes stipulations to mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES**

The NRHP listing criteria are as follows (36 CFR Section 60.4):

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:
(a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

RURAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

The rural historic landscape is a category of resources that is evaluated under the Section 106 process. This resource category is relevant to this project because RD 1000, the local geographic setting of the proposed project, is eligible for NRHP listing as a Rural Historic Landscape District. National Register Bulletin 30 defines a rural historic landscape as a geographical area that historically has been used by people or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features. Rural landscapes commonly reflect the day-to-day occupational activities of people engaged in traditional work such as mining, fishing, and various types of agriculture. Often, they have developed and evolved in response to both the forces of nature and the pragmatic need of people to make a living. Landscapes that are small and that have no buildings or structures, such as an experimental orchard, are classified as sites. Most, however, being extensive in acreage and containing a number of buildings, sites, and structures—such as a ranch or farming community—are classified as historic districts. Large acreage and a proportionately small number of buildings and structures differentiate rural historic landscapes from other kinds of historic properties.

National Register Bulletin 30 distinguishes rural historic landscapes from designed landscapes. Rural landscapes usually are not the work of a professional designer and have not been developed according to academic or professional design standards, theories, or philosophies of landscape architecture. These properties possess tangible features, called landscape characteristics, that have resulted from historic human use. In this way, they also differ from natural areas that embody important cultural values but have experienced little modification, such as sites having religious meaning for Native American groups.

EXISTING PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

USACE, the SHPO, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the ACHP in 1991 executed a PA that governs the Section 106 process for implementation of the American River Watershed Project, including constructing levee, channel, and related flood control improvements in the Natoma Basin. The PA covers implementation of the specific elements of the proposed improvements that would involve the USACE as the federal lead agency. Additional signatories of the PA include The Reclamation Board and SAFCA.

The PA is relevant to the present study because it controls the Section 106 process for work within the American River Watershed Project, a flood control program that coincides in part with the proposed project. Furthermore, it acknowledges the following: “The Project may be modified based on public input, congressional authorization, and ongoing negotiations among the primary sponsors.” Portions of the proposed project that also coincide with the American River Watershed Project must satisfy the provisions of the PA.

The PA includes procedures for the treatment of indirect and direct impacts of the levee improvements associated with the American River Watershed Project. The executed PA specifies inventory and NRHP evaluation procedures for historic properties, as well as the process for development of Historic Property Treatment Plans (HPTPs). Additionally, the PA details report format and review, participation of interested parties, curation of...
recovered materials, and professional qualifications. Mitigation measures may include archaeological documentation, architectural and engineering documentation, and historical documentation, following standards and guidelines promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

**NATURAL SETTING**

The geological information presented here is taken from SAFCA’s Environmental Impact Report on Local Funding Mechanisms for Comprehensive Flood Control Improvements for the Sacramento Area (SAFCA 2007).

The project area lies in the Sacramento Valley portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province. The Great Valley is a large valley trending northwest-southeast that is bounded by the Sierra Nevada to the east and south, the Coast Ranges to the west, and the Klamath Mountains to the north. The Great Valley is drained by the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, which join and flow out of the Great Valley province through San Francisco Bay. This geomorphic province is an asymmetric trough approximately 400 miles long and 50 miles wide that is characterized by a relatively flat alluvial plain made up of a deep sequence of sediment deposits from Jurassic to Recent age. The sediments in the Great Valley vary between 3 and 6 miles in thickness and were derived primarily from erosion of the Sierra Nevada to the east, with lesser material from the Coast Ranges to the west. The eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley is flanked by uplifted and tilted sedimentary strata that overlie rocks of the Foothills Metamorphic Belt and are in turn overlain on the west by younger alluvium.

The Sacramento Valley has been a depositional basin throughout most of the late Mesozoic and Cenozoic time. A vast accumulation of sediments was deposited during cyclic transgressions and regressions of a shallow sea that once inundated the valley. Overlying the thick sequence of sedimentary rock units that form the deeply buried bedrock units in the mid-basin areas of the valley are Late Pleistocene and Holocene (Recent) alluvial deposits, consisting of reworked fan and stream materials that were deposited by streams prior to the construction of the existing flood control systems. The youngest geomorphic features in the area are low floodplains, which are found primarily along the Sacramento and American Rivers. The natural floodplains of these rivers are very wide in this area because the land is relatively flat. These major drainage ways were originally confined within broad natural levees sloping away from the rivers or streams. The natural levees formed through the deposition of alluvium during periods of flooding. As flood waters lost energy, the coarser materials settled out nearest the rivers and streams, forming the natural levees and sand bars in the vicinity of the river channel. The finer material was carried in suspension farther from the rivers or streams, and settled out in quiet water areas such as swales, abandoned meander channels, and lakes. However, because the streams have meandered and reworked the previously deposited sediments, extreme variations in material types may be found over a limited distance or depth.

Flanking the Recent alluvial deposits are late Pleistocene alluvial fan and terrace deposits of the Modesto and Riverbank Formations (Helley and Harwood 1985). Stream terrace deposits, mapped as the Modesto Formation, are higher in elevation and older than floodplain sediments. Before the construction of the existing levees, these stream terraces were occasionally flooded, but only small amounts of sediment were deposited during flood events. The lower fan terraces of the Riverbank Formation are higher in elevation and older than stream terraces, and were only rarely flooded.

The Natomas Basin is situated within the climatic band classified as the Lower Sonoran Zone. The climatic pattern is characterized as Mediterranean, with cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers. Locally, this pattern consists of approximately 17 inches of annual rainfall, high summer temperatures, and low humidity. The dominant vegetative communities in this area are prairie grasslands and tule marshes, with some areas of riparian woodland. Valley oak (Quercus lobata), cottonwood (Populus fremontii), sycamore (Platanus racemosa), and willow trees (Salix spp.) once grew on the verge of streams and rivers. Tule marshes included stands of tules, cattails, sedges, rushes, and clumps of willow trees.
Faunal species that frequented the prehistoric prairie grasslands and tule marshes included mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus), tule elk (Cervus elaphus), antelope (Antilocapra americana), weasel (Mustela frenata), river otter (Lutra canadensis), raccoon (Procyon lotor), and beaver (Castor canadensis). Migratory waterfowl, such as geese (Branta canadensis) and swans (Olor sp.), passed through during winter, joining resident white pelicans (Pelecanus erythrorhynchos), great blue and black-crowned herons (Ardea herodias, Nycticorax nycticorax), ibis (Plegadis falcinellus), cranes (Grus canadensis), cormorants (Phalacrocorax sp.), and eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus). Badgers (Taxidea taxus), coyotes (Canis latrans), skunks (Mephitis mephitis), jackrabbits (Lepus californicus), and cottontail rabbits (Sylvilagus audubonii) inhabited higher ground.

Within the waterways, chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), rainbow trout (Salmo gairdneri), Pacific lamprey (Lampetra tridentata), and white sturgeon (Acipenser transmontanus) seasonally joined the other fish species indigenous to the area. Predators such as mountain lions (Felis concolor), grizzly bears (Ursus americanus), wolves (Canis lupus), kit fox (Vulpes macrotis), and bobcats (Lynx rufus) also roamed the area (Moratto 1984).

PREHISTORIC SETTING

PALEO-INIAN AND LOWER ARCHAIC PERIODS

The earliest well-documented entry and spread of humans into California occurred at the beginning of the Paleo-Indian Period (10,000–6000 B.C.). Social units are thought to have been small and highly mobile. Known occupation sites have been identified within the contexts of ancient alluvial lake shores and coastlines, where characteristic hunting implements, such as fluted projectile points and chipped stone crescent forms, have been found. Prehistoric adaptations over the ensuing centuries have been identified in the archaeological record by numerous researchers working in the area since the early 1900s, as summarized by Fredrickson (1974) and Moratto (1984). Because of its plentiful resources and temperate climate, the Central Valley was well populated prehistorically and served as the location for some of the more substantial village sites known in California.

Beardsley (1948), Heizer and Fenenga (1939), and others conducted numerous studies that form the core of our early understanding of upper Central Valley archaeology. Little has been found archaeologically that dates to the Paleo-Indian or Lower Archaic (6000–3000 B.C.) time periods. However, archaeologists have recovered much data from sites occupied by the Middle Archaic period. The lack of discovery of sites from earlier periods may be the result of high sedimentation rates that have left the earliest sites deeply buried and inaccessible.

MIDDLE ARCHAIC, UPPER ARCHAIC, AND EMERGENT PERIODS

During the Middle Archaic Period (3000–1000 B.C.), the broad regional patterns of foraging subsistence strategies gave way to more intensive procurement practices. Subsistence economies were more diversified, possibly including the introduction of acorn processing technology. Human populations were growing and occupying more diverse settings. Permanent villages occupied year-round were established, primarily along major waterways. The onset of status distinctions and other indicators of growing sociopolitical complexity mark the Upper Archaic Period (1000 B.C.–A.D. 500). Exchange systems become more complex and formalized. Evidence of regular, sustained trade between groups was seen for the first time.

Several technological and social changes characterized the Emergent Period (A.D. 500–1800). The bow and arrow were introduced, ultimately replacing the dart and atlatl. Territorial boundaries between groups became well established. It became increasingly common that distinctions in an individual’s social status could be linked to acquired wealth. Exchange of goods between groups became more regularized with more goods, including raw materials, entering into the exchange networks. In the latter portion of this period (A.D. 1500–1800), exchange relations became highly regularized and sophisticated. The clamshell disk bead became a monetary unit for exchange, and increasing quantities of goods moved greater distances. Specialists arose to govern various aspects of production and exchange.
The Middle and Upper Archaic and Emergent Periods are further broken down under the Central California Taxonomic System. These three time periods are well represented in archaeological assemblages in the vicinity of the project area. The assemblages are discussed in detail in Bennyhoff and Fredrickson (1969) and Moratto (1984) and are summarized here.

The Windmiller Pattern (3000–500 B.C.) of archaeological assemblages included an increased emphasis on acorn use and a continuation of hunting and fishing activities. Ground and polished charmstones, twined basketry, baked-clay artifacts (frequently used as a substitute for stone in the Central Valley), and worked shell and bone were hallmarks of Windmiller culture. Widely ranging trade patterns brought goods in from the Coast Range and trans-Sierran sources as well as closer trading partners. Perforated charmstones were associated with some burials. Mano and metate and small mortars were used but were rare.

Distinctive burial practices (ventrally extended, oriented westward) identified with the Windmiller Pattern also appeared in the Sierra Nevada foothills, indicating possible seasonal migration into the Sierra Nevada. The specific orientation of burials reinforces the idea that summers were spent in the Sierra Nevada and winters in the Central Valley. Men were generally buried in separate areas, in deeper graves, and with more artifacts than women, possibly indicating a higher social status. However, the rich offerings found with some women and children suggest that wealth also followed lineages of some sort of social patterns as well.

The Berkeley Pattern (200 B.C.–A.D. 700) represented a greater reliance on acorns as a food source than was seen previously. Distinctive stone and shell artifacts distinguished it from earlier or later cultural expressions, and may indicate the arrival and spread of ancestral Plains Miwok from the Bay Area region. Burials were predominantly placed in a tightly flexed position and frequently included red ochre. Minimally shaped mortar and pestle technology was much more prevalent than mano/metate. Nonstemmed projectile points become more common.

The Augustine Pattern (A.D. 700–1800) was marked by increasing populations resulting from more intensive food procurement strategies, and also by a marked change in burial practices and increased trade activities. Intensive fishing, hunting and gathering, complex exchange systems, and a wider variety in mortuary patterns were all hallmarks of this period. Mortars and pestles were more carefully shaped, and bow-and-arrow technology was present. Fishing implements became more common, trade increased, and cremation was used for some higher-status individuals. A well-developed ceramic industry has been noted at a site near Sloughhouse, east of Sacramento.

**ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING**

The project area is situated within the lands traditionally occupied by the Nisenan, or Southern Maidu. The language of the Nisenan, which includes several dialects, is classified within the Maidu family of the Penutian linguistic stock (Kroeber 1925). The western boundary of Nisenan territory was the western bank of the Sacramento River and the area between present-day Sacramento and Marysville. In the Sacramento Valley, the triebist, consisting of a primary village and a few satellite villages, served as the basic political unit (Moratto 1984). Valley Nisenan territory was divided into three triebist areas, each populated with several large villages (Wilson and Towne 1978), generally located on low, natural rises along streams and rivers or on slopes with a southern exposure. One important village, Pasune, near Discovery Park, appears to have been recorded as CA-SAC-26. Other villages—Wollok, Leuchi, Wishuna, Totola, and Nawrean—were located east of the confluence of the Feather and Sacramento Rivers, near the northwestern portion of the Natomas Basin.

Nisenan houses were domed structures covered with earth and tule or grass and measured 10–15 feet in diameter. Brush shelters were used in the summer and at temporary camps during food-gathering rounds. Larger villages often had semisubterranean dance houses that were covered in earth and tule or brush and had a central smoke hole at the top and an east-facing entrance, as well as smaller sweathouses. Another common village structure was a granary, which was used for storing acorns (Wilson and Towne 1978). Valley Nisenan people followed a
seasonal round of food gathering, as did most California Indians. The wide variety of food resources available was exploited year round, but hunting and gathering activities were at their most intense in late summer and early fall. Food staples included acorns, buckeyes, pine nuts, hazelnuts, various roots, seeds, mushrooms, greens, berries, and herbs. Game, roasted, baked, or dried, included mule deer, elk, antelope, black bear, beaver, squirrels, rabbits, fish, shellfish, and other small animals and insects (Wilson and Towne 1978). Seasonal harvests were carried out by families or the larger community, engendering social behavior such as sharing, trading, and conducting ceremonies.

Euro-American contact with the Nisenan began with infrequent excursions by Spanish explorers and Hudson Bay Company trappers traveling through the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in the early 1800s. In general, Nisenan lifeways remained stable for centuries until the early to middle decades of the 19th century. With the coming of Russian trappers and Spanish missionaries, cultural patterns began to be disrupted as social structures were stressed. An estimated 75% of the Valley Nisenan population died in the malaria epidemic of 1833. With the influx of Europeans during the Gold Rush era, the population was further reduced as a result of disease and violent relations with the miners. However, today the Maidu are reinvesting in their traditional culture and, through newfound political, economic, and social influence, now constitute a growing and thriving native community in California.

HISTORIC SETTING

EARLY EXPLORATION

Although Russian trappers and traders associated with the Hudson’s Bay Company likely traveled through Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba Counties during earlier years, the first well-documented European exploration of the general region occurred in 1808, when Spanish explorer Gabriel Moraga led an expedition from Mission San Jose to the northern Sacramento Valley (Hoover, Rensch, and Rensch 1966). The earliest Euro-American settlement coincided with the establishment of land grants by the Mexican government in the 1840s. John A. Sutter obtained the first such grant in the region in 1841. Sutter’s New Helvetia Rancho encompassed lands on the east bank of the Feather and Sacramento Rivers within the project area (Beck and Haase 1974).

MINING

Although there are no records of large-scale mining having been conducted in the project area or in the immediate vicinity, the industry had considerable indirect effects on historical developments in the region. The diggings and mines in the Sierra Nevada foothills dramatically increased economic activity in the region, leading to increased prosperity and the rise of larger and more numerous support industries, such as cattle ranches and farms. In addition, sediments washing into the Central Valley watercourses, including the Feather, Sacramento, and American Rivers, had a negative impact on water quality and on the scale and frequency of seasonal flooding.

Hydraulic mining, first conducted in Nevada in 1852, was the most cost-effective means of recovering placer gold from deeply buried gravels along and near river and stream channels. To access these deeply buried deposits, miners used streams of water under high pressure to wash away sediments and gravels. The sands and gravels were passed through sluices that separated out the placer gold. Silt and sand washed into nearby creeks, streams, and rivers, raising watercourse beds, clogging the channels, and generally polluting the waters. Between 1849 and 1909, 195 million cubic meters of mining debris entered the channels of the American River basin. The deposition of silt in the rivers resulted in the raising of the riverbeds and increased flooding. After 1861, catastrophic floods became more common, prompting the development of a levee system and beginning the process of land reclamation for agricultural purposes.

Construction of a railroad was a natural outgrowth of Sacramento’s expansion and the need to deliver supplies to the California foothills. The railroad was completed by February 1856. The first rail line ran to the town of Folsom, where at least 21 different wagon trains then carted goods from the train to outlying areas as far away as Carson City, Nevada. The Central Pacific Railroad bought the Sacramento Valley Railroad in 1865 and added its
facilities to those already being built for the Transcontinental Railroad. The Central Pacific and its successor, the Southern Pacific Railroad, became the major industry in Sacramento after 1863. It is estimated that early in its history, the railroad employed 20–30% of salaried employees in Sacramento (Historic Environment Consultants 1998).

AGRICULTURE AND FLOOD CONTROL

GENERAL

Agriculture and ranching were the primary industries in the present-day Sacramento and Sutter County region during the historic period. Regional ranching originated on the New Helvetia rancho in the early 1840s. The Gold Rush precipitated growth in agriculture and ranching, as ranchers and farmers realized handsome returns from supplying food and other goods to miners. Frequent floods plagued the residents of the region, however, and posed a significant threat to the viability of agricultural interests and further settlement.

Initial efforts at flood control were usually uncoordinated and consisted of small levees and drains constructed by individual landowners. These features proved insufficient to protect cultivated land, and much of the project area flooded regularly (Dames & Moore 1994a). In 1861, the California Legislature created the State Board of Swampland Commissioners to reclaim swamp and overflow lands. The State Board of Swampland Commissioners established 32 districts that attempted to enclose large areas with natural levees. Lack of cooperation among the landowners in the districts led to chronic financial crises. When the legislature terminated the State Board of Swampland Commissioners in 1866, responsibility for swamp and overflow land fell to the individual counties. Many counties offered incentives to landowners for reclaiming agriculturally unproductive land. If a landowner could certify that he had spent at least $2 per acre in reclamation, the county would refund the purchase price of the property to the owner. Speculators took advantage of this program and a period of opportunistic and often-irrational levee building followed (Thompson 1958).

In the early part of the 20th century, the state legislature established The Reclamation Board to exercise jurisdiction over reclamation districts and levee plans. That year, the state approved and began implementation of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project (SRFCP). The ambitious project included the construction of levees, weirs, and bypasses along the river to channel floodwaters away from population centers. Under the SRFCP, new reclamation districts were created, including RD 1000, consisting of approximately 55,000 acres in the Natomas Basin. RD 1000 was largely controlled by the Natomas Company, which had access to more money than any individual landowner. The Natomas Company was formed in 1851 in Sacramento County to supply water for placer mining and irrigation. It later became involved in dredging for gold and expanded its water supply business. The Natomas Company became involved in land reclamation in part as a rebuttal of criticism that farmland was being destroyed by the company’s gold dredging activities (Dames & Moore 1994a).

RD 1000 RURAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE DISTRICT

The infrastructure of RD 1000 (Exhibit 4) was completed in the 1920s. It includes levees, drainage canals, pumps, irrigation systems, agricultural fields, and roads, as well as remnant natural features. The originally constructed features included levees and exterior drainage canals, an interior drainage canal system, nine pumping plants, a series of levee and interior roads, and unpaved rights-of-way between the farm fields.

Previous efforts to document and mitigate impacts on elements of RD 1000 are relevant to the proposed project. The RD 1000 area has been identified as eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as a Rural Historic Landscape District. The evaluation process was conducted both to determine the NRHP eligibility of the district and to evaluate whether the district would be significantly affected by flood control projects planned and subsequently implemented by the USACE as part of the American River Watershed Project (Dames & Moore 1994a). The “determination of effects” statement concluded that the USACE projects would adversely affect both contributing
and noncontributing elements of the Rural Historic Landscape District by allowing for greater development to occur in the region. Mitigation measures were recommended and adopted. These consisted of Historic American Engineering Record documentation, which was prepared by Peak & Associates (1997); videotapes of historic properties; and a list of repositories where copies of the information would be made available to the public.

Dames & Moore determined that RD 1000 appears to be eligible for listing as a Rural Historic Landscape District at the state level of significance for the period from 1911 to 1939 under Criterion A. The area of significance was listed as reclamation and the historical context was listed as the flood control and reclamation of the Sacramento River basin within the SRFCP as an important part of the history of reclamation and flood control. The district retains much of its historic integrity, including location design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The contributing and noncontributing elements of the district were defined as part of this effort. Contributing elements were described as follows:

- **Drainage System**: East Levee, River Levee, Cross Canal Levee; Natomas East Main Drainage Canal; Cross Canal; Pleasant Grove Canal; Pumping Plants No. 1-A, 2, and 3; the canal connecting Pumping Plant No. 3 and the West Drainage Canal, North Drainage Canal, East Drainage Canal, West Drainage Canal, Natomas Main Drainage Canal, and the drainage ditches within the areas of contributing large-scale land patterns.

- **Road System**: Garden Highway from Orchard Lane north to the Cross Canal; East Levee/Natomas Road; Sankey Road; Riego Road; Elverta Road; Elkhorn Boulevard from Garden Highway to the western boundary of the Sacramento Airport; Del Paso Road from Powerline Road to its intersection with Interstate 5 (I-5); San Juan Road from Garden Highway to its intersection with I-5; Powerline Road; El Centro Road from north of Interstate 80 (I-80) to its intersection with Bayou Way; and the right-of-way roads within fields in the areas of contributing large scale land patterns.

- **Large-Scale Land Patterns**: Land area that consists of open fields formed by the intersection of the canals and roads in the area bounded as follows: west of the East Levee; west of Sorrento Road, north of Del Paso Road between the East Levee and I-5, west of I-5 from its intersection with Del Paso Road to its intersection with I-80; north of I-80 from its intersection with I-5 to the River Levee; east of the River Levee; and south of the Cross Canal Levee.

Noncontributing resources include parts of the drainage system (some pumping plants and associated branch canals); parts of the road system; some large-scale land patterns (the area bounded by Sorrento Road to the east levee, south of Del Paso Road between I-5 and the east levee, south of I-80, and the Airport); and some land uses, vegetation, boundary demarcations, buildings, and structures such as those more closely associated with agriculture than reclamation, municipal structures, commercial structures, and electric power lines.
STUDY METHODOLOGY

This section describes the methods used to date to identify cultural resources in the study area and to satisfy the relevant statutory and regulatory framework. The methodology is consistent with state and federal standards, was developed to meet the requirements of CEQA and NHPA Section 106, and is consistent with the PA. All study elements described in this section have been completed by archaeologists that meet the Secretary of the Department of the Interior's professional qualification standards.

The cultural resource inventory efforts will be completed in phases, as access to project lands is acquired. A phased identification process is specifically authorized at 36 CFR Section 8004.2(b)(2):

Where alternatives under consideration consist of corridors or large land areas, or where access to properties is restricted, the agency official may use a phased process to conduct identification and evaluation efforts. The agency official may also defer final identification and evaluation of historic properties if it is specifically provided for in a memorandum of agreement executed pursuant to § 800.6, a programmatic agreement executed pursuant to § 800.14 (b), or the documents used by an agency official to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act pursuant to § 800.8. The process should establish the likely presence of historic properties within the area of potential effects for each alternative or inaccessible area through background research, consultation and an appropriate level of field investigation, taking into account the number of alternatives under consideration, the magnitude of the undertaking and its likely effects, and the views of the SHPO/THPO and any other consulting parties. As specific aspects or locations of an alternative are refined or access is gained, the agency official shall proceed with the identification and evaluation of historic properties in accordance with paragraphs (b)(1) and (c) of this section.

The following sections describe background research conducted to identify existing resources and sensitivity of resources, completed identification efforts, and future work required under the phased approach.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACT PROGRAM

EDAW sent a letter of inquiry to the NAHC on June 12, 2007, asking for information or concerns regarding the project area, as well as a list of individuals or organizations that might have information or concerns regarding the project area (Appendix A). On June 19, 2007, Debbie Pilas-Treadway of the NAHC responded and indicated that no known sites were found in the Sacred Lands File that were located within the project area or in the immediate vicinity. Ms. Pilas-Treadway also provided EDAW with a list of individuals who could be contacted concerning cultural resources in the project area. These individuals were sent contact letters on June 21, 2007, with information regarding the proposed project and a request for any information they might provide or concerns that they might have about the project. No written responses were received; therefore, follow-up phone calls were made on July 9, 2007. Only one individual, Rose Enos (referred to by the NAHC as "Miwok/Maidu"), answered. Ms. Enos expressed general concern regarding avoidance of burial sites and asked to be contacted if work is conducted on such sites. Messages were left for the remaining people on the contact list; however, no response from any of these individuals has been received. In addition, EDAW contacted Randy Yonemura of the Ione Band of the Miwok to request information on areas of concern. Mr. Yonemura led an EDAW archaeologist on a field visit of the project area and provided anecdotal information on areas of potential Native American burials.

INFORMATION CENTER RECORDS SEARCHES

Records searches were conducted in stages in 2006 and 2007 for different portions of the proposed project footprint. Most of the searches were conducted at the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, located at California State University, Sacramento. The NCIC records search covered portions of the project area in Sacramento County. Records searches were also conducted at the
Northeast Information Center (NEIC), which maintains cultural resource records for Sutter County. The searches at both facilities included, but were not necessarily restricted to, an examination of the following resources:

- *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976 and updates)
- *California Historical Landmarks* (1996 and updates)
- *California Points of Historical Interest* (1992 and updates)
- *Caltrans Local Bridge Survey* (1987)
- Various historic maps

The NEIC and NCIC reported that several cultural resource inventories have been conducted within the project area. These are listed in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>Bass, H. O.</td>
<td><em>Department of Transportation Negative Archaeological Survey Report: State Route 99</em></td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7173</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Unlimited</td>
<td><em>A Cultural Resources Study for Sutter Bay Project, Sutter County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7175</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Unlimited</td>
<td><em>A Cultural Resources Study for Sutter Bay Project Highway 99/70 Interchange/Crossroad Improvements Sutter County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34698</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Rural Historic Landscape Report for Reclamation District 1000 for the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluations for the American River Watershed Investigation, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5777</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Historic Property Treatment Plan for Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District for the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluations for the American River Watershed Investigation, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4197</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Archaeological Inventory Report, Notomus Locality, Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation, American River Watershed Investigation, El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6944</td>
<td>Ebasco Environmental</td>
<td><em>Cultural Resources Survey of the Sacramento Energy Project Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5655</td>
<td>Eggerman, R., and B. Hatoff</td>
<td><em>Roseville Energy Facility Cultural Resources Appendix J-1 of Application for Certification</em></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6945</td>
<td>Foster, J. W., and D. G. Foster</td>
<td><em>An Archaeological Survey of the South Sutter Industrial Center Property, Sutter County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2987</td>
<td>Jensen, P.</td>
<td><em>Historic Properties Survey Report for the Proposed Fisfield Road at Pleasant Grove Creek Canal, Colfax District 3, Sutter County, California</em></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6893</td>
<td>Kaptain, N.</td>
<td><em>Historic Property Survey Report for the State Route 99/Rego Road Interchange Project Sutter and Sacramento Counties</em></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3469A</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td><em>Historic American Engineering Record Reclamation District 1000 HAER No. CA-187</em></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Wilson, K.L.</td>
<td><em>Sacramento River Bank Protection Unit 34 Cultural Resources Survey Final Report</em></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NEIC = Northeast Information Center
Source: Data provided by the Northeast Information Center in 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banek, B.</td>
<td><em>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the South Natomas Area for the River Bank Holding Company, Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4188</td>
<td>Billat, L. B.</td>
<td><em>Nestled Communications Wireless Telecommunications Service Facility—Sacramento County</em></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bouey, P. D.</td>
<td><em>Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation: Sacramento River Bank Protection (Unit 44) Project</em></td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4457</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td><em>Negative Historic Property Survey Report for the Proposed Installation of Automatic Vehicle Census Systems on Interstate 80 East of the Wesi El Camino Over-Crossing and on Highway 51 East of the “E” Street Ramps, Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4194</td>
<td>Chavez, D., L. H. Shoup, C. Desgrandchamp, and W. G. Slater</td>
<td><em>Cultural Resources Evaluations for the North Natomas Community Plan Study Area, Sacramento, California</em></td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4193</td>
<td>County of Sacramento Department of Environmental Review and Assessment</td>
<td><em>Draft Environmental Impact Report for Teal Bend Golf Course Use Permit</em></td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4190</td>
<td>CRS Archaeological Consulting and Research Services</td>
<td><em>Sacramento Metro Airport Airmail Facility—letter report</em></td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3409</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Unlimited</td>
<td><em>A Cultural Resources Study for Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency Borrow Sites Project Sacramento County</em></td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4463</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Unlimited</td>
<td><em>A Cultural Resources Survey and Archival Review for the Arden-Garden Connector Project Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3469B</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Rural Historic Landscape Report for Reclamation District 1000 for the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluations for the American River Watershed Investigation, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4197</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Archaeological Inventory Report, Natomas Locality, Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation, American River Watershed Investigation, El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1994b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5777</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore</td>
<td><em>Historic Property Treatment Plan for Reclamation District 1000 Rural Historic Landscape District for the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluations for the American River Watershed Investigation, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4195</td>
<td>Derr, E.</td>
<td><em>Cultural Resources Report: North Natomas Comprehensive Drainage Plan; Levee Improvements, Canal Widening and Additional Pumping Capacity</em></td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4466</td>
<td>Derr, E.</td>
<td><em>Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the Arden-Garden Connector Project CT-03-30274.81 Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6892</td>
<td>Derr, E. H.</td>
<td><em>American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project, Feasibility Study: Alternative 1C, 2C, 3, Sacramento and Sutter Counties, California</em></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6944</td>
<td>Ebasco Environmental</td>
<td><em>Cultural Resources Survey of the Sacramento Energy Project Sacramento County, California</em></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC Report No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5655</td>
<td>Egherman, R., and B. Hatoff</td>
<td>Roseville Energy Facility Cultural Resources Appendix J-1 of Application for Certification</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3489B</td>
<td>Far Western Anthropological Research Group</td>
<td>Addendum to the Report on the First Phase of Archaeological Survey for the Proposed SMUD Gas Pipeline Between Winters and Sacramento Yolo and Sacramento Counties, California</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster, J. W.</td>
<td>A Cultural Resource Investigation of the Blue Oaks Skilled Nursing Facility Site Auburn, California</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glover, L. C., and P. D. Bouey</td>
<td>Sacramento River Flood Control System Evaluation, Mid-Valley Area Cultural Resources Survey, Colusa, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, California</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4449</td>
<td>Herbert, R. F.</td>
<td>Report on the National Register Eligibility of the Sacramento River Docks Building 37 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5803</td>
<td>Herbert, R. F.</td>
<td>Report on the National Register Eligibility of the Sacramento River Dock Complex including Building 4635 (Dock) and Building 4637 (Warehouse) McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4202</td>
<td>Humphreys, S., and L.楣nside</td>
<td>A Review of the Work Carried Out at Sacramento 16, the Bennett Mound</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4178</td>
<td>Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the North Natomas Drainage System's San Juan Pump Station</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2956</td>
<td>Nadolski, J. A.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Jibboom Street Bridge Project Sacramento, California</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4435</td>
<td>Nadolski, J. A.</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigations for the Sacramento-KOVR Diverse Lateral Overbuild in Sacramento and Yolo Counties</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5810</td>
<td>PAR Environmental Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Northgate Boulevard/Arden-Garden Intersection Cultural Resources Investigation, City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, California</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Peak, A. S.</td>
<td>American River Parkway An Archaeological Perspective</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2764</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report and Finding of No Adverse Effect for the Proposed American River Parkway Bike Trail Improvement Project, City and County of Sacramento, California</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2765</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed American River Parkway Bike Trail Improvement Project, City and County of Sacramento, California</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3469A</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Historic American Engineering Record Reclamation District 1000 HAER No. CA-187</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4173</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Report on the Archaeological Testing Within the Riverbend Classics Project Area, City of Sacramento, California</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4181</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Overview for the North Natomas Long-Term Planning Area, Sacramento County, California</td>
<td>4181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6830</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Determination of Eligibility and Effect for the Natomas Panhandle Annexation Project Area Sacramento County, California</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4456</td>
<td>Ritchie, M.</td>
<td>Finding of Effect for the Proposed Safety Improvements and Rehabilitation of the Jibboom Street Bridge on Jibboom Street, Bridge No. 24C-022, Sacramento, Sacramento County, California</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4456</td>
<td>Snyder, J.W.</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report (Positive) for the Jibboom Street Bridge Safety Improvements and Rehabilitation Project Jibboom Street, Sacramento County, California</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4411</td>
<td>Sonoma State Anthropological Studies Center</td>
<td>Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance and Backhoe Testing for the South Natomas Projects (P92-122, P92-160) Sacramento County, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3408</td>
<td>Theodoros Cultural Research</td>
<td>Discovery Park Construction Site Examination for Archaeological Resources in the Area of CA-SAC-26—letter report</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4458</td>
<td>True, D. L.</td>
<td>8-Acre Survey at 1801 Garden Highway, Sacramento, California</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Wilson, K. L.</td>
<td>Sacramento River Bank Protection Unit 34 Cultural Resources Survey Final Report</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer  
Source: North Central Information Center Record Search 2007

Numerous archaeological investigations have covered portions of the Natomas Basin. These have generally focused on areas closest to the rivers and levees. There has been very little archaeological inventory of lands more than 100 feet from the levee toes, and ground surface visibility has frequently been poor even in surveyed areas.

The most comprehensive of these investigations were completed by Dames & Moore and Far Western. In 1994, Dames & Moore (1994b) conducted a broad survey in the Natomas Basin as part of the American River Watershed Investigation. Surveying of selected parcels along the Sacramento River resulted in the identification of 17 primarily historic sites. During the same effort, Dames & Moore visited an additional 10 previously identified cultural resources to update site records for those locations. At the same time, Dames & Moore (1994a) prepared a draft Historic Property Treatment Plan that explored the history and elements of RD 1000. In 1996, Dames & Moore completed its evaluation of RD 1000, concluding that it appeared to be eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A at a state level of significance as an example of reclamation and flood control in the Sacramento River basin during the period 1911–1939. This report extensively documents both the contributing and noncontributing resources of RD 1000. Previously, in 1990, Far Western had conducted surveys of areas along the same route surveyed by Dames & Moore in 1994 (Dames & Moore 1994b), as well as of additional areas (Bouey and Herbert 1990). Far Western (Bouey, Berg, and Hunter 1991) followed up with limited test excavations of two sites that may be within or near the footprint of 2009–2010 project components (borrow areas) that have not yet been fully defined.

Numerous cultural resources were identified in the course of previous survey efforts, including ranches and farms; agricultural, transportation, and reclamation features; and debris scatters, as well as prehistoric occupation and burial sites consisting of mounds or the disturbed remnants of mounds (Tables 3 and 4).
EDAW FIELD SURVEYS

Fieldwork undertaken by EDAW in 2007 focused on the areas that would be affected by project construction in 2008: the NCC south levee, Sacramento River east levee Reaches 1–4B to Station 214+00, the proposed right-of-way of the relocated Elkhorn Canal and the new GGS/Drainage Canal, and potential borrow sites. EDAW conducted pedestrian surveys of those portions of these areas that were accessible; however, only a small proportion of the land area in the potential project footprint for 2008 was accessible to surveys, mainly because of the presence of crops. As access to the unsurveyed lands becomes available, pedestrian surveys will be completed in these areas.

In April/May 2007, an EDAW archaeologist examined the NCC south levee and adjacent lands within the existing maintenance right-of-way. In July/August 2007, a crew of EDAW archaeologists conducted field surveys in accessible parcels within Sacramento County–owned Airport bufferlands north of the Airport. On the Airport bufferlands, the surveys covered a 400-foot-wide strip east of the Sacramento River east levee and small portions of the proposed borrow sites in the Airport north bufferlands. Survey areas within 1,000 feet of the Sacramento River and the locations of prehistoric lakebeds were walked using transects 15 meters apart. Farther from the Sacramento River and prehistoric lakebeds, the transect interval was widened to 30 meters. The potential borrow sites were almost completely inaccessible because they contained rice crops. Exhibit 3 shows those portions of the project area that were surveyed by EDAW in 2007. Areas with poor ground surface visibility (i.e., less than 50%), would require subsequent survey at a time of year when ground surface visibility would be improved.

Two new historic sites, NLIP-1 and NLIP-2, were identified during the surveys adjacent to Garden Highway, and four groups of farm buildings, NLIP-3 through NLIP-6, were also identified and evaluated (Appendix B).

As mentioned above, Randy Yonemura of the Ione Band of the Miwok also showed an EDAW archaeologist the locations of subsurface cultural resources that have not been recorded in any of the previously prepared documentation filed with the NCIC and NEIC, which are known to him from anecdotal information.

IDENTIFIED CULTURAL RESOURCE SITES IN THE SUTTER COUNTY PORTION OF THE PROJECT AREA

Table 3 lists the known cultural resource sites in the Sutter County portion of the project area. Most of the listed sites are in areas proposed for 2009–2010 construction. The sites that may be affected by 2008 construction are shown with an asterisk. The sites listed in Table 3 are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial*</th>
<th>P-No.1</th>
<th>Historic/Prehistoric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
<th>Quadrangle</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Status If Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-SUT-84H*</td>
<td>51-000084</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Natomas Cross Canal/Pleasant Grove Creek Canal levees</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove, Verona</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-000096H*</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1950s-era ranch</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-4*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-5*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney Mound*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Intact occupation mound site</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
CRHR = California Register of Historic Resources; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.
* Sites that would be or may be affected by the 2008 construction elements are marked with an asterisk.
Source: Data compiled by EDAW in 2007
CA-SUT-84H (P-51-000084)

This trinomial includes both the NCC south levee and the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal (PGCC) west levee, the northernmost contributing resources to RD 1000. The NCC levee measures approximately 25 feet wide at the top, 75 feet wide at the base, and 15 feet high. The top has been graded and graveled for vehicle traffic. The PGCC levee is smaller, measuring approximately 20 feet wide at the top, 60 feet wide at the base, and 10 feet high. There is also an associated retention basin, constructed of concrete and measuring 50 feet by 35 feet across and 15 feet deep. A concrete and steel pump foundation is located within the basin. Concrete footings running from a hole in the side of the basin to the top of the NCC levee indicate that a large pipe once connected the two features.

Archaeologists reported that the levee (unclear which one) was raised and strengthened twice, after flooding during 1938–1939 and after flooding in RD 1001 during 1955. RD 1000 modified the NCC south levee and its adjacent canals in 1987 and SAFCA modified them in 1996. SAFCA constructed a cutoff wall in the western portion of the NCC south levee in 2007.

P-51-000096H

Located on the Sacramento/Sutter county line and at the edge of a proposed borrow area, this resource consists of a historic ranch complex that includes two residences, four sheds or barns, and a trailer. The archaeological survey crew was not allowed on the property to record the structures in more detail.

NLIP-3, 7240 GARDEN HIGHWAY

The Sutter County Assessor's records currently list this property along the Sacramento River east levee south of Sankey Road as vacant. No construction date is on file for the buildings. The construction methods and materials appear to date to the early 20th century. This property appears to have always functioned as a residential and agricultural complex. The buildings are in good condition but lack the historic associations or architectural distinctions that would make them eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP.

NLIP-4, 11000 GARDEN HIGHWAY

This property is near the Sacramento River east levee north of Riego Road. The Sutter County Assessor's records list one of the two residences on the property as being constructed in 1957. The property has been in the Lauppe family since that time. The land, originally listed as Assessor's Parcel Number 35-020-15, was split into separate parcels several years ago as part of a lot-line adjustment. Because of the split, the 35-020-15 parcel number was retired, and additional parcel numbers (35-020-18, 35-020-19) were assigned.

Research did not reveal this property to be significantly associated with an important historic event, and the historic-era building located here is not known to be associated with an individual considered important in local history. The property itself has undergone regular periods of construction over the years, with new buildings added and older structures modified. The buildings lack the historic associations or architectural distinctions that would make them eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP.

NLIP-5, HOWSLEY ROAD AT THE NATOMAS CROSS CANAL

This small complex includes a mid-20th century residence and several turn-of-the-century horse stalls. The buildings are in good condition but lack the historic associations or architectural distinctions that would make them eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP.
**NLIP-6, HOWSLEY ROAD AT THE PLEASANT GROVE CREEK CANAL**

This is a small residential complex dating to the mid-20th century. The buildings are in good condition but lack the historic associations or architectural distinctions that would make them eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP.

**BARNEY MOUND**

This is an unrecorded prehistoric occupation mound with a residence on top, located along Powerline Road north of Sankey Road. Although the site has not been recorded officially, it is well known in the region and, as an intact prehistoric mound site in an area where almost all such sites have been destroyed, is likely to be eligible for CRHR and NRHP listing.

**IDENTIFIED CULTURAL RESOURCE SITES IN THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY PORTION OF THE PROJECT AREA**

Table 4 lists the known cultural resource sites in the Sacramento County portion of the project area. This table does not include several known sites in the southeastern portion of the Natoma Basin (located mainly along the Natoma East Main Drainage Canal [NEMDC]/Steelhead Creek) because there are no proposed project elements in that part of the basin. Most of the listed sites are in areas proposed for 2009–2010 construction. The sites that may be affected by 2008 construction are shown with an asterisk, and those that may be affected by 2009–2010 construction are shown with a plus sign. The sites listed in Table 4 are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>P-No.</th>
<th>Historic/Prehistoric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
<th>Quadrangle</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Status if Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-15/H*</td>
<td>34-000042</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Occupation mound with historic debris</td>
<td>1934, 1990, 1993</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-17*</td>
<td>34-000044</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>May have been destroyed</td>
<td>1934, 1990</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-18</td>
<td>34-000045</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>1934, 1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-160/H*</td>
<td>34-000187</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Occupation/burial mound with historic farm</td>
<td>1947, 1949, 1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-430H</td>
<td>34-000457</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>West drainage canal</td>
<td>1991, 1993, 1997</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-485/H*</td>
<td>34-000512</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Occupation mound and historic home site</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td>Potentially eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-486H</td>
<td>34-000513</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic home site</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-487H</td>
<td>34-000514</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-488H</td>
<td>34-000515</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-489H</td>
<td>34-000516</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinomal</td>
<td>P-No.</td>
<td>Historic/ Prehistoric</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Recorded</td>
<td>Quadrangle</td>
<td>NRHP/CRHR Status If Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-490H</td>
<td>34-000517</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-491H</td>
<td>34-000518</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-492H</td>
<td>34-000519</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic well, pipes and vegetation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-493H</td>
<td>34-000520</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-494H</td>
<td>34-000521</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-569H</td>
<td>34-000741</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>1994, 1998</td>
<td>Taylor Monument, Rio Linda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-Sac-836H</td>
<td>34-001354</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Farm complex</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-000883</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-000884</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-000886</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Rio Linda, Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-001552</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-001557</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Pumping plant</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-001558</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Pumping plant</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-001559</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Pumping plant</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-1</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Lean-to and shed</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLIP-2</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic debris scatter</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Taylor Monument</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Sites that would be or may be affected by the 2008 construction elements are marked with an asterisk.
| Trinomal | P-No. | Historic/ Prehistoric | Description | Date Recorded | Quadrangle | NRHP/CRHR Status If Known |

Source: Data provided by EDAW in 2007

CA-Sac-15/H

This site, near the Sacramento River east levee south of I-5, consists of a prehistoric occupation midden mound with a concentration of debitage, flaked stone tools, shell artifacts, faunal remains, fire-cracked rock, and baked clay objects. The mound has been heavily affected by farming and ranching activities. There is a ranch complex including a bunkhouse, garden, shed, chicken coop, water tower, garage, and driveway on the mound; historic debris on the site includes glass and broken ceramic fragments. A limited auger testing program was carried out west of the mound along the Sacramento River east levee and found no cultural materials along that transect (Bouey and Herbert 1990), however the authors suggested that the site may have been mis-mapped.

CA-Sac-16/H (P-34-000043)

CA-Sac-15/H is south of the Airport on a property that would be a potential borrow source for the proposed project. This site has been variously called the Bennett Mound, Mound Ranch, Willey Mound, and S-16. It includes the remains of a prehistoric occupation mound, possibly the largest in the Sacramento Valley, but has been leveled in stages by agricultural activities. The site location corresponds to the ethnographic village of Nawwean. What remains today consists of dark midden soils in plowed fields with fragments of human remains, shell, fire-cracked rock, baked clay objects, groundstone, faunal bone, flaked stone artifacts, and debitage. A few historic artifacts, such as brick and ceramic fragments, are also present. Today, two separate loci have been identified and recorded as CA-Sac-16/H; the larger, Locus 1, represents the approximate original location of the
mound. Locus II is an area of redepited soil taken from the mound in the past. There is also a historic-era component of the site from the remnants of a slaughterhouse and brick factory present before the 1930s. Historic artifacts noted include bricks, sawed mammal bone, a filled-in privy, bottles, ceramic and metal fragments, and glass.

The site was originally described as very large, up to 7 acres in area, and 20 feet high. The earliest investigations were conducted in 1923 by Zallio, who excavated at the site a number of times and recovered projectile points, bone tools, Haliotis ornaments, and other artifacts (Bouey, Berg, and Hunter 1991). It was first formally recorded in 1934 by Heizer, who identified it as a large mound with stone artifacts and freshwater shell on the surface. Sacramento Junior College excavated pits and trenches up to 18 feet deep in 1936–1937. The main focus of this effort was on recovery of mortuary remains; however, considerable quantities of nonburial associated artifacts were also documented. More excavations were conducted by Sacramento State College in 1953 and by American River College between 1966 and 1971, and more artifacts and burials were salvaged by Peak, Crew, and Gerry (1984) when what was left of the mound was leveled. At that time, Peak, Crew, and Gerry estimated that as much as 13 feet of the mound might still be present below the plowed surface. As an interesting side note—and as an indication of the original CA-Sac-16/H mound’s prominence—Peak, Crew, and Gerry mention that Heinrich Schliemann (an amateur archaeologist and later the discoverer of Troy) visited the site in 1851–1852.

More recently, Bouey and Herbert (1990) completed a surface survey and excavated two auger holes at the toe of the levee that forms the western boundary of the site; they reported evidence of subsurface cultural deposits, including shell midden. Larger-scale excavations (Bouey, Berg, and Hunter 1991), dug within 100 feet of the levee toe and the ramp leading up to Garden Highway, confirmed that midden deposits still exist; however, agricultural activity seems to have destroyed any stratigraphic integrity the deposits might have had. Farther from the levee toe was not undertaken.

The summary of the research done by 1991 (Bouey, Berg, and Hunter 1991) agreed with the conclusions of Derr (1983) that the site was a large, permanent habitation locus occupied from the Upper Archaic (ca. 1000 B.C.) to just after the beginning of European contact. Derr found that the upper 20–60 centimeters of soil (in the areas he examined near the levee) consisted of redistributed midden with artifacts and isolated human remains. What appears to be missing from any of these analyses is an attempt to define the original mound or to find intact elements of the site that may have been located beyond the original mound. If there are intact subsurface deposits associated with CA-Sac-16/H, then the site may be eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP because of the potential information contained in those deposits.

The earliest documentation, Heizer’s site record form from 1934, does not give dimensions for the mound and does not contain specific enough information to provide for relocation of the original boundaries of the mound. It is presumed that the dispersed midden from the mound now covers a larger surface area than the mound used to occupy. However, it is unclear exactly how large an area that is because various investigations have reported Locus I (the larger site deposit) as measuring 110 meters by 185 meters (Bouey and Herbert 1990), 250 meters by 250 meters (Kauffman and Kauffman 1983), and 450 meters by 850 meters (Dames & Moore 1993). The Dames & Moore site record form appears to be the only one that maps out the secondary Locus II area, northeast of the main deposit and east of a drainage ditch (as of 1993).

**CA-Sac-17 (P-34-000044)**

This is the location of a mound site reported by Heizer in 1934 west of Fisherman’s Lake; however, none of the mound remains. In 1990, Bouey and Herbert attempted to locate any cultural remains but could not find any evidence of cultural deposits on the surface or in auger holes. The site is near the Undercome Ranch.
CA-SAC-18 (P-34-000045)

This site, landward of the Sacramento River east levee north of San Juan Road, consists of a sparse scatter of basalt debitage, one cryptocrystalline biface fragment, a polished stone, and possible fire-cracked rock. It was originally described by Heizer as a mound 30 yards in diameter and 5 feet high; however, Heizer may have misinterpreted a natural rise in the landscape as a mound. CA-Sac-18 appears to be lacking the intensive cultural deposits that are the hallmark other nearby known mound sites (Dames & Moore 1994b).

CA-SAC-160/H (P-34-000187)

This is a multicomponent site near the Sacramento River east levee north of San Juan Road. It includes a prehistoric occupation mound with a farm complex situated on top. Excavations in the 1940s removed numerous burials and artifacts including groundstone, flaked stone tools, shell beads and ornaments, fire-cracked rock, baked clay objects, stone beads, faunal remains, bone awls, bird bone tubes and whistles, obsidian drills, quartz crystals, charmstones, and historic glass trade beads, as well as historic debris related to farming and occupation of the top of the mound.

CA-SAC-164 (P-34-000191)

CA-Sac-164 is a very large, deeply stratified prehistoric occupation and burial mound near Sand Cove Park on the Sacramento River that has been explored a number of times using archaeological techniques; however, in spite of these efforts, the true boundaries of the site remain unknown. The site includes shell midden with abundant cultural materials including fire-cracked rock, flaked and ground stone tools, charmstones, polished bone implements, debitage, quartz crystals, bone and shell beads, baked clay objects, and plentiful faunal remains. Large fire-cracked rock features and hearths have also been noted. Because of its significant scientific value and the integrity, CA-Sac-164 was nominated for NRHP listing in 2001.

The site was first recorded in 1951, after a newspaper article reported that human remains and stone tools were eroding out of the cutbank and into the Sacramento River. Observers who walked along the edge of the cutbank in summer and fall when the river was at its lowest noted that site deposits, interspersed with flood-deposited silt, extended at least 4 meters below the current-day surface. Excavations in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s confirmed the depth of intact and resource-bearing cultural strata at the site, at least along the river exposure. Work on the land side of the Sacramento River levee indicated that downward-trending cultural strata might be found there as well, beginning well over a meter below the ground surface, however the site's depth, extent, and boundaries have never been completely defined.

Annual river height fluctuation, wave action resulting from boat wakes, and looting combined to cause continual erosion and collapse of the cutbank. This resulted in artifacts and remains falling onto the beach area below, where they either washed into the river or collected by the public. To address this issue, a site stabilization program was implemented in 2005 that included placing dirt and plantings over the cutbank and creating a wave break near the river's edge of the site.

CA-SAC-430H (P-34-000457)

This feature is the West Drainage Canal, a relatively unmodified canal that originates at Fisherman's Lake and flows southeast to the East and Main Drainage Canals.

CA-SAC-485/H (P-34-000512)

This site, between the Sacramento River east levee and the proposed location of the relocated Elkhorn Canal, was once a prehistoric occupation and burial mound that has been leveled by agricultural activities and was documented by Dames & Moore in 1994. The remains of a historic-era homestead, consisting mainly of
ornamental vegetation, driveway, and historic debris, were noted on top of the prehistoric site. Dames & Moore archaeologists noted that the prehistoric component was large, measuring 220 meters by 160 meters with two depositional loci—a larger area near Garden Highway and a smaller deposit to the east. Prehistoric artifacts noted at the time included obsidian and basalt flakes and tools, shell beads and ornaments, faunal remains, groundstone fragments, charmstones, baked clay, imported exotic tool stone, and shell.

In August 2007, EDAW archaeologists undertook a limited shovel testing program at CA-Sac-485/H to determine whether there was an undisturbed subsurface deposit that could be affected by the proposed canal construction in the vicinity of this site (Exhibit 6). The August investigation began with a survey of the site area where a sparse assortment of artifacts was visible; because no concentrations of artifacts were identified on the surface, the Dames & Moore archaeological site map was used to guide the placement of shovel test pits (STPs). Brian Padilla, of the El Dorado Miwok, was present while the STPs were excavated.

During the course of excavations, archaeologists uncovered artifacts including obsidian and basalt flakes; clamshell disk beads; burned earth; faunal remains, including freshwater mussel shell, and fire-cracked rock. Human remains were uncovered in three of the STPs; the Sacramento County coroner and NAHC were contacted, excavation of each of those three STPs was halted immediately, and the remains were reburied where they were found. None appeared to be part of a larger, intact burial and all were found in the upper 50 centimeters of soil.

In general, site soils consisted of dry compact silts with a small sand and clay content; excavation and screening were difficult because the soils were very dry and hard. If artifacts were recovered, excavation generally proceeded to 100 centimeters below surface (cmts); where no artifacts were found, excavations terminated around 80 cmts. A deeply buried midden layer was identified in each of the four STPs (Nos. 4, 6, 21, and 24) closest to the levee, beginning anywhere from 55 cmts to 80 cmts. Excavation halted at approximately 100 cmts in these STPs without reaching the bottom of the midden deposit; a split-spoon probe was used in STP No. 21 to find the bottom of the deposit, which was reached at approximately 160 cmts. Although the northern and southern edges of the midden deposit were not located, the STP program was halted on the assumption that a more formal testing program, using a combination of test units and additional STPs, would be implemented as part of more detailed design of the proposed project. Based on the data collected during the brief testing at CA-Sac-485/H, it appears that significant intact prehistoric deposits may be found below capping soils at the site. If this is true, CA-Sac-485/H may be eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP for the site's data potential.

CA-Sac-486H (P-34-000513)

This site near the Sacramento River east levee below the North Drainage Canal consists of the remains of a historic-era homestead. The structure that once stood on the site has been demolished. Remnant landscape plantings and debris consisting of ceramic fragments, bottle glass, ceramic, bricks, mortar, and metal fragments were noted. The structures were visible in a 1937 aerial photograph and were depicted on the 1967 U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangle map. The archaeologists who identified the site in 1994 noted that some of the trees appeared to be less than 30 years old, although a fragment of amethyst glass (generally associated with the turn of the century) was noted.

CA-Sac-487H (P-34-000514)

Like CA-Sac-486H, this location near the Sacramento River east levee below the North Drainage Canal includes historic debris, such as concrete fragments, milled lumber, metal fence posts, wire, farm machinery parts, clear and green glass, window glass, and ornamental plantings, all of which indicate that a structure existed at the site at one point but has since been demolished. Also like the previous site, a structure was visible in this location in a 1937 aerial photograph; several structures were indicated on the 1950 and 1975 topographic quadrangle maps for the area.
CA-Sac-488H (P-34-000515)

This is another site near the Sacramento River east levee below the North Drainage Canal where a structure appeared on a 1937 aerial photograph and 1950 topographic quadrangle map, although no building is on the site today. Historic debris, ornamental vegetation, and a fence line remain. The debris included various concrete fragments, corrugated metal, wire, culvert pipe, and a large section of iron pipe.

CA-Sac-489H (P-34-000516)

This is another site near the Sacramento River east levee below the North Drainage Canal where a structure appeared on a 1937 aerial photograph and 1950 topographic quadrangle map, although no building is on the site today. The associated debris includes a fenced-off well head, concrete fragments, lumber, window glass, wooden posts, galvanized pipes, old fencing overgrown by an oak tree, an enamelware bucket, tires, ceramic fragments, bottle glass, and a metal bucket. Ornamental landscaping plants were also noted.

CA-Sac-490H (P-34-000517)

This site, near the south end of Powerline Road, had three structures that appeared on a 1937 aerial photograph and 1950 topographic quadrangle map, although no building is on the site today. The historic debris is similar to the debris found at sites CA-Sac-486H through CA-Sac-489H, including concrete, brick, iron piping, a fence post, bottle glass, ceramic fragments, and galvanized metal pipe, as well as remnant ornamental vegetation.

CA-Sac-491H (P-34-000518)

This site, also near the south end of Powerline Road, was likely used in association with four structures that appeared on the 1950 topographic quadrangle map. The 1937 aerial photograph associated with other sites listed here includes coverage of this property, however, only trees are clearly visible in the photograph. The artifacts consist of a sparse scatter, including a wood fence, concrete fragments, bricks, and metal fence posts. Ornamental vegetation was noted nearby.

CA-Sac-492H (P-34-000519)

This site, near the south end of Powerline Road, consists of a concrete-capped well, associated water pipes, and remnant ornamental vegetation and fruit trees that were likely associated with a structure visible on the 1950 topographic quadrangle map of the area. A cluster of trees is visible in the 1937 aerial photograph, but no structures are clearly visible. The site is now used to keep honeybees.

CA-Sac-493H (P-34-000520)

The 1950 topographic quadrangle map and 1937 aerial photograph of the region indicate that there was once a large barn and associated structure at this location near the Sacramento River east levee south of I-5. Today, scattered historic debris—clear and colored glass, porcelain and earthenware, iron pipe, bone fragments, brick, and a white ceramic insulator—is all that remains.

CA-Sac-494H (P-34-000521)

This is another site, west of Fisherman's Lake, where a structure appeared on a 1937 aerial photograph and 1950 topographic quadrangle map, although no building is present today. Associated debris documented by an archaeological team in 1994 included concrete and brick fragments, an iron water pipe, white ceramic insulators, and clear bottle glass. In addition, the archaeologists noted abundant modern debris on the site, making it difficult to distinguish between modern and historic artifacts.
ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN

The project area, including portions of the area that may be within the footprint of 2008 construction elements, has not been completely surveyed to date. As shown in Table 5, several sites that are potentially eligible for CRHR or NRHP listing may be affected by the proposed project, and elements of RD 1000 would be modified. For sites that do not appear to be eligible for listing in the NRHP or on the CRHR, or that are eligible but that would not be affected by a proposed project, no further action would be recommended. A draft Research Design is being prepared to describe recommended efforts to define the sites listed in Table 5 to determine the potential for their avoidance, if possible; methods for testing to determine their eligibility for listing as necessary; and a plan for identifying potential cultural resources that are not known from the published records.

In addition, for each phase of the NLIP Levee Improvements Project, the following efforts will be conducted:

- completion of pedestrian surveys for the entire project footprint, once access is acquired;
- preparation of further Cultural Resources Inventory Reports with recommendations of eligibility, finding of effects, and recommended mitigation measures; and
- preparation of a Historic Property Treatment Plan for resources determined to be eligible or recommended as eligible for NRHP listing, in accordance with Stipulation 4 of the PA.
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APPENDIX A

Project Correspondence.
June 7, 2007

Debbie Pilas-Treadway  
Native American Heritage Commission  
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364  
Sacramento, Ca 95814  

RE: Natomas Levee Improvement Project  

Dear Ms. Pilas-Treadway:  

EDAW is conducting cultural resources studies for the above-referenced project located generally north of the City of Sacramento, in Sacramento and Sutter counties, and located on the Grays Bend, Taylor Monument, Verona, Rio Linda, Pleasant Grove, Sacramento East, and Sacramento West USGS quadrangle maps. Background research and field studies conducted for this project will identify cultural resources that may be impacted by proposed levee improvements throughout the American River basin. This letter is intended to initiate part of the consultation process that will eventually be required under Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act.  

I am pleased to bring this activity to your attention, and would appreciate any information you can provide regarding prehistoric, historic, or ethnographic Native American land use. I am interested in any contemporary Native American values that may be present near or within the project area and would like to request a search of the NAHC Sacred Land files.  

Please send via-mail or facsimile (916-414-5850) a listing of local Native American representatives at your earliest convenience, so that I may contact appropriate individuals and account for their potential concerns in the planning process.  

If you have any questions or comments feel free to contact me at charlane.gross@edaw.com, or by phone at 916-414-5800. I look forward to hearing from you soon.  

Sincerely,  

Charlane Gross, M.A., R.P.A.  
Senior Archaeologist
June 19, 2007

Charlene Gross  
EDAW Inc.  
2011 J Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sent Via Fax: 916-414-5850  
# Of Pages: 3  
RE: Natomas Levee Improvement project, Sacramento and Sutter Counties

Dear Ms. Gross:

The Native American Heritage Commission has reviewed the Sacred Lands File and found several burial/recorded sites in/near the project area. The location of sites is confidential.

I recommend that you contact the North Central Information Center, Ca State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street, Adams Building, Suite 103, Sacramento, CA 916-278-6217 for sites in Sacramento County and Northeast Information Center, Ca State University, Chico, Building 25, Suite 204, Chico, CA 95929, 530-898-4413 for Sutter County, for further information of recorded sites located in/near the APE.

I have enclosed a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations contacts may have knowledge of additional cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. These lists should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. A minimum of two weeks must be allowed for responses after notification.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 653-4038.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Debbie Pilas-Treadway  
Environmental Specialist III
Native American Contacts
Sacramento and Sutter Counties
June 19, 2007

√ Rose Enos
15310 Bancroft Road
Auburn, CA 95603
Maidu
Washoe
(530) 878-2378

Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Nicholas Fonseca, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1340
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
Maidu
(530) 676-8010
(530) 676-8033 Fax

√ Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians
Frank Watson, Vice Chairperson
1940 Feather River Blvd., Suite B
Oroville, CA 95965
Maidu
eranch@cnccnet.com
(530) 532-9214
(530) 532-1768 FAX

Strawberry Valley Rancheria
Calvine Rose, Chairperson
PO Box 667
Marysville, CA 95901
Maidu
(530) 676-8010
(530) 676-8033 Fax

√ Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians
Glenda Nelson, Chairperson
1940 Feather River Blvd., Suite B
Oroville, CA 95965
Maidu
eranch@cnccnet.com
(530) 532-9214
(530) 532-1768 FAX

Strawberry Valley Rancheria
Robert Kerfoot
PO Box 667
Marysville, CA 95901
Maidu
(530) 676-8010
(530) 676-8033 Fax

√ Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Jeff Murray, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 1340
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
Maidu
jpmurray@saband.org
(530) 676-8010
(530) 676-8033 Fax

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn
Jessica Tavares, Chairperson
575 Menlo Drive, Suite 2
Rocklin, CA 95765
Maidu
(916) 663-3720
(916) 663-3727 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7250.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 6097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Natomas Levee Improvement project, Sacramento and Sutter Counties.
Native American Contacts
Sacramento and Sutter Counties
June 19, 2007

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn
Tribal Preservation Committee
575 Menlo Drive, Suite 2  Maidu
Rocklin, CA 95765  Miwok
916 663-3720
916 663-3727 - Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.34 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.36 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Natomas Levee improvement project, Sacramento and Sutter Counties.
June 21, 2007

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn
Tribal Preservation Committee
575 Menlo Drive, Suite 2
Rocklin, CA 95765

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

To Whom It May Concern:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlene Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn
Jessica Tavares, Chairperson
575 Menlo Drive, Suite 2
Rocklin, CA 95765

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Ms. Tavares:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Strawberry Valley Rancheria
Robert Kerfoot
P.O. Box 667
Marysville, CA 95901

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Mr. Kerfoot:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Strawberry Valley Rancheria
Calvine Rose, Chairperson
P.O. Box 667
Marysville, CA 95901

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Mr. Rose:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Single Springs Band of Miwok Indians  
Nicholas Fonseca, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1340  
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Mr. Fonseca:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA  
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Jeff Murray, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 1340
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Mr. Murray:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians
Glenda Nelson, Chairperson
1940 Feather River Blvd., Suite B
Oroville, CA 95965

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Ms. Nelson:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlene Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASB
June 21, 2007

Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians  
Frank Watson, Vice Chairperson  
1940 Feather River Blvd., Suite B  
Oroville, CA 95965

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Mr. Watson:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA  
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
June 21, 2007

Rose Enos
15310 Bancroft Road
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Natomas Levee Improvement Project(s)

Dear Ms. Enos:

EDAW, Inc., an environmental firm, has been retained to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for various SAFCA (Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency) levee improvement projects throughout the American River Basin in both Sacramento and Sutter Counties (see attached map). There are few specific planned improvements as yet, but the projects may include levee strengthening or widening, excavation for slurry walls or canals, soil removal from various borrow sites throughout the basin, and similar types of projects. The work will be conducted over the next several years, but EDAW is collecting cultural resources information now to help guide planning decisions made for the individual elements of this much larger effort.

We would appreciate your help in identifying any concerns you or your community may have regarding any cultural resources in the study area. Please return the enclosed response form. Returning this form does not imply that you approve or disapprove of the study, nor does it limit your opportunity to comment at a later time. Efforts to address your concerns will be included in the planning process.

In order to incorporate your concerns and/or input in any forthcoming reports, we would appreciate receiving your comments by July 10th.

If you have questions, please contact me at (916) 414-5800.

Sincerely,

Charlane Gross, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist

Enclosures: Map, Response form, SASE
Call Participants:

LBI - Rosil Enos

Initiated By: LBI

Phone Number: 530-878-2378

Subject: SAFCA/PAEDM C.C.

Discussion:

- CONCERN IS BURIAL SITE AVOIDANCE

- WOULD LIKE ANY INFORMATION CONCERNING ANY FURTHER WORK CONCERNING SUCH SITES

Action Item(s):

Distribution:

This phone note may contain confidential and proprietary information. It is intended for use by EDAW, Inc., its clients, vendors, and other associates.
P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: ☑ Not for Publication ☐ Unrestricted  a. County: Sutter
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Date:
   Taylor Monument  7-31-07  T10N; R4E; NW1/4 of NW 1/4 of Sec 6; Mount Diablo B.M.
c. Address: City: Zip:
d. UTM: Zone 10S; 622214 mE/4289367 mN, 622229 mE/4289312 mN, 622244 mE/4289358 mN

e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
The lean-to structure, shed, associated debris and looter's pit are located approximately (?) feet east of Garden Highway, south of the intersection of Garden Highway Reigo Road.

P3a. Description: The dilapidated remains of a structure and shed include a rectangular wood frame "lean-to" style building with a corrugated metal roof, which stands on a concrete pad, and a smaller, square wooden shed. An assortment of debris litter the area between the two structures and includes: white earthenware, tires, window glass, clear and brown bottle glass, corrugated metal sheets, rusted metal objects, milled lumber fragments, tires, window blind fragments, and pieces of dislodged mortar. Also, what appears to be a looter's pit is nearby with 1950's and 1960's era bottles, plastic, and a porcelain drawer pull within or near it. The site was found in a dense cluster of trees, poison oak and blackberry brambles; the numerous blackberry bushes and other groundcover obscure the availability of a full description of the structure. None of the site components appeared to be more than 40-50 years old. The Taylor Monument USGS quadrangle indicates two structures that match the site location, and both of these appear as a part of the 1980 photoreview of the 1967 original. This site does not appear to contain values that would make it eligible for listing on the CRHR or NRHP.

P3b. Resource Attributes:
   AH2 (structure pad), AH15 (standing structure), AH4 (trash scatter)

P4. Resources Present: ☑ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5b. Description of Photo:
   Remnants of structure-facing north-northeast

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: ☑ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

P7. Owner and Address:

P8. Recorded by:
   Charlene Gross
   EDAW
   2022 J Street
   Sacramento, CA 95811

P9. Date Recorded:
   7-31-07

P10. Survey Type:
   Intensive

P11. Report Citation:

*Attachments: ☑ NONE ☑ Location Map ☑ Sketch Map ☑ Continuation Sheet
☑ Building, Structure/Object Record ☑ Archaeological Record ☑ District Record
☑ Milling Station Record ☑ Rock Art Record ☑ Artifact Record
☑ Other (List): ☑ Linear Feature Record ☑ Photograph Record
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMAR Y RECORD

Other Listings
Review Code
Reviewer
Date

Page 1 of 2

*Resource Name or #: NLIP-2

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: ☑Not for Publication ☐Unrestricted  a. County: Sacramento
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Date:
   Taylor Monument 7-31-07 T10N; R4E; SW¼ of SW ¼ of Sec 13; Mount Diablo B.M.
c. Address: City: Zip:

d. UTM: Zone 10S; 621430 mE/ 4286256 mN
e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
   East of the Garden Highway approximately (?) feel

P3a. Description: This site consisted of a small historic debris scatter noted in a dirt farm road east of the Sacramento River East Levee
   and a drainage ditch. There appeared to be a mix of modern debris and a fragment of amethyst glass. It is presumed that this deposit
   was relocated from one of the nearby farm sites. The mixture of historic and modern debris and the location in an area disturbed by
   levee, ditch, and road construction all indicate that this site does not retain sufficient integrity to make it eligible for listing on the CRHR
   or NRHP.

P3b. Resource Attributes:
   AH4 (trash scatter)

P4. Resources Present: ☐Building ☐Structure ☐Object ☐Site ☐District ☐Element of District ☑Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5b. Description of Photo:
   None available

P6. Date Constructed/Age and
   Sources: ☑Historic ☐Prehistoric ☐Both

P7. Owner and Address:

P8. Recorded by:
   Charlane Gross
   EDAW
   2022 J Street
   Sacramento, CA 95811

P9. Date Recorded:
   7-31-07

P10. Survey Type:
   Intensive

P11. Report Citation:

*Attatchments: ☑NONE ☐Location Map ☑Sketch Map ☐Continuation Sheet
   ☐Building, Structure/Object Record ☐Archaeological Record ☐District Record ☐Linear Feature Record
   ☐Milling Station Record ☐Rock Art Record ☐Artifact Record ☐Photograph Record
   ☐Other (List):
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

PRIMARY RECORD

Page 1 of 5

Resource Name or #: NLIP-3 7240 Garden Highway

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: □ Not for Publication □ Unrestricted □ a. County: Sutter
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary)

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

Barn

Two-story, wood-frame building with a corrugated metal gable roof litted with an outrigger on the northern façade. The exterior of this building features both vertical and board and batten siding. Two double-wide openings and a single-entry door are located on the northern elevation.

House 1

East of the barn is a small wood-frame house. (see Continuation).

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)
HP2 = House; HP4 = Barn, shed.

P4. Resources Present: □ Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other (Isolates, etc)

P5a. Description of Photo:
(View, date, accession #)
Photo 19, Lkg East

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: □ Historic □ Prehistoric □ Both Ca. 1920

P7. Owner and Address:
William Cummings
1625 Creekside Dr.
Folsom, CA 95630

P8. Recorded by:
TOMAS, A.
EDA W, Inc.
2022 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

P9. Date Recorded:
8/6/07

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
Reconnaissance

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none")

Attachments: □ NONE □ Location Map □ Sketch Map □ Continuation Sheet
□ Building, Structure/Object Record □ Archaeological Record □ District Record □ Linear Feature Record
□ Milling Station Record □ Rock Art Record □ Artifact Record □ Photograph Record
□ Other (List):
B1. Historic Name: Unknown
B2. Common Name: N/A
B3. Original Use: Agricultural Complex  B4. Present Use: Vacant
*B5. Architectural Style:
   Vernacular
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
   Constructed ca. 1920
*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: Original Location:
*B8. Related Features:
   Outbuildings: Sheds, Barn.
*B10. Significance: Theme Agricultural Architecture  Area Nicolaus, CA
   Period of Significance N/A  Property Type Agricultural  Applicable Criteria N/A
   (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
   Sutter County Assessor’s records currently list this property as vacant. No construction date is listed on file for the buildings; however the construction methods and materials appear to date to the early twentieth century.
   The earliest known owners of this property were G.H. Lyall and Hardin et al. Currently, the property is owned by William C. Cummings (Verona Farming Partnership). Cummings received ownership of the parcel in October 2004, in a grant deed from Metro Air Park, LLC (Assessor document # 0029189). (see Continuation)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)
*B12. References:
   Sutter County Assessor’s records.

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator:
   Tomes, A.  
*Date of Evaluation:
   8/7/07

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
P3a (Description) continued.

This building is partially obscured by tree cover, and was not completely visible during the field visit. The building appeared to be situated on a concrete foundation.

Shed 1

A wood-frame shed is located northeast of the house. This building features a saltbox roof with exposed rafter tails. Sash window openings (minus glazing) are located on the northern elevation. The east façade displays two single-entry doors.

House 2

This building is a single-story, wood-frame house with a corrugated metal roof and little eave overhang. The exterior of this building features shiplap siding. A boarded up window opening is present on the eastern façade. This building sits upon a concrete foundation.

House 3

This is a wood-frame building with a partially collapsing flat roof. A porch, supported by square wooden posts, is located on the western elevation. This building is partially concealed by tree cover, and was not completely visible during the field visit.

Shed 2

This small building is of wood construction and features a shed roof.
B10 (Significance) continued:

This property appears to have always functioned as a residential and agricultural complex. Research did not reveal the property to be significantly associated with an important historic event (CRHR Criterion 1). Little information was found on early owners of the property, George Lyall and James Hardin. Lyall was originally from Illinois, and settled in the Verona Township of Sutter County sometime between 1880 and 1900. Hardin was originally from Tennessee, and settled in the Nicolaus Township of Sutter County around the same time (Sutter County Census records). Neither the property nor known past owners are listed in the various secondary references reviewed during this study which chronicled significant properties and pioneers in Sutter County history.

The buildings on this property do not appear to be significantly associated with an important individual(s) in local history (CRHR Criterion 2). Although the buildings appear to exhibit a good degree of integrity, they do not embody distinctive architectural characteristics, nor do they represent the work of a master (CRHR Criterion 3). While buildings and structures can sometimes provide important information on historic construction techniques and technologies, these types of buildings are well represented in both written and visuals sources, and do not appear likely to yield important primary information (CRHR Criterion 4). These buildings do not appear to be eligible for listing on the CRHR.
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Page 1 of 4

*Resource Name or #: NLIP-4  11100 Garden Highway

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication  ☐ Unrestricted  ☑ a. County: Sutter
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

P2b. USGS 7.5' Quad:  Date:
Verona  1967  T 11N  R 3E  ¼ of  ¼ of Sec  Mount Diablo B.M.

P2c. Address: 11100 Garden Highway  City: Nicolaus  Zip: 95637

P2d.UTM: Zone ;  mE/ mN

P2e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
APN: 935-0020-015

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The historic-era residence on this property is a wood-frame building with a hipped roof and composition shingles. The exterior features stucco siding, and a combination of aluminum siding and one-over-one sash windows. An enclosed porch is located on the southern façade. This building is situated on a gentle slope, and sits upon a concrete foundation.

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)
HP2 - House

P4. Resources Present: ☑ Building  ☐ Structure  ☐ Object  ☐ Site  ☐ District  ☐ Element of District  ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5b. Description of Photo:
(View, date, accession #)
Photo 8; Lkg NE

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:
☑ Historic  ☐ Prehistoric  ☐ Both

P7. Owner and Address:
Burton Lauppe
11100 Garden Highway
Sacramento, CA 95837

P8. Recorded by:
Tomes, A.
EDAW, Inc.
2022 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

P9. Date Recorded:
8/7/07

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
Reconnaissance

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter)

Attachments:
☑ Building, Structure/Object Record  ☐ Milling Station Record  ☐ Other (List):
☐ Location Map  ☐ Archaeological Record  ☐ Rock Art Record
☐ Sketch Map  ☐ Continuation Sheet  ☐ Linear Feature Record
**B1. Historic Name:** Unknown

**B2. Common Name:** N/A

**B3. Original Use:** Residence

**B4. Present Use:** Residence

**B5. Architectural Style:** Vernacular

**B6. Construction History:** (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

Constructed 1957

**B7. Moved?** ☑ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown

**B8. Original Location:**

**B9. Related Features:**

Sheds

**B9a. Architect:**

**B9b. Builder:**

**B10. Significance:** Theme Residential Architecture

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)

Period of Significance N/A

Property Type Residence

Applicable Criteria N/A

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

This residential complex is mostly comprised of contemporary (post-1957) buildings. Sutter County Assessor records list one of the two residences on the property as being constructed in 1957. The property has been in the Lauppe family since this time. The parcel is currently owned by Alan Lauppe, who received the property from Burton and Kathryn Lauppe in December 2006 (Assessor document # 00030459). (see Continuation)

**B12. References:**

Sutter County Assessor's records.

**B13. Remarks:**

**B14. Evaluator:**

Tomes, A

**Date of Evaluation:**

8/7/07
B10 (Significance) continued:

The land, originally listed as APN: 35-020-15, was split into separate parcels several years ago due to a lot line adjustment. Because of the split, the 35-020-15 parcel number was retired, and additional parcel numbers (35-020-18, 35-020-19) were assigned (Sutter County Assessor).

Research did not reveal this property to be significantly associated with an important historic event (CRHR Criterion 1). The historic-era building on this property is not known to be associated with an individual(s) considered important in local history (CRHR Criterion 2). The property itself has undergone regular intervals of construction over the years, with new buildings (e.g. garage-1987, second residence-1977, and sheds) being built on the property. The historic-era residence maintains only a fair degree of integrity; the porch on the southern façade has been enclosed, and some of the windows have been replaced over the years. This simple vernacular building, in its current configuration, does not embody distinctive architectural characteristics, nor does it appear to be the work of a master (CRHR Criterion 3). This type of building is well represented locally and on a state-wide level, and therefore does not appear likely to yield important primary information (CRHR Criterion 4). This building does not appear eligible for CRHR listing.
State of California — The Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION  

PRIMAl Y RECORD  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Resource Name or #: NLIP-5</td>
<td>2434 Howsley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P1. Other Identifier:  

P2. Location:  

- Not for Publication  
- Unrestricted  

a. County: Sutter  

b. USGS 7.5' Quad:  

- Verona  
- 1967  
- T ; R ; ¼ of ¼ of Sec ; Mount Diablo B.M.  

c. Address: 2434 Howsley Road  

- City: Pleasant Grove  
- Zip: 95688  

d. UTM: Zone ; mE/ mN  

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)  
The historic-era buildings on this property include a residence, and what appear to be stalls. The residence was constructed in 1952 (Sutter County Assessor’s records). The two stalls, although not listed in the assessor's records, appear to predate the residence by approximately 10 – 15 years.

The residence on the property is partially obscured by tree cover, and was not completely visible during the field visit. What was visible showed a single-story residence with an overall L-shape plan, and crossgable roof. A full-width porch is present on the southern façade. This building sits upon a concrete foundation. (see Continuation).

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)  

- HP2 – House; HP2 – Animal stall  

P4. Resources Present:  

- Building  
- Structure  
- Object  
- Site  
- District  
- Element of District  
- Other (isolates, etc.)  

P5b. Description of Photo:  

- Photo 13, Lkg North  

P8. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  

- Historic  
- Prehistoric  
- Both  
- 1952  

P7. Owner and Address:  

- Wagen Shelley  
- 2434 Howsley Road  
- Pleasant Grove, CA 95688  

P8. Recorded by:  

- Tomas, A.  
- EDAW, Inc.  
- 2022 J Street  
- Sacramento, CA 95814  

P9. Date Recorded:  

- 8/17/07  

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)  

- Reconnaissance  

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none")  

*Attachments:  

- Building, Structure/Object Record  
- Milling Station Record  
- Other (List):  

- Location Map  
- Archaeological Record  
- Sketch Map  
- District Record  
- Rock Art Record  
- Artifact Record  
- Photograph Record  

- Continuation Sheet  
- Linear Feature Record  

DPR 523A (1/95)
B1. Historic Name: Unknown
B2. Common Name: No
B3. Original Use: Ranch
B4. Present Use: Ranch
*B5. Architectural Style: Vernacular
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
   Constructed in 1952.
*B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: Original Location:
*B8. Related Features:
   Outbuildings: Sheds, stalls, trailers.
B9a. Architect: Unknown
B9b. Builder: Unknown
*B10. Significance: Theme Residential Architecture Area: Pleasant Grove, CA
   Period of Significance N/A Property Type Residence Applicable Criteria N/A
   (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
   The community of Pleasant Grove was established ca. 1867 at its present location. Originally known as Gudge Eye, the name was changed to Pleasant Grove Creek that same year when a post office was established. In 1875 the name was shortened to the present name Pleasant Grove.

   Early buildings in the community included a saloon, hotel, boarding house, shoe shop, schoolhouse, and doctor's office. Approximately a dozen dwellings and two blacksmith shops were located in the immediate vicinity. The primary impetus to the economy was agriculture, with grain and livestock forming the principal crops. In later years rice also became an important crop. (see Continuation).

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

*B12. References:
   Sutter County Assessor's Records.
   Thompson and West. 1879. History of Sutter County, CA.

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Tomes, A.
*Date of Evaluation: 8/17/07

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
P3a (Description) continued:

The stalls on this property are of wood construction, and feature horizontal milled wood, and shed roofs covered with corrugated metal. Openings are located on the buildings northern facades. The buildings are in disrepair, and feature sway braces propped against the southern façade of the eastern-most stall. These stalls are situated upon earthen foundations. Other buildings on this property include modern trailers and metal-covered sheds.

B10 (Significance) continued:

One of the largest early ranches in Pleasant Grove was the Spanish Ranch. It contained 2000 acres, and was owned by State Senator Frederick Cox of Sacramento County. The land was later leased by Reese D. Murphy who farmed it for several years (Wagner 1992). Over the years, the Spanish Ranch was broken up into smaller parcels, of which the subject property was part.

2434 Howsley Road (APN: 35-050-030)

This property is zoned as an animal farm. The Sutter County Assessor's Office lists the residence on this property as having been built in 1952. The earliest known owners of the property were N.P. Rogers and an individual with the initials F.E.F. Today, the property is owned by Warren A. Shelley (Sutter County Assessor's records).

This property also appears to be a parcel which was originally part of the larger Spanish Ranch. This property has always functioned for agricultural (husbandry) purposes. Because none of the existing buildings appear to date to the property's earliest usage, research did not reveal the property, in its current configuration, to be significant within that theme (CRHR Criterion 1). This property is not associated with person(s) considered important in local or state history (CRHR Criterion 2). Little information was found on Nathaniel Rogers, other than that he was an early settler in Pleasant Grove. F.E.F. could possibly have been Eben Fisfield, of which there is currently a road named near the project area. Fisfield, born in Maine in 1834, came to California in 1859. He resided in Amador County for approximately nine years, then in San Joaquin County for approximately five years. He later settled in Sutter County (Thompson and West 1879). Although these individuals were early settlers in the community, none of the existing buildings on the subject property date to their ownership/occupation. None of the buildings, therefore, have an association to, or are eligible for CRHR listing due to an association with these individuals.

The subject buildings on this property retain a good degree of integrity, however, they do not display distinguishing architectural characteristics, nor do they appear to be the work of a master (CRHR Criterion 3). While buildings and structures can sometimes yield important information on historic construction techniques or technologies (CRHR Criterion 4), these types of buildings are well documented in both written and visual material, and do not appear to be sources of important primary information. These buildings do not appear to be CRHR eligible.
**P1.** Other Identifier:

- Location: [ ] Not for Publication [ ] Unrestricted
- a. County: Sutter
- and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
- b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Date:
- Veronica 1967 T 11 N ; R 4 E ; 
- c. Address: 2145 Howsley Road City: Pleasant Grove Zip: 95668
- d. UTM: Zone ; mE/ mN
- e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
- APN: 35-090-025

**P3a.** Description: (Describe resource and major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

This residential complex features a mix of contemporary and historic-era buildings. The northern-most residence on the property was constructed in 1957 (Sutter County Assessor’s records). This residence is a single-story, wood-frame building with a cross-gable roof and moderate eave overhang. The roofing is composed of composite shingles. This building also features aluminum-sliding windows, and a single-entry door on the northern façade. This residence is situated upon a concrete slab foundation.

Southwest of the residence is a 3-car garage. (see Continuation).

**P3b.** Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

HP2 - House; HP4 - Detached Garage

**P4.** Resources Present:

- [ ] Building
- [ ] Structure
- [ ] Object
- [ ] Site
- [ ] District
- [ ] Element of District
- [ ] Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5b.** Description of Photo:

(View, date, accession #)

Photo 2, Lkg SE

- [ ] Historic
- [ ] Prehistoric
- [ ] Both

**P6.** Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

- [ ] Historic

1957

**P7.** Owner and Address:

Morrison 2000

3559 Howsley Road

Pleasant Grove, CA

**P8.** Recorded by:

Tomes, A.

EDAW, Inc.

2022 J Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

**P9.** Date Recorded:

8/15/2007

**P10.** Survey Type: (Describe)

Reconnaissance

**P11.** Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter

"none".)

**Attachments:**

[ ] NONE

[ ] Building, Structure/Object Record

[ ] Milling Station Record

[ ] Other (List):

[ ] Location Map

[ ] Archaeological Record

[ ] Rock Art Record

[ ] Sketch Map

[ ] District Record

[ ] Artifact Record

[ ] Photograph Record

[ ] Continuation Sheet

[ ] Linear Feature Record
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

Page 2 of 4  Resource Name or #: NLIP-6  2145 Howsley Road

61. Historic Name: Unknown
62. Common Name: N/A
63. Original Use: Homestead
64. Present Use: Residential Complex
65. Architectural Style: Vernacular
66. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
   Constructed in 1957.
67. Moved? ☒No ☐Yes ☐Unknown Date: Original Location:
68. Related Features:
   Outbuildings: Shed and garages.
69a. Architect: Unknown
69b. Builder: Unknown
9a. Area Pleasant Grove, CA
10. Theme: Residential Architecture
   Period of Significance N/A
   Property Type: Residence
   Applicable Criteria N/A
   (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
   The community of Pleasant Grove was established ca. 1857 at its present location. Originally known as Gough Eye, the name was changed to Pleasant Grove Creek that same year when a post office was established. In 1875 the name was shortened to the present name Pleasant Grove.

Early buildings in the community included a saloon, hotel, boarding house, shoe shop, schoolhouse, and doctor's office. Approximately a dozen dwellings and two blacksmith shops were located in the immediate vicinity. The primary impetus to the economy was agriculture, with grain and livestock forming the principal crops. In later years rice also became an important crop. (see Continuation).

11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

12. References:
   Sutter County Assessor's Records.
   Thompson and West. 1879. History of Sutter County, CA.

13. Remarks:

14. Evaluator:
   Tomes, A.
   Date of Evaluation: 8/17/07

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
This wood-frame, corrugated metal-covered building displays a salt-box shaped roof, and 3 bays on its northern façade. This building is contemporaneous with the residence. The other buildings on this property are contemporary and include: a large metal storage building, a second residence, and a second garage.

B10 (Significance) continued:

One of the largest early ranches in Pleasant Grove was the Spanish Ranch. It contained 2000 acres, and was owned by State Senator Frederick Cox of Sacramento County. The land was later leased by Reese D. Murphy who farmed it for several years (Wagner 1992). Over the years, the Spanish Ranch was broken up into smaller parcels, of which the subject property was part.

2145 Howsley Road (APN: 35-080-025)

This property, in its current configuration, has always functioned as a residential complex. Other parcel numbers for this property have included 35-080-002, and 35-080-023, both of which have been retired (Sutter County Assessor’s records).

The property appears to have originally been part of the larger Spanish Ranch, which was later split into several smaller parcels. The earliest known occupants of this parcel were R. Murphy and M. Donaldson. Today the owner of the property is listed as Morrison 2000 (Sutter County Assessor’s records).

Research did not reveal this property, in its current configuration, to be associated with an important historic trend or event (CRHR Criterion 1). This property is not known to be associated with an individual considered important in local or state history (CRHR Criterion 2). R. Murphy, born in Missouri in 1863, came to California with his mother in 1872. They settled in Nicolaus, and later purchased a ranch at Pleasant Grove. Mary Donaldson was the wife of Alex, a farmer and stock-raiser. Alex Donaldson came to Sutter County ca. 1861. He was in the mercantile business for a short time, before turning to agriculture. He married Mary Pierce on June 30, 1869 (Thompson and West 1879). Alex stops appearing in the Sutter County Census records in 1900, and is presumed to have died sometime between 1880 (last census he appears in) and 1900. The 1890 census was destroyed in a fire. Although these individuals were early settlers in the community, none of the existing buildings on the subject property dates to their ownership/occupation. None of the buildings, therefore, have an association to, or are eligible for CRHR listing due to an association with these individuals.

Although the buildings retain a good degree of integrity, they are vernacular in style to the 1950s, and do not display distinguishing architectural characteristics that make them notable examples of vernacular architecture. These buildings do not represent the work of a master (CRHR Criterion 3). While buildings and structures can sometimes yield important information on historic construction techniques or technologies (CRHR Criterion 4), these types of buildings are well documented in both written and visual material, and do not appear to be sources of important primary information. The buildings on this property do not appear to be eligible for listing on the CRHR.
Pursuant to the provisions of Section 106 per 36 CFR Section 800.3(c)(3) the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is initiating consultation regarding the issuance of approvals and permits for the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Landside Improvements Project (NLIP). This letter describes the project proposed by Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), the NLIP, and the approach proposed by the Corps for satisfying Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for this undertaking. The project is intended to provide urgently needed flood control system improvements and provide at least 100-year flood protection as quickly as possible to the Natomas Basin in southern Sutter and northern Sacramento Counties (Enclosure I), while laying the groundwork to achieve at least urban-standard (“200-year”) flood protection over time.

The project includes improving various portions of the Natomas Basin flood control system and making related landscape and irrigation/drainage infrastructure modifications in three phases in 2008, 2009, and 2010. Enclosure 2 shows the anticipated phases of construction along the levee system. Project activities are summarized as follows and more details are provided in Enclosure 3:

2008 construction

- Along the 5.3-mile Natomas Cross Canal (NCC) south levee, raise the levee to provide additional freeboard; realign the levee to provide a more stable waterside slope and to reduce the need for removal of waterside vegetation, and construct a seepage cutoff wall in the eastern 4.3 miles (approximately) of the levee to reduce the risk of levee failure due to seepage and stability concerns.

- Along the Sacramento River east levee, construct a raised adjacent setback levee from the NCC to about 3,100 feet south of the North Drainage Canal with seepage berms where required to reduce seepage potential, and install woodland plantings.

- Construct a new canal designed to provide drainage and associated giant garter snake habitat (referred to in this EIR as the “GGS/Drainage Canal”), relocate the Elkhorn Canal between the North Drainage Canal and the Elkhorn Reservoir settling basin (“Elkhorn Reservoir”), and remove a deep culvert from under the levee near the Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2 site.
- Re-contour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

2009 and 2010 construction

Along the Sacramento River east levee south of the limits of the 2008 improvements, construct an adjacent setback levee (raised where needed to provide adequate freeboard) with seepage berms, relief wells, and cutoff walls as required, and install woodland plantings.

- Widen the levee and construct seepage berms along the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal west levee.

- Construct a new GGS/Drainage Canal between Elkhorn Reservoir and the West Drainage Canal, improve the West Drainage Canal, relocate the Riverside Canal and the Elkhorn Canal downstream of Elkhorn Reservoir, and reconstruct the Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2.

Re-contour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

- Remove encroachments from the water side of the Sacramento River east levee as needed to ensure that the levee can be certified as meeting the minimum requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and USACE design criteria, and address Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for the State Route 99/70 bridge crossing of the NCC.

Through discussion with your office, we have determined that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) is the appropriate vehicle for satisfying Section 106. The nature of the undertaking, the cultural resources management efforts required, and the necessary federal authorizations and permits require a departure from the process for satisfying Section 106 described in 36 CFR Section 800 et. seq. The standard Section 106 process requires federal agencies to identify all historic properties, determine the effect of the undertaking on those resources, and complete dialogue with consulting parties before Section 106 is complete. For the following reasons, this procedure is not possible in this instance:

- The applicant requires both permission to alter federal flood control structures under Section 408 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S. Code Section 408) and one or more individual permits to discharge fill to jurisdictional waters under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S. Code Section 1344). The Section 408 permission will be granted separately for each year of project construction, corresponding to the three years of project work (2008, 2009, and 2010) that collectively constitute the entire project.

- The undertaking will likely have an adverse effect on at least one historic property, CA-Sac-485/H. This adverse effect must be resolved via the Section 106 process, and the method of resolution should be documented in an agreement document.
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) will consist of the work described in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the Natomas Levee Improvement Program Landside Improvements Project. The exact APE for all phases of construction remains unclear.

The applicant is in the process of acquiring rights-of-entry, easements, and ownership interests in the project footprint where effects on historic properties may occur. This phased access will require an ongoing effort to inventory historic properties in the APE, rather than a single inventory effort.

The project includes landside improvements to the levee along the east bank of the Sacramento River, an area that is sensitive for buried archaeological sites. The method for dealing with unanticipated discoveries needs to be in an agreement document and described in detail in a manner that incorporates the framework provided in 36 CFR Section 800.13 Post-review Discoveries.

The complexity and phased nature of the project dictates that ongoing consultation with federally recognized tribes and other Native American groups and individuals is the best method for incorporating their concerns and input.

The Corps proposes that SAFCA, the USACE, and the SHPO adopt a Programmatic Agreement (PA) providing for a phased identification of resources and assessment of effects. We have included a draft PA (Enclosure 4) for your consideration. Upon receipt of your concurrence, we will notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.14 et. seq. If the ACHP declines to participate, we will collaborate with your office to develop and finalize the management framework provided in the PA. If you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me so that we can remed[y any information gaps. Comments or questions may be sent to Mr. Daniel A. Bell, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CESPK-PD-RA, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814; email at daniel.a.bell@usace.army.mil; phone at (916) 557-6818, or fax at (916) 557-7856.

Sincerely,

Francis C. Piccola
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosures
Ms. Jessica Taveres, Chairperson  
United Auburn Indian Community of Auburn  
575 Menlo Drive, Suite 2  
Rocklin, California 95765  

Dear Chairperson;  

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Sacramento District, is writing you in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, to inform you of the proposed Natomas Levee Improvement Program Landslide Improvements Project (Project) located along the Sacramento River in Sutter and Sacramento Counties. The project requires that the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency obtain permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (Corps), and is therefore considered a federal undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and is subject to the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We are also inviting you to participate as a concuring party in the development and execution of a Programmatic Agreement (PA). The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed project is shown on the enclosed topographic map (enclosure 1).

The proposed project is intended to provide urgently needed flood control system improvements and provide at least 100-year flood protection as quickly as possible to the Natomas Basin in southern Sutter and northern Sacramento Counties, while laying the groundwork to achieve at least urban-standard ("200-year") flood protection over time.

The proposed project includes improving various portions of the Natomas Basin flood control system and making related landscape and irrigation/ drainage infrastructure modifications in three phases in 2008, 2009, and 2010. Enclosure 2 shows the anticipated phases of construction along the levee system. Project activities are summarized as follows:

2008 construction

- Along the 5.3-mile Natomas Cross Canal (NCC) south levee, raise the levee to provide additional freeboard; realign the levee to provide a more stable waterside slope and to reduce the need for removal of waterside vegetation, and construct a seepage cutoff wall in the eastern 4.3 miles (approximately) of the levee to reduce the risk of levee failure due to seepage and stability concerns.

- Along the Sacramento River east levee, construct a raised adjacent setback levee from the NCC to about 3,100 feet south of the North Drainage Canal with seepage berms where required to reduce seepage potential, and install woodland plantings.

- Construct a new canal designed to provide drainage and associated giant garter snake habitat (referred to in this EIR as the "GGS/Drainage Canal"), relocate the Elkhorn Canal between the North Drainage Canal and the Elkhorn Reservoir settling basin ("Elkhorn Reservoir"), and
remove a deep culvert from under the levee near the Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2 site.

- Recontour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

2009 and 2010 construction

- Along the Sacramento River east levee south of the limits of the 2008 improvements, construct an adjacent setback levee (raised where needed to provide adequate freeboard) with seepage berms, relief wells, and cutoff walls as required, and install woodland plantings.

- Widen the levee and construct seepage berms along the Pleasant Grove Creek Canal west levee.

- Construct a new GGS/Drainage Canal between Elkhorn Reservoir and the West Drainage Canal, improve the West Drainage Canal, relocate the Riverside Canal and the Elkhorn Canal downstream of Elkhorn Reservoir, and reconstruct the Reclamation District 1000 Pumping Plant No. 2.

- Recontour the land and create marsh and upland habitat at borrow locations.

- Remove encroachments from the water side of the Sacramento River east levee as needed to ensure that the levee can be certified as meeting the minimum requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program and USACE design criteria, and address Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for the State Route 99/70 bridge crossing of the NCC.

The level of effort towards identifying historic properties will be conducted pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(b)(1) and will include an updated records and literature search, and field survey. We have developed a draft PA to take into account any adverse affects to historic properties as a result of project construction. A PA is a compliance document that specifies procedures that a Federal agency will follow on a project when all of the potential adverse effects are not known. PA’s are negotiated and executed between the Federal agency, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and occasionally the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Stipulations in the draft PA have been included to take into account any issues or concerns that you may have regarding cultural resources and potential adverse effects on them. We are also requesting information regarding the presence of any traditional cultural properties, sacred sites, or other areas of cultural interest to the members of the Paskenta Band in the project area. A copy of the draft PA is provided for your review and comment (enclosure 3).

We request that you respond within 45 days of receipt of this letter. We would appreciate knowing if you wish to participate in consultation on the PA, and we welcome your comments and suggestions that you may have. Please direct any comments on the draft PA, cultural resources investigation, or any other aspect of our work on the Project to Mr. Daniel A. Bell, Archeologist, at (916) 557-6818, email: daniel.a.bell@usace.army.mil. Questions regarding the overall project may be directed to Mr. Daniel Tibbits, Project Manager, at (916) 557-7372, or email dan.p.tibbits@usace.army.mil. Your time and consideration are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Francis C. Piccola
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosures
May 8, 2008

Office of State Historic Preservation
1416 9th Street, Room 1442-7
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Dwight Dutschke, Associate Park & Recreation Specialist, Project Review Unit
   Email: ddutschke@parks.ca.gov
   Fax: 916-653-9824

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District
1325 J Street, Room 840
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Col. Thomas C. Chapman, District Engineer
   Email: lori.d.whitmer@usace.army.mil
   Fax: 916-557-7859
Attn: Linda Brown

Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency [SAFCA]
1007 – 7th Street, 7th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attn: Stein M. Buer, Executive Director
      John Bassett, Director of Engineering
   Email: info@safca.org
   Fax: 916-874-8289

Re: Draft Programmatic Agreement for the Natomas Levee Improvement Program; Notification of Ongoing Consultation Issues Arising from Ongoing Work at Site

Dear Mr. Dutschke, Col. Chapman, Ms. Brown, Mr. Buer, and Mr. Bassett:

The Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians [the Band], designated as the Most Likely Descendant [MLD] by the Native American Heritage Commission, takes this opportunity to provide preliminary comments on the proposed Programmatic Agreement and to request formal consultation before the Programmatic Agreement is finally negotiated, especially to include protocols for the respectful treatment and disposition of human remains, associated funerary objects, and other cultural items.
As a preliminary matter, we wish to advise the addressed agencies that by this letter the Band does not intend to imply that the agencies have not tried to contact the Band’s prior representative for these matters, Mr. Jeff Murray. In order to avoid any further delays, the Band has identified John Tayaba, Tribal Vice Chair, to take all responsive actions with regard to our obligations as MLD. Please also understand that our comments are preliminary. The Band has asked our attorney, Brigit S. Barnes, to review the proposed Programmatic Agreement, relevant portions of the NLIP Landside Improvements EIR, and related federal reviews so as to advise Mr. Tayaba on these matters, as well as a pressing issue which must be addressed regardless of the status of negotiations on the Programmatic Agreement. We ask that copies of any and all correspondence to the Band be sent to Mrs. Barnes at Brigit S. Barnes & Associates, Inc., 3262 Penryn Road, Suite 200, Loomis, CA 95650; Telephone: (916) 660-9555; Fax: (916) 660-9554; Email: bsbarnes@landlawbybarnes.com.

Please also consider this letter to request that the Band be treated as a “consulting party” for the Programmatic Agreement, and for all future work along the Natomas River, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(f)(3).

1. **Possible Disrespectful Treatment of Native American Remains During Sampling by EDAW On Site**

The Band has been informed, and its preliminary investigation confirms, that while EDAW was conducting small-scale shovel testing along the eastern side of CA-Sac-485/H, a preliminarily identified burial site was rough-dug, thus resulting in potential damage to the human remains located within the pit. Based on what we have been informed of, the treatment of the site overall does not comport with state or federal law, and we request an immediate investigation into the manner of excavation used by EDAW at the site.

2. **Comments to Draft Programmatic Agreement [PA]**

**General.** Has the Advisory Council on Historic Preservations Been Invited to Participate? We request that the Council be involved or otherwise have an opportunity to comment if consultation with the Tribes is inadequate. We do not know whether any of the Tribes identified in the NLIP EIR have been given an ability to speak to the language of this PA, or been invited to be formal signatories to this PA. As the MLD, we request the right to be a formal signatory to this PA after negotiation.

1. **DEFINITIONS**

**APE.** The Native American community should be allowed to comment on the Area of Potential Effects [APE] before it is altered. We formally request that the PA definition notes that “the Tribes have been consulted about the nature and location of the APE and their concerns have been adequately considered”, or some similar language.

**Cultural Resources.** It is appropriate to include traditional cultural places in this definition, but traditional cultural properties should be moved to the following definition.
“Historic Property” explicitly includes traditional cultural properties as properties of value to cultural groups that have been determined eligible for or are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

II. STANDARDS

(A.) Professional Qualifications. Please include specific mention of an ethnographer for places of value to the Native American community. The perspective of the Tribes needs to be addressed by a professional who understands and communicates tribal interests, and whose values are not at odds with tribal values.

(B.) Historic Preservation Standards. Please include the following: “The Corps shall insure that the Tribes are provided with all draft reports prepared pursuant to this Programmatic Agreement, and that the Tribes will be offered the opportunity to review and comment on the reports. All comments by the Tribes shall be appropriately considered in the preparation of the final report.”

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(C.) Project Phasing and Potential Changes to the APE. Please note our request under definition of the APE above, and include throughout this document as necessary.

IV. INVENTORY OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

(C.) Changes to the APE. Please note our request under the definition of APE above.

V. TREATMENT OF EFFECTS

(A.) Historic Property Treatment Plans. The Tribes wish to be included in the review and comment of HPTPs that involve resources of value to the Native American community. The PA says that concurring parties may be distributed to the Tribes as concurring parties. We request that this word be changed to “shall”.

Review Schedule. The Tribes should be included in the 30-day review period.

(C.) Final Report. The Tribes should be offered the draft report and an opportunity to review and comment. A copy of the revised final report shall be provided to the Tribes.

VI. NATIVE AMERICANS AND OTHER PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC NOTICE

The Tribes are not members of the public for purposes of consultation, and should be afforded their full role as specified in the 2001 Final Rule of 36 CFR 800 and the intent within the 1999 revisions to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
IX. AMENDMENTS

Please include the concurring parties at the table for amendments if the Project has not been completed within five years.

Concurring Parties Signature Page. The Tribes should be individually listed and afforded a place for signature on page 10 of 10.

We hope that receipt of this letter will result in a consultation to resolve many of our questions regarding the treatment of historic and culturally significant finds along the Natomas River.

Sincerely,

THE SHINGLE SPRINGS BAND OF MIWOK INDIANS

By: John Tayaba, Tribal Vice Chair

cc: Debbie Pilas-Treadway, Native American Heritage Commission
Executive Office

Mr. John Tayaba, Tribal Vice Chair
Shingle Springs Rancheria
Post Office Box 1340
Shingle Springs, California 95682

Dear Vice Chair Tayaba:

I am responding to your May 8, 2008, letter requesting that the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (The Band) be treated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) as a "consulting party" for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the Natomas Levee Improvement Program, Landside Improvements Project (NLIP).

Your correspondence indicates you have three primary areas of concern. First, you notified the Corps that The Band is designated as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) by the Native American Heritage Commission, for certain actions involving the NLIP. Second, requested we investigate the actions of EDAW, a consulting firm to the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), regarding its treatment of Native American remains during recent field investigations at the site identified as CA-Sac-485/H. Lastly, you requested to be treated as a consulting party on the NLIP PA and provided substantive comments for our consideration.

We appreciate your desire to be fully engaged with all aspects of the PA. Please find enclosed a copy of the executed PA, dated May 1, 2008. As an alternative to amending the completed PA, the Corps would like invite you to consult on the creation of the Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP). It is our belief that the concerns you expressed in your May 8 correspondence can be adequately addressed in the HPTP. Additionally, upon receipt of your letter the Corps, initiated an inquiry into EDAW's actions, and will share the results of this effort with you as soon as we can meet. While the Corps does not have the authority to direct the activities of EDAW or SAFCA, it has been in close contact with both entities and has recommended EDAW, who is acting through SAFCA, review its MLD procedures with the Native American Heritage Commission. That said, we understand controlled investigations/excavations may be continuing, by-way-of field consultations with input from one of the Band's representatives, as a standard operating procedure. Further, EDAW and SAFCA have assured the Corps that every effort is being made to address the Band's concerns and that they will continue to do so.
The Corps acknowledges that the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians is a federally recognized tribe and desire to meet with you and/or your staff as soon as practicable. In preparation for our meeting, please let me know if I have not fully captured your concerns and if there are any other concerns which we may prepare to address.

Mr. Mark Gilfillan is the District's Tribal Liaison and point of contact for all Sacramento District and Tribal Nation consultations and concerns. Mr. Gilfillan will soon be in contact with you or your designated staff to facilitate and arrange our meeting with dates amenable to The Band. If you have any questions regarding our meeting, please contact Mr. Gilfillan at our Colorado West Regulatory Branch, 400 Rood Avenue, Room 142, email address mark.a.gilfillan@usace.army.mil, or telephone (970) 243-1199, extension 15. I look forward to our meeting and addressing your concerns.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Chapman, P.E.  
Colonel, U.S. Army  
District Engineer

Enclosure
June 12, 2008

Mr. John Tayaba

Tribal Vice Chair
Shingle Springs Rancheria
P.O. Box 1340
Shingle Springs, CA
95682

Dear Mr. Tayaba:

RE: Your letter of May 08, 2008 and our meeting on June 04, 2008.

On behalf of the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) we wish to thank you for the opportunity to meet in person last week in the office of the Native American Heritage Commission. This letter is in response to the concerns raised in your letter of May 8, 2008 and at our meeting on June 4th regarding the treatment of historic properties that could be affected by the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (Program). This urgently needed Program will address identified deficiencies in the levee system protecting the Natomas Basin and will provide the 80,000 residents of the basin with a high level of protection against potentially catastrophic flooding.

SAFCA values the input of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (Band) as we make important decisions about the management of historic properties that could be affected by the Program. We recognize that the Band has a significant role in determining the treatment of historic properties as a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, in addition to your role as the most likely descendant (MLD) under California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. It is our intention to make every effort to incorporate your input and be responsive to your concerns as we move forward with the Program in a timely fashion. This letter provides a brief discussion of three items of critical concern, and then addresses other issues raised in your letter and at our meeting.

**Future Steps for 106 Consultations**

The Corps, SAFCA, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) have executed a programmatic agreement (PA) that governs treatment of significant cultural resources that may be affected by the Program. The PA requires consultation with the public and Native American individuals and
organizations (Stipulation VI). We expect to collaborate closely with you as the MLD on behalf of the Band in determining how cultural resources are managed for the Program. For each phase of construction (2008, 2009, 2010) we will consult with you regarding the area of potential effects, the inventory of historic properties, and the management of potentially adverse effects under historic property treatment plans.

**Excavation of Skeletal Remains at CA-SAC-485/H**

SAFCA’s consultant, EDAW, is conducting ongoing excavations at CA-SAC-485/H. This site contains burial features and skeletal remains. In accordance with State law, EDAW contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in early March 2008, during the 2008 season of fieldwork, when human remains were encountered during archaeological excavations needed for compliance with Section 106. The NAHC assigned you as MLD on April 15, 2008. To enlist your input and ensure appropriate treatment of human remains, our Consultant has provided the Band (email of May 21, 2008) with proposed field protocols for dealing with cultural resources and a draft burial treatment plan. The Band’s review and comment on these documents would be greatly appreciated.

In your May 8th letter you indicate that the burial site may have been inappropriately excavated, and the treatment of the site may not comply with Federal and State law. We are not presently aware of any violation of federal or state law, including your right to determine disposition of human remains under Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code. However, we will conduct an impartial investigation of events at CA-SAC-485/H to determine if the previous activities at the site were in compliance with State and Federal laws as well as standard protocols for site investigation. We will follow up with you as this process moves forward.

**Independent Peer Review**

As part of our effort to ensure sufficient and appropriate identification and treatment of cultural resources, we are prepared to provide an ethnographer for assistance in the identification process and to retaining consultants acceptable to the Band to conduct an external peer review of EDAW’s ongoing efforts and strategy. We have identified Far Western Anthropological Research Group as a firm with regional expertise in archaeology and geomorphology. However, as discussed at the June 4th meeting, we would welcome any alternative suggestions you may have regarding a qualified ethnographer and a firm to conduct the peer review.

**Other Concerns**

1. **Definition of Historic Properties**
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The Band notes that it is appropriate to include traditional cultural places (TCPs) in the definition of historic properties. Eligible and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed TCPs are included in the definition of historic properties in the implementing regulations, and are included in our definitions by reference to the regulations in the PA.

2. Ongoing Communication & MLD Liaison

SAFCA would appreciate your clarification regarding how SAFCA and its consultants should communicate with the MLD, the Band and its representatives. A clear definition of contacts and their specific roles will help us meet your expectations and facilitate cooperation as the project moves forward.

3. Modified Construction Methods

As discussed at our June 4th meeting SAFCA’s engineering staff are developing a series of modifications to standard construction methods proposed for sensitive historic properties. We will be circulating a memo identifying these methods and hope to discuss them with you when we meet again. As the Band offered during the meeting, SAFCA would appreciate receiving the results of the cultural resources ‘damage’ study that was prepared for an undisclosed site. This study should assist us as we develop our modified construction methods.

4. Final Report

SAFCA will forward a copy of the draft final report(s) to be prepared per Stipulation V(C) of the PA and will consider the Band’s comments in making final revisions to that document.

Summary

SAFCA seeks to accomplish the Program in a manner which is respectful and sensitive to Native American heritage. We appreciate your input and welcome your continued assistance in implementing the PA and managing historic properties associated with this important Program. We also look forward to hosting you on a Program field trip at a mutually convenient time. Please contact Peter Buck at 916-874-4581 if you have any questions or need further information, and please coordinate with him by phone or e-mail regarding when you are available to meet with the PA signatories.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Stein M. Buer  
Executive Director
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cc.

Larry Myers, Executive Secretary, Native American Heritage Commission.
Dwight Dutcheske, Assoc. Park & Recreation Specialist, State Historic
Preservation Office.
Brigit Barnes, Attorney for the Band, Brigit S. Barnes & Associates Inc.
Michelle LaPena, Attorney, LaPena Law Corporation.
July 23, 2008

Janis Offermann
Senior Environmental Planner
Department of Water Resources
Division of Environmental Services
Environmental Compliance and Evaluation Branch
1725 23rd Street, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA 95816

Dear Ms. Offermann:

The Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) is constructing the Natomas Levee Improvement Program (NLIP), Landslide Improvements Project. This project will provide necessary improvements to the levee system that surrounds the Natomas Basin, including portions of Sutter County, Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento, California. This project requires permits and authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to discharge fill to waters of the United States and to modify federal flood control structures. These federal actions require that the Corps comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Section 106 mandates that federal agencies consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable time to comment on the action. Historic properties are cultural resources such as archaeological sites, historic buildings and objects, and traditional cultural places that are listed on, or are eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Compliance with Section 106, as defined in Part 800 of Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), normally requires five sequential steps:

- determination of the area in which the undertaking may affect historic properties (also referred to as the area of potential effects or “APE”)
- identification of cultural resources within the APE
- evaluation of those resources for listing on the NRHP
- identification of adverse effects on NRHP-eligible resources that would result from the undertaking
- and resolution of adverse effects

The Section 106 process also requires the federal agency to consult with the public, Indian Tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) during the identification and evaluation of historic properties and to consider ways to minimize adverse effects of the undertaking on those properties. These steps may occur...
sequentially as the federal agency consults with these parties in the context of routine federal undertakings. For complex undertakings such as the NLIP, however, the Section 106 regulations provide alternate pathways to Section 106 compliance. Agencies may perform phased identification, evaluation, and resolution of adverse effects as an undertaking proceeds, per 36 CFR Part 800.4(b)(2). This section allows a phased management of resources if a specific process is defined in an agreement document such as a programmatic agreement (PA) or memorandum of agreement (MOA).

The Corps, in consultation with SAFCA and the California SHPO, has developed a PA for the NLIP detailing a phased identification, evaluation, and treatment process for this undertaking (a copy of the executed PA is attached for your information and use). This stepwise process will track the phases of project construction during 2008, 2009 and 2010. This phasing is necessary because the Corps must issue separate authorizations and permits under the Rivers and Harbor Act and the Clean Water Act for each year of work. The geographic scale of the construction involved and uncertainty about the exact nature of work for future phases also dictates that the inventory, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties be developed as phases of the NLIP proceed. These circumstances require that historic properties are identified and managed separately for each year of planned project construction. The PA provides for the following steps to comply with Section 106:

- Inventory of historic properties prior to each year of construction, and submission to the Corps and SHPO of an inventory report and APE map for each year (Stipulation III[C], Stipulation IV). This document will evaluate identified resources and make a finding of effects based on the potential of the undertaking to result in adverse effects.
- Resolution of adverse effects by preparation of a historic properties treatment plan for each adversely affected property (Stipulation V[A]).
- Consultation with the public at large and Native American individuals and organizations with cultural ties to the APE.

In summary, SAFCA and the Corps will identify and manage historic properties in phases related to construction activities over the next few years. We understand that this undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties with noteworthy values to both the archaeological and Native American communities. Such resources include CA-SAC-485/H, the remains of a prehistoric site containing numerous features and Native American burials. The full list of potentially affected resources that have been identified within the project area is provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (SAFCA, 2007) prepared for the project. We are currently conducting additional archaeological inventory for the 2008 construction season and additional site evaluation efforts are needed for the planned 2009 construction season.

We are contacting you to fulfill the consultation requirements under the PA and to provide you with the opportunity to consult regarding substantive decisions about how to resolve adverse effects on historic properties. This consultation replaces the general
requirement for public and Native American consultation under the Section 106 regulations because the PA replaces these regulations, in part, for these undertakings. A key part of the consultation process is to provide notice and opportunity to participate in the decision making process to determine how adverse effects will be resolved. We are preparing a draft historic property treatment plan to manage potential adverse effects on CA-SAC-485/H. If you would like to review this document please contact our office to be placed on the distribution list. We are also consulting with the Most Likely Descendant designated for CA-SAC-485/H, Mr. John Tayaba of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, as required under state law.

Please contact Peter Buck of SAFCA, at 916-874-4581 or buckp@saccounty.net should you have questions or need further information regarding the identification or treatment of historic properties for this undertaking.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John A. Bassett
Director of Engineering
Design Construction Maintenance