I. CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section presents baseline conditions for cultural (historic, archeological, and paleontological) resources in unincorporated Yolo County and evaluates potential impacts to such resources that may occur by implementation of the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan (Draft General Plan). The baseline conditions for this analysis are based on the Yolo County General Plan Update Background Report and the references cited therein,[1] supplemental background research, and consultation with interested parties. No field studies were done. For the purposes of the EIR, the information presented in this section comprises the County's cultural resources "environment," or physical conditions in the area that will be affected by build-out of the Draft General Plan. This section also identifies potentially significant impacts to cultural and paleontological resources, and recommends mitigation measures as necessary.

1. Setting

This section describes the existing conditions and regulatory context for cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area. The existing conditions portion includes (1) a description of the methods used to prepare this analysis; (2) overviews of the cultural background of the Draft General Plan area; and (3) a summary of the recorded cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area. The regulatory context portion summarizes the federal, State, and local laws and regulations that apply to cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area.

a. Existing Conditions. The existing conditions for cultural resources are described below.

(1) Methods. To prepare this report, LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) used a Draft General Plan area-wide existing conditions analysis prepared by Jones & Stokes. The analysis consisted of a records search and literature review. LSA supplemented the analysis by contacting potentially interested parties and conducting a paleontological resources analysis. The County, per the requirements of Government Code Section 65352.3, has initiated consultation with tribal organizations under Senate Bill 18. Each task is described below.

Records Search and Literature Review. Jones & Stokes conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California. The NWIC is the official State repository for cultural resource records and studies for Yolo County. All of the USGS base maps containing site and study locations for the County were consulted, and the locations of archaeological and architectural resources and studies were noted. This information provided the basis for the archaeological sensitivity assessment of the County, which is discussed later in this section. Jones & Stokes also consulted the following sources:

- *Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File*[2] (California Office of Historic Preservation). The directory includes the listings of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the results of the 1986 County Wide Historic Inventory.

[1] Jones and Stokes, 2005. *Background Report for the Yolo County General Plan Update.* Prepared for Yolo County.

[2] California Office of Historic Preservation. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento.

- Historical maps of Yolo County on file at the NWIC;
- *California Place Names*;[3]
- *Historic Spots in California*;[4]
- *California Gold Camps*;[5] and
- *Caltrans Bridge Inventory.*

Contact with Potentially Interested Parties. The Native American Heritage Commission[6] (NAHC) and the Yolo County Historical Museum[7] (Museum) were contacted for information or concerns about the Draft General Plan area. The NAHC stated that several recorded archaeological sites are in the Draft General Plan area, and no response was received from the Museum.

Paleontological Resources Analysis. A fossil locality search was conducted for the Draft General Plan area by Dr. Pat Holroyd of the University of California, Berkeley Museum of Paleontology in October 2008. The search was done to identify paleontological resources in the Draft General Plan area. Relevant paleontological and geological literature for Yolo County (including newspaper accounts of fossil discoveries) was reviewed to characterize the County's geology and paleontological sensitivity.

Senate Bill 18 Consultation. The County initiated consultation with tribal organizations in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Senate Bill 18. On September 20, 2006, and again on February 28, 2008, certified letters were sent to Ms. Elaine Patterson, Chairwoman of the Cortina Band of Indians, and to Mr. Marshall McKay, Chairman of the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians. The letters described the General Plan update process and the data gathered by the County to date, and also requested meetings with the tribal organizations on ways to identify and preserve or mitigate impacts to cultural places on land affected by the Draft General Plan. No response was received from the Cortina Band. Several consultation meetings and subsequent communications have been held with

[3] Gudde, Erwin G.,1969. *California Place Names: The Origin and Etymology of Current Geographical Names.* University of California Press, Berkeley.

[4] Kyle, D. E., M. B. Hoover, H. E. Rensch, E. G. Rensch, and W. N. Abeloe, 1990. *Historic Spots in California.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

[5] Gudde, Erwin G., 1975. California Gold Camps: *A Geographical and Historical Dictionary of Camps, Towns and Localities Where Gold was Found and Mined; Wayside Stations and Trading Centers*. Edited by Elizabeth Gudde. University of California Press, Berkeley.

[6] On October 28, 2008, LSA sent a letter describing the Draft General Plan and a map depicting the General Plan area to the NAHC in Sacramento requesting a review of its Sacred Lands File for any Native American cultural resources that might be affected by the implementation of the Draft General Plan. On December 23, 2008, Ms. Pilas-Treadway, Environmental Specialist III at the NAHC, responded by fax stating that the search of the Sacred Lands File ". . . found several burial/recorded sites in/near the project [General Plan] area." The locations of the sites are confidential and were not disclosed in the response.

[7] On November 17, 2008, LSA mailed a letter and map depicting the General Plan area to the Museum requesting information or concerns about historical sites in the County that may be impacted by the Draft General Plan. No response has been received to date. LSA made a follow-up telephone call to the Society on November 24, 2008, and left a voicemail requesting that Society staff contact LSA regarding concerns about the Draft General Plan. No response to LSA's voicemail has been received to date.

the Rumsey Band. The results are incorporated into the Draft General Plan and this EIR as appropriate.

(2) Archeological and Historical Resources Background. This section discusses the pre-contact, ethnographic, and historical background of the Draft General Plan area.

Pre-Contact Background. Although the Sacramento Valley may have been inhabited by humans as early as 10,000 years ago, the evidence for early human use is likely deeply buried by alluvial sediments that accumulated rapidly during the late Holocene epoch. Archaeological remains from this early period, though rare, have been found in and around the Central Valley, although to date none have been identified in the County. These early archaeological remains were grouped into what is called the Farmington Complex, which is characterized by core tools and large, reworked percussion flakes. It is generally thought that the economy of this early period was based on the exploitation of large game. Later periods are better understood because of a better representation in the archaeological record.

The taxonomic framework of the Sacramento Valley has been described in terms of archaeological patterns. A pattern is a general mode of life characterized archaeologically by technology, particular artifacts, economic systems, trade, burial practices, and other aspects of culture. Fredrickson identified three general patterns of resource use for the period between 4500 years before present (B.P.) and the contact period: the Windmiller, Berkeley, and Augustine patterns.

The Windmiller Pattern (4500 B.P.–2500 B.P.) shows evidence of a mixed economy that relied on the procurement of game and plant foods. The archaeological record contains numerous projectile points and a wide range of faunal remains. Fishing was also an important activity, as evidenced by fishing hooks and spears found in association with the remains of sturgeon, salmon, and other fish. Plant use is indicated by ground stone artifacts and clay balls that were used for boiling substances like acorn mush. Settlement strategies during the Windmiller period reflect seasonal adaptations: habitation sites in the valley were occupied during the winter months, with populations moving into the foothills during the summer.

The Windmiller Pattern ultimately changed to a more specialized adaptation termed the Berkeley Pattern (2500 BP–1500 B.P.). A reduction in the number of handstones and millingstones and an increase in mortars and pestles indicate a greater dependence on acorns. Although gathered plant resources gained importance during this period, the continued presence of projectile points and atlatls (spear-throwers) in the archaeological record indicates that hunting was still an important activity.

The Berkeley Pattern was superseded by the Augustine Pattern around A.D. 500. The Augustine Pattern reflects a change in subsistence and land use patterns to those of the ethnographically known people (Patwin, Plains Miwok) of the historic era. This pattern exhibits a great elaboration of ceremonial and social organization, including the development of social stratification. Exchange became well developed, with an even more intensive emphasis on the use of the acorn, as evidenced by shaped mortars and pestles and numerous hopper mortars. Other notable elements of the Augustine Pattern's artifact assemblage include flanged tubular smoking pipes, harpoons, clamshell disc beads, and an especially elaborate baked clay industry, which included figurines and pottery vessels (Cosumnes Brownware). The presence of small projectile point types, referred to as the Gunther

Barbed series, indicates the use of the bow and arrow. Other traits associated with the Augustine Pattern include the introduction of pre-interment burning of offerings in a grave pit during mortuary rituals, increasingly sedentary villages, population growth, and an incipient monetary economy in which beads were used as a standard of exchange.

Ethnographic Background. The County includes portions of the territories of two Native American groups: the Patwin and, to a lesser extent, the Plains Miwok. The western hills and mountains of the County and the lower grassland plains and oak groves were inhabited by the Hill Patwin, while the banks of the Sacramento River and associated riparian and tule marshland habitats were inhabited by the River or Valley Patwin. The Plains Miwok used this area as well.

The material culture and settlement-subsistence practices of the Patwin and the Plains Miwok share similar traits, likely because of historical relationships and an often-shared natural environment. Historical maps and accounts of early travelers to the Sacramento Valley testify that tule marshes, open grasslands, and occasional oak groves characterized the lower elevations near the Sacramento River and Delta. This part of the County was inundated in the winter and exceedingly dry in summer. Because of this, much of the floodplain was sparsely inhabited and Native Americans typically situated their larger, permanent settlements on higher ground along the Sacramento River. Hill Patwin tribelets lived in inter-montane valleys on the eastern side of the North Coast Range, their populations concentrating in particularly dense numbers along Cache and Putah creeks.

The Patwin and Plains Miwok speak languages classified as part of the Penutian linguistic stock, the largest Native American linguistic stock in California. Linguistic, ethnographic, and archaeological data suggest that Penutian language speakers entered California relatively late in time and settled nearly half of the State by approximately 200 years ago. Summary descriptions of Patwin and Plains Miwok cultures are presented below.

Patwin. The word *Patwin* does not itself denote a unified political entity. Rather, Patwin is the word for 'people' used in self-reference by several independent tribelets inhabiting territory that includes present-day Yolo County. These tribelets were the southern extent of a larger group of tribelets that shared close linguistic and cultural similarities. These contiguous tribelets, which stretched from the Delta northward along the western Sacramento Valley to the valleys of the upper Trinity River, were collectively called Wintun by early ethnographers. Subsequent linguistic analysis resulted in the division of these peoples into three general groups: Wintu (northern), Nomlaki (central), and Patwin (southern). For the purposes of this document, the use of the word Patwin includes all southern Wintun groups who inhabited or who currently inhabit Yolo County. The following ethnographic information describes what is known about the way of life of the Patwin around the time of contact with Euro-American explorers and settlers.

The Patwin inhabited lands that include almost the entire County. As with most of the hunting-gathering groups of California, the tribelet represented the basic social and political unit. Typically, a tribelet headman would reside in a major village where ceremonial events were often held. The position of tribelet headman was patrilineally inherited among the Patwin. The headman's main duties involved administering ceremonial events and economic activities, although village elders had considerable influence over political matters. Headmen often directed the location and timing of various fishing, hunting, or gathering expeditions and made critical decisions concerning elaborate ceremonies. Tribelet headmen also resolved conflicts in the community and provided leadership

during conflicts with neighboring groups. Patwin headmen apparently had more authority than their counterparts in many other central California groups.

The Patwin constructed four types of structures, all occurring in or around the villages: dwellings, ceremonial dance houses, sweat houses, and menstrual huts. All of these were semi-subterranean, earth-covered structures that were either elliptical (Hill Patwin) or circular (River Patwin).

The Patwin economy was based principally on the use of natural resources from the riparian corridors, wetlands, and grasslands adjacent to the Sacramento River and along drainages of the North Coast Range. The family was the basic subsistence unit that used this resource mosaic. Tribelets with territory primarily on the floor of the Sacramento River valley had the largest populations, such as *P'ālo* and *Yo'doi*, near Knights Landing, and *Moso*, *Imil*, and *Kisi* along Cache Creek. These groups relied on riparian and wetland resources, and fish, shellfish, and waterfowl were important sources of dietary protein.

Salmon, sturgeon, perch, chub, sucker, pike, trout, and steelhead were caught with nets, weirs, fishhooks, and harpoons. Mussels were harvested from the gravels along the Sacramento River channel. Geese, ducks, and mudhens were hunted using decoys and various types of nets. Tribelets with territory on the western margin of the Sacramento River valley (such as *Chemocu*, *Putato*, and *Liwai* along Putah Creek, and *Sukui*, near Bear Creek north of Guinda) relied less on riparian and wetland animal resources and more on terrestrial game. Deer, tule elk, antelope, bear, mountain lion, fox, and wolf were driven, caught with nets, or shot with bow and arrow.

The majority of important plant resources in the Patwin diet came from the grasslands of the Sacramento River floodplain and the woodlands of the Coast Range foothills. Acorns were a staple food of all of the Patwin tribelets. As in many other native California cultures, acorns were pulverized into meal and leached with water in a sand basin. The processed meal was then used to make a gruel or bread. A number of seed plants were also important secondary food sources, such as sunflower, wild oat, alfilaria, clover, and bunchgrass. The seeds from these plants typically were parched or dried, then ground into meal. Manzanita and juniper berries were also, dried, pulverized, and strained through baskets to make cider. Blackberries, elderberries, and wild grapes were eaten raw, dried and ground into meal or boiled. On the western margin of the Patwin culture area, sugar pine and foothill pine nuts were roasted and eaten whole.

Plains Miwok. The Plains Miwok inhabited the lower reaches of the Mokelumne and Cosumnes rivers, and the banks of the Sacramento River from Rio Vista to Freeport. The primary sociopolitical unit was the tribelet, consisting of the residents of several base settlements and their associated seasonal camps. Each tribelet was independent and held and defended specific territories. In what is now southeastern Yolo County, a village called *Ylamne* was located on the Sacramento River across from present-day Freeport, and another village, *Siusumne*, was located south of *Ylamne*.

The basic subsistence strategy of the Plains Miwok was seasonally mobile hunting and gathering. However, tobacco was cultivated and dogs were domesticated. Plant foods included acorns, buckeyes, laurel nuts, hazelnuts, seeds, roots, greens, and berries. Acorns, the primary staple, were gathered in the fall and stored through the winter. Seeds were gathered from May through August. Intentional, periodic burning in August ensured an ample supply of seed-bearing annuals and forage for game. The Plains Miwok ate more meat in the winter when stores of plant resources grew smaller. Hunting

was accomplished with the aid of the bow and arrow, traps, and snares. Animal foods consisted of deer; elk; antelope; rodents; waterfowl; quail, pigeons, flickers, and other birds; freshwater mussels and clams; land snails; fish; and insects. Salt was obtained from springs or through trade with people from the Mono Lake area.

Plains Miwok technology included tools of bone, stone, antler, wood, and textile. Typical basketry items were seed beaters; cradles; sifters; rackets used in ball games; and baskets for storing, winnowing, parching, and carrying burdens. Other textiles included mats and cordage. The Plains Miwok constructed several types of structures: conical habitation structures fashioned from tule matting, earth-covered semi-subterranean winter dwellings, acorn granaries, menstrual huts, sweathouses, and conical grinding huts over bedrock mortars.

Historical Background. Yolo County was one of the original 27 counties when California became a State in 1850. Initially, the County's territory was nearly twice as large as it is now and included a large portion of present day Colusa County. By 1923, the boundaries were redrawn to their current configuration. It is thought that the name "Yolo" is derived from the word *yoloy*, the Native American word signifying "a place filled with rushes." At one time the region abounded with fields of tule rushes, as well as swamplands, marshes, and sloughs. Settlement of the County by immigrants from the United States and other countries occurred relatively early compared to other areas of California. For this reason, numerous historical cultural resources are found in the County.

The Central Valley was explored by Spaniards as early as 1808, including Gabriel Moraga, who guided an expedition up the Sacramento River to present day Sutter County in search of potential inland mission sites. His excursion was followed in 1817 by Father Narciso Duran, Father Ramon Abella, and Luis Arguello, who established a temporary camp near present day Clarksburg. In 1821, Arguello and a party of explorers entered the area once again, this time passing through Solano and Yolo counties before reaching the Sacramento River near Grimes.

During the early 1800s, the region was also explored by hunters and trappers such as Jedediah Strong Smith, Ewing Young, and Hudson's Bay Company trappers. The hunters found the banks of the rivers and streams rich with beaver, otter, and other animals whose pelts were a highly valuable commodity in the worldwide trade of the time. They used to "cache" their pelts near Cache Creek, hence the name.

Early Settlements. Yolo County originally consisted of 11 Mexican land grants. Of these 11, only five were eventually confirmed after the U.S. government assumed control of the region: Rancho Rio de Los Putos, Rancho Quesesosi, Rancho Rio de Jesus Maria, Rancho Jimeno, and Rancho Canada de Capay.

The Gold Rush transformed Yolo County from an isolated farming community to a booming agricultural region, as disenchanted miners realized they could make a greater fortune through farming and ranching rather than gold prospecting. In 1850, 1,086 people lived in the County; by 1870 that number swelled to 9,899. The majority of growth occurred in the central and western parts of the County near roads and fords crossing Putah and Cache creeks. Early settlements in the County's interior were situated along the road from Benicia that crossed Putah Creek at Wolfskill's ranch near present-day Winters.

Fremont, the County's first town, was founded in 1849 along the confluence of the Sacramento and Feather rivers (south of present day Knights Landing). It became the first County seat in 1850. After Fremont suffered flood damage in 1851, the County government was moved to Washington (now West Sacramento). Between 1856 and 1861, the County seat moved from Washington to Cacheville (present day Yolo) and back to Washington. Flooding finally motivated voters to choose centrally located Woodland as the permanent County seat in 1862.

Capay. John Lang established the town of Langville in the late 1870s, subdividing and filing a plat for 12 acres at the southern end of the Capay Valley. Langville quickly overshadowed a stage stop, hotel, and blacksmith shop complex in Capay City that had flourished prior to 1874. By the late 1880s, the name of Langville was changed to Capay to match the local school, post office, and railroad depot. Between 1890 and 1940, the town serviced the Capay Valley as the major commercial and agricultural shipping center.

Clarksburg. In the spring of 1849, German immigrant Frederick Babel settled and established a farm on the west bank of the Sacramento River about 10 miles south of Washington (now West Sacramento). During the 1850s, other farmers followed and began providing fruit, vegetables, and milk products to gold miners. Clarksburg remained isolated by miles of dense tules during the last half of the 1800s, but by the 1920s it had developed into a small town as the Holland Land Company reclaimed and sold land. Today, Clarksburg remains a small farming community.

Davis. In 1850, Joseph B. Chiles acquired roughly 4,200 acres of the Rancho Laguna de Santo Calle land grant, which he eventually divided between his sons-in-law Jerome C. Davis and Gabriel Brown. Large ranches developed in the area during the 1850s (e.g., the Davis Ranch), and produced a variety of grains, fruits, and nuts, as well as livestock and dairy products. The farming community, known as the Putah Township by the 1860s, experienced major changes and became a commercial center when the California Pacific Railroad established Davisville as a new township and junction. Since the 19th century, the City of Davis has been closely associated with education following the establishment of the University State Farm in 1907. Fifty-two years later, the University State Farm became a general campus of the University of California.

Dunnigan. The settlement of Dunnigan began during the Gold Rush, as thousands of gold seekers passing through the area stopped at Lone Tree, an early hostelry. Competitors soon arrived as A.W. Dunnigan and partner Henry Yarrick opened a hotel and blacksmith shop that was the beginning of a permanent commercial center called the North Grafton judicial district. In 1876, Dunnigan donated land to the Northern Railway and filed a town plat, naming the town after himself. Agricultural production and related businesses have sustained the community since the 1850s. Between the 1890s and the 1980s the residential population grew from 200 to 1,500.

Esparto. The Stephens family, who owned part of the Rancho Canada de Capay land grant, first settled the area now known as Esparto (originally called "Esperanza," the Spanish word for hope) in the 1850s. In 1888, Rhoada Stephens Bonynge sold 1,300 acres to the Capay Valley Land Company, a Southern Pacific Railroad holding company, for the development of a large townsite that included railroad facilities and a rural subdivision of five, 10, and 20-acre parcels. As a farming community, Esparto experienced limited growth before World War II. The small town continues to serve as the principal education and commercial center for the Capay Valley.

Guinda. In 1887, Capay Valley Land Company established the Guinda townsite adjacent to the railroad depot. Called the Guinda Colony Tract, 1,380 acres were allocated by the company for a subdivision that included rural lots of 10 and 20 acres. Packing and shipping orchard fruit products was a staple of the town's economy until the 1920s. By the 1980s, the town consisted of a small settled residential area and local businesses.

Knights Landing. In 1853, Charles F. Reed surveyed and founded a town he called Knights Landing, named in honor of his father-in-law, early pioneer William Knight. By the 1860s, the river town began to flourish, and in 1869 a bridge was constructed across the river to carry wagons and the newly completed California Pacific Railroad. Beginning in the 1930s, local businesses moved near a newly created highway and highway bridge to take advantage of the new means of transporting goods. Still a farming town, Knights Landing is a popular destination for recreational fishing.

Madison. The townsite of Madison was established in 1877 when farmer and landowner Daniel B. Hurlbut donated 10 acres of land in the southwest corner of the Rancho Canada de Capay land grant for a Vaca Valley and Clear Lake Railroad depot and siding. During the late 1800s, the town became a trading center for shipping livestock and grain. Although the introduction of rice boosted the area's agricultural production, Madison's importance as a commercial center substantially decreased by the 1940s. Today, it has a population of over 500 and is primarily a residential center.

Rumsey. The Southern Pacific Railroad established the townsite of Rumsey in 1887 as the terminus of the railroad from Elmira. The town was named for Captain DeWitt C. Rumsey, a pioneer landowner in the Capay Valley. The growth of Rumsey was slow, and the town hall was not constructed until 1906. Agricultural land surrounds the town, and much of the land is zoned as an agricultural preserve.

West Sacramento. In 1849, Margaret McDowell established the town of Washington, currently known as West Sacramento, along the west bank of the Sacramento River directly across from the City of Sacramento. During the 1850s, Washington became a political and commercial center for the County because of its location. In 1859, manufacturing became a prominent part of Washington's economy when the California Steam Navigation Company established a shipyard in the town. Canneries also became a profitable industry in the area during the late 1800s. During the 20th century, the area continued to grow and prosper. In June 1963, the Port of Sacramento was opened to deep-sea shipping traffic with the completion of the Deep Water Ship Channel. In 1987, West Sacramento became Yolo County's fourth incorporated city.

Winters. In 1875, an extension of the southern leg of the Vaca Valley Railroad resulted in the establishment of the town of Winters at the northern terminus of the rail line. The town of Winters was laid out in the Rancho Rio de los Putos land grant and derives its name from Theodore Winters, a land speculator who sold much of his land to the Vaca Valley Railroad Company for the 40-acre town site. By 1880, 523 residents inhabited the budding agricultural and commercial center. Initially recognized as an important grain-shipping center, the Winters area gradually became a prominent fruit-growing district. By the 1890s, the area surrounding the town was commonly called the "Winters fruit belt." Crops grown in the region included apricots, plums, peaches, pears, olives, grapes, almonds, walnuts, figs, prunes, lemons, pomelos, pomegranates, and oranges. The 20th century saw gradual changes in the types of crops grown in the Winters area as the production of

fresh fruits was gradually replaced by the nut industries due to marketing trends. Agricultural lands north and east of Winters are chiefly devoted to rotation crops of tomatoes, grains, alfalfa, and rice.

Woodland. In 1849, "Uncle Johnny" Morris, a native of Kentucky, was the first to settle in the Woodland area. During the 1850s and 1860s, other farmers followed and established farms and livestock operations in the area. By 1862, Woodland was designated the permanent County seat. Two years following the induction of the railroad in 1869, Woodland incorporated and quickly evolved into the commercial and financial center of the County. During the early 1900s, agricultural industries in Woodland flourished, and by the 1930s the city had rice mills, a sugar refinery, canneries, and facilities to build and repair farm machinery. Throughout the 1960s the population of Woodland grew rapidly and, following the construction of Interstate 5, the northeastern section of town expanded to include industrial plants and distribution centers.

Yolo. Yolo, originally named Cacheville, became the first community to develop in the interior of the County. Yolo was part of Thomas Hardy's Rancho Rio de Jesus Maria land grant, and began to see settlement in 1849. By 1856, the town of Cacheville was formally laid out and designated as the County seat, then grew rapidly for a few years and became a prosperous farming district. In the late 1800s, Cacheville lost the County seat and faced increased competition from new railroad communities. By 1900, the town name was changed to Yolo. In spite of some loss in trade, railroad access encouraged new agricultural endeavors that have continued to sustain the community.

Zamora. Permanent settlement in the town now known as Zamora began in 1851 when Theodore Weyand built a home that became an overnight stop for travelers through the region. By 1858, the Prairie post office and school were established, and farms in the area began cultivating barley and wheat, as well as raising livestock. In 1876, James J. Black donated a 10-acre right-of-way to the Central Pacific Railroad and filed a town plat for a new community called Black's Town. By 1900, the small town had a population of 150 residents, and shortly thereafter the town name was changed to Zamora. During the late 1960s, the Zamora School was closed and several buildings were demolished to make way for the Interstate 5 freeway.

Transportation. As the County developed, the area's transportation improved. Although rancho boundaries commonly served as transportation routes, growth and land subdivision led to the creation of travel corridors. The demand for more direct transportation routes resulted in the construction of several railroad lines throughout the County, including the Central Pacific Railroad (1876) and the California Pacific (1868). By 1871, rail lines extended from Vallejo to Dixon, Davisville (now Davis), Washington (West Sacramento), Woodland, and Vacaville.

Despite these improvements, farmers in the southwestern portion of the County were still faced with poor transportation options, as no rail lines were close enough to serve their needs. Because of this, growers were forced to haul their goods to market by horse and wagon in Sacramento and beyond, which often took up to five days. The owners of the Vaca Valley Railroad Company, Andrew M. and George B. Stevenson, recognized this dilemma and formulated plans to extend a rail line through the southern portion of the County. In 1857, the southern leg of the Vaca Valley Railroad was laid. The extension of this line resulted in the permanent establishment of the town of Winters, located at the northern terminus of the rail line. In 1877, the Vaca Valley and Clear Lake Railroad Company was incorporated and extended the line north from Winters to Cache Creek. The Southern Pacific Railroad took over ownership of the Vaca Valley and Clear Lake Railroad Company the following year, and

the railroad was extended into the Capay Valley. The new line assisted farmers who were starting to cultivate fruit and nut orchards in the northwest region of the County. As a result of the development, the Capay Valley Land Company laid out new towns including Brooks, Esparto, Capay (formerly Langville), Cadenasso, Tancred, Guinda, and Rumsey.

During the 1900s, the automobile became an increasingly important mode of transportation, and roads were built throughout the County. The Yolo Causeway, a 3.5-mile bridge over the Yolo Bypass, was constructed in 1916. The bridge greatly improved automobile transportation between Yolo and Sacramento counties by providing year-round road access across the tules. In the northwest section of the County, State Route 16 was constructed in the 1930s to provide access to the Capay Valley. By the end of the 1960s, Interstates 5, 80, and 505 also existed as major freeway arteries connecting roads throughout the County.

19th Century Industry. Early settlers found the County to be ideal for livestock operations, and cattle raising quickly became an important occupation. By 1855, 27,000 cattle were in the County, and by the 1870s County residents were required to fence their land to protect neighboring fields from free-ranging herds. To make livestock operations more profitable, a better grade of stock was introduced, eventually including beef cattle, dairy cows, sheep and hogs.

In the 1840s and 1850s, residents of the County based their livelihood on raising livestock, but as floods and droughts hampered their operations, farmers increasingly turned to the planting of crops. Soon an acre of land became more valuable for growing crops than for sustaining domestic livestock. As settlers shifted their attention to farming, a new market was created for mules and horses. Stagecoaches and farm innovations such as gangplows required the heavy use of these animals. Between 1860 and 1870, the number of cattle in the County decreased from 23,480 to 11,260, while the number of horses in the County jumped from 3,940 to 9,773. Partly through Theodore Winter's influence, the County also gained a reputation for its organized horse races, and boasted some of the fastest horses in the State.

The County's soil, terrain, and climate were perfect for agricultural development. The fertile soil, rich from centuries of runoff from the nearby coastal mountains and flooding from the Sacramento River, was especially conducive for planting. In addition, Putah Creek, Cache Creek, and the Sacramento River provided plentiful water for irrigation.

Barley and wheat became the dominant crops in the County starting in the 1860s. Alfalfa was the major irrigated crop in the 1870s. Between 1870 and 1900, 25,000 to 35,000 acres of barley were planted each year in the County. Grown primarily for beer production, the barley crop was sold both at home and abroad. In 1860, 13,236 acres of wheat were planted, and by 1893, the acreage had increased to 231,306. In 1893, however, a worldwide depression resulting from an overproduction of wheat effectively ended the boom.

Other successful crops included hops, green peas, onions, beans, tomatoes, corn, sugar beets, flax, and grapes. Fruit and nut varieties were also planted, such as almond, walnut, cherry, pear, plum, apple, olive, orange, lemon, apricot, peach, nectarine, and berries of all kinds. By the mid 1880s, California's fruit industry was thriving and was second only to gold mining in economic importance.

In the 1850s, the average farmer farmed 160 acres of his land, but in 1870 that number rose to 450 acres. During this period 69 farms in the County were individually composed of more than 1,000 acres. In the 1870s, the bulk of the County's fertile land had been homesteaded. By 1891, nearly 1/4 of the County's land was filled with orchards.

Rancheria System. Between 1906 and 1910, funds were provided through a series of appropriation acts to purchase small tracts of land in the central and northern parts of California for the landless Indians in those areas, thereby establishing the rancheria system in California. Nearly 50 years later, the federal government attempted to terminate the status of 41 California rancherias under the Rancheria Act of 1958. Termination was a federal Indian policy in the 1950s and 1960s designed to end the tribes' special relationship with the federal government and to subject them to State laws. Tribal land was converted to private ownership, and in most instances sold. In 1967, the newly established California Indian Legal Services sought to reverse the termination of California rancherias through litigation. Twenty-eight of the 41 rancherias have since been restored. The Rumsey Rancheria in the Draft General Plan area is home to the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians, a prominent sovereign tribal entity with trust lands in the Capay Valley.

20th-Century Industry. Yolo County gained a reputation for its purebred livestock, which, by 1920, numbered over 154,064 heads of cattle, horses, mules, burros, swine, sheep, and goats. Despite a severe hoof-and-mouth disease outbreak between 1924 and 1926, the livestock won several awards at fairs in the United States, including the International Livestock Exposition at Chicago.
The turn of the 20th century brought many agricultural changes to the County. Irrigation improvements introduced new crops such as rice to the area. Between 1915 and 1921, rice acreage increased from 1,500 acres to over 20,000. Between 1910 and 1921, the planting of nut trees jumped from 184,000 trees to 337,379. At the same time, fruit trees decreased from 521,135 to 373,437.

Commercial enterprises related to agriculture and livestock sprang up around the County in the early years of the 20th century and furthered the development and growth of the region. Principal industries included rice mills, dried fruit companies, vegetable and fruit-packing plants, as well as feed and barley plants.

In 1906, the University of California purchased Jerome Davis' 780-acre farm to establish a farm, which was to function as part of the university's College of Agriculture. Through its research, the university farm would revolutionize the agricultural industry. The Davis farm eventually evolved into a separate campus of the University of California and it continues to enjoy a world-renowned reputation in agricultural research and education, and is currently the largest employer in the County.

Between 1911 and 1918, hundreds of miles of levees were constructed to control flooding in the Sacramento Valley. In addition, the Fremont and Sacramento weirs, the Knights Landing Ridge Cut, and the Yolo Bypass were built as part of massive flood control efforts. During this period, the combination of flood control and the reclamation of lands near the Sacramento River contributed to the conversion of thousands of acres of swampland. Companies such as River Garden Farms of Knights Landing and Holland Land Company of Clarksburg developed large farms on the land and revitalized many communities.

Between 1910 and 1930, the County's agricultural growth continued to flourish. During World War I, growers worked especially hard to meet the increasing need for food. Although, like the rest of the

nation, the County suffered during the Depression, the food demands of World War II resulted in the agricultural industries' recovery.

After World War II, mainly due to research at the University of California, Davis, advancements in technology revolutionized the planting of crops, irrigation, cultivation, harvesting, and transportation. Developments in technology led to mechanized farm equipment, which resulted in increased production, reduction of human labor, and increased profits. Crops such as rice, wheat, corn, alfalfa, beets, almonds, walnuts, grapes, and prunes were among those mechanically harvested. Further improvements in the area of flood control and irrigation development, such as dams and reservoirs, also greatly increased the County's abundance.

Although much of Yolo County remained rural with agriculture as the foundation of the economy, areas such as Davis, Woodland, and West Sacramento became increasingly urbanized during the 20th century. Davis continues to expand and support the University of California campus. Woodland is currently a thriving agribusiness and industrial center, as well as the County seat. In 1963, the opening of the Deep Water Channel into the Port of Sacramento in West Sacramento provided worldwide access to Yolo County's agricultural and manufacturing goods.

(3) Paleontological Resources Background. This section presents a brief summary of the paleontological background of Yolo County. A general geological and paleontological overview of the County is presented first, followed by a summary of the County's geologic units and the types of fossils they may contain.

Geological and Paleontological Overview. The County's diverse geology spans 145 million years, from the Cretaceous Period through today. The western boundary of the County is the Blue and Rocky ridges, a northwest-southeast trending range comprised of the Cretaceous Great Valley Sequence. The Great Valley Sequence formed when great quantities of mud, sand, and gravel accumulated as regularly bedded layers on the ocean floor of a deep trench along the margin of the North American continent. Seven geological formations have been identified in the Upper Cretaceous sediments; from oldest to youngest these are the Fiske Creek, Venado, Yolo, Sites, Funks, Guinda, and Forbes Formations. The units are exposed along a north-south axis, dipping below the surface steeply towards the east to form the hills on the west side of Yolo County. The Blue Ridge is bounded by two faults, and is being uplifted on its eastern edge.

Capay Valley is in the northwestern corner of Yolo County and east of the Blue Ridge. Capay Valley is a graben, which is a geologic block that has down-dropped due to faulting, while the Blue Ridge and the hills to the east have simultaneously been uplifted.[8] The valley is drained by Cache Creek and, aside from recent Holocene alluvium in and near the creek bed, is primarily comprised of the Pleistocene-age Modesto-Riverbank Formation fluvial terrace deposits. Exposed on the western edge of the Capay Valley are the Tertiary-age Capay Formation, a marine sandstone; and the Pliocene Tehama Formation, a sand/silt/volcaniclastic formation that includes the Putah Tuff, which overlies the Great Valley Sequence. The hills to the east of the Capay Valley also consist of the Great Valley Sequence and the Tehama Formation. The Dunnigan Hills, in the northern portion of the County and east of the Capay Valley, are an anti-clinal, northwest-southeast-trending range consisting of the

[8] Wagner, D.L., and E.J. Bortugno. 1987. *Geologic Map of the Santa Rosa Quadrangle, California, 1:250,000.* California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento, California.

Tehama Formation. The Tehama Formation is also found in isolated outcrops throughout the southern portion of the County, but it has been dissected by various sloughs and creeks and buried by more recent Quaternary alluvium.

The southern and eastern portions of Yolo County are in the relatively flat alluvial plain of the Sacramento Valley. The Sacramento Valley is a northwest-southeast-trending structural trough that contains a thick sequence of sediments, ranging in age from the Jurassic to recent Pleistocene and Holocene alluvium.[9] The eastern boundary of the County is the Sacramento River. Prior to modern flood control measures, the river would heavily flood in the winter and deposit sediments on its floodplain. The river has also historically meandered across its floodplain, creating new channels and leaving behind oxbow lakes.

Geologic Unit Summary. The geological units within the County are described below, from youngest (surface) to oldest (deepest).

Holocene Alluvium (Holocene: Recent–10,000 years old). Late Holocene alluvial deposits overlie older Pleistocene alluvium and/or the upper Tertiary bedrock formations in the southern and eastern portions of Yolo County. This alluvium consists of sand, silt, and gravel deposited in fan, valley fill, terrace, or basin environments. This unit is typically in smooth, flat valley bottoms, in medium-sized drainages, and in other areas where the terrain allows a thin veneer of this alluvium to deposit.[10] These alluvial deposits contain vertebrate and invertebrate fossils of extant, modern taxa,[11] which are generally not considered paleontologically significant.

Pleistocene Alluvium (Pleistocene: 10,000–1.8 million years old). The majority of alluvium in the Capay Valley, a valley east of the Dunnigan Hills, and the southern portion of the County consists of the Pleistocene-age Modesto-Riverbank and Red Bluff formations. These less-permeable sediments are basin, terrace, or riverbank deposits found at a distance from the present-day course of the Sacramento River. Vertebrate fossils in Late Pleistocene alluvium are representative of the Rancholabrean land mammal age, and many such taxa are now extinct.[12] These fossils include, but are not limited to, bison, mammoth, ground sloths, saber-toothed cats, dire wolves, cave bears, rodents, birds, reptiles, and amphibians.[13,14,15,16,17] Pleistocene alluvium is highly sensitive for paleontological resources.

[9] Wagner, D.L., Jennings, C.W., Bedrossian, T.L., and Bortugno, E.J., 1981. *Sacramento Quadrangle Map No. 1A, 1:250,000.* California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento, California.

[10] Graymer, R.W., D.L. Jones, and E.E. Brabb, 2002. *Geologic Map and Map Database of Northeastern San Francisco Bay Region, California*. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey.

[11] Helley, E.J, K.R. La Joie, W.E. Spangle, and M.L. Blair, 1979. *Flatland Deposits of the San Francisco Bay Region - their geology and engineering properties, and their importance to comprehensive planning*. Geological Survey Professional Paper 943. U.S. Geological Survey and Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

[12] Bell, C.J., E.L. Lundelius, Jr., A.D. Barnosky, R.W. Graham, E.H. Lindsay, D.R. Ruez, Jr., H.S. Semken, Jr., S.D. Webb, and R.J. Zakrzewski, 2004, pp. 232-314. The Blancan, Irvingtonian, and Rancholabrean Mammal Ages. In *Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic Mammals of North America*, Edited by M.O. Woodburne, Columbia University Press, New York.

[13] Bell et al., op. cit.

[14] Helley et al., op. cit.

[15] Hertlein, L.G., 1951, pp. 187-192. Invertebrate Fossils and Fossil Localities in the San Francisco Bay Area. In *Geology Guidebook of the San Francisco Bay Counties: History, Landscape, Geology, Fossils, Minerals, Industry, and Routes to Travel*, prepared by Olaf P. Jenkins. Bulletin 154. California Division of Mines, San Francisco.

Tehama Formation (Pliocene: 1.8–5.3 million years old). The Tehama Formation is exposed in the western side of the County, on both sides of the Capay Valley and in the Dunnigan Hills, and in isolated outcrops in the southern portion of the County. This formation is composed of sandstone, siltstone, conglomerate, and volcaniclastic (ash fragments) rocks.[18,19] This formation is associated with, and can be identified by, the Putah Tuff member, which yielded a radiometric age of 3.3 million years.[20] This series of fluvial deposits is 2,000 feet thick on average and contains fragmentary vertebrate bones.[21] The majority of fossil localities found in the County are in the Tehama Formation.

Capay Formation (Eocene: 35–55 million years old). The Capay Formation is exposed on the western side of the Capay Valley. The formation varies in thickness between 10 feet and 500 feet and consists of shale and sandstone that dates to the Eocene. The Capay Formation contains numerous invertebrate marine fossils, mostly consisting of shells.[22] The Capay Formation has high paleontological sensitivity, with 102 recorded invertebrate fossil localities. Graymer suggested that the Capay Formation belongs to the Vacaville Shale.[23]

Forbes Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years ago). The Forbes Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is in the hills east of Capay Valley, and also comprises the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Forbes Formation consists of massive beds of fine-to-coarse-grained wacke, with shell fragments that grade into inter-bedded siltstone and shale. This unit contains Late Cretaceous foraminifers and may contain significant invertebrate marine fossils.[24]

Guinda Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years old). The Guinda Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is in the hills east of Capay Valley and the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Guinda Formation is a thick-bedded-to-massive, coarse-to-fine-grained wacke that grades up into gray siltstone and shale. This formation contains Late Cretaceous radiolarians and foraminifers. There are no fossils recorded in the Guinda Formation in the County, but fossils from this formation are of paleontological significance.[25]

---

[16] Savage, Donald, 1951, pp. 215-314. Late Cenozoic Vertebrates of the San Francisco Bay Region. *University of California Publications Bulletin of the Department of Geological Sciences* 28(10):215-314.

[17] Stirton, R.A., 1951, pp. 177-186. Prehistoric Land Animals of the San Francisco Bay Region. In *Geology Guidebook of the San Francisco Bay Counties: History, Landscape, Geology, Fossils, Minerals, Industry, and Routes to Travel*, prepared by Olaf P. Jenkins. Bulletin 154. State of California Division of Mines, San Francisco.

[18] Wagner et al., 1981, op. cit.

[19] Graymer, Jones, and Brabb, op. cit.

[20] Miller, W.L., 1966. *Petrology of the Putah Tuff Member of the Tehama Formation, Yolo and Solano Counties, California*. Master's thesis, University of California, Davis.

[21] Russell, Richard, D., 1927. *The Tehama Formation of Northern California*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Geology, University of California, Berkeley.

[22] Weaver, C.E., 1949. *Geology of the Coast RangesImmediately North of the San Francisco Bay Region, California*. Geological Society of America Memoir 35. Sacramento.

[23] Graymer, Jones, and Brabb, op. cit.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

Funks Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years ago). The Funks Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is in the hills east of Capay Valley and the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Funks Formation consists of a tan weathering, gray, marine siltstone and mudstone. This geologic unit also includes thin beds of wacke. The Funks Formation shale beds contain Late Cretaceous (Santonian) foraminifers. [26]

Sites Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years ago). The Sites Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is found in the hills east of Capay Valley and the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Sites Formation consists of thick bedded, laminated gray wacke and thick beds of dark gray carbonaceous siltstone. This unit is up to 6,000 feet thick and has been attributed to the Late Cretaceous through foraminiferal analysis.[27] No significant fossils have been found in this formation.

Yolo Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years old). The Yolo Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is found in the hills east of Capay Valley and the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Yolo Formation is moderately thick-bedded, fine-to-coarse-grained sandstone with local mudstone and siltstone. The unit contains Carbonaceous debris and the mudstone beds have Late Cretaceous radiolarians and foraminifers. [28]

Venado Formation (Late Cretaceous: 65–100 million years old). The Venado Formation is part of the Great Valley Sequence, and is found in the hills east of Capay Valley and the Blue Ridge on the western edge of Yolo County. The Cenomanian (99–93 million years old) Venado Formation consists of more than 1,000 feet of massive sandstone, shale, and conglomerate. This unit may contain marine shells; however, the Venado Formation is of low paleontological significance.[29]

(4) Recorded Cultural Resources. This section describes the recorded cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area.

Archaeological Resources. There are over 1,200 recorded cultural resources in Yolo County, 275 of which are archaeological. The number of pre-contact (i.e., prior to Euro-American contact with native cultures) archaeological deposits recorded in the County is 157; the number of recorded historical archaeological sites is 118. A table of the archaeological sensitivity of the County is provided in a confidential appendix (Appendix Cultural-A, located at the County Planning Department).

Pre-Contact Archaeological Resources. Pre-contact sites include habitation sites, limited occupation sites, hunting/processing camps, lithic reduction stations, milling stations, quarries/single reduction locations, rock art sites, rock features, and burial locations. Sites may fall into more than one category (e.g., habitation sites may be associated with rock art). Therefore, sites may be classified as more than one type.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ghosh, B., and D.R. Lowe, 1992, pp. 51-95. *Architecture of deep-water channel complexes, Cretaceous Venado sandstone member, Sacramento Valley, California*. Pacific Section Society of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists.

The most common pre-contact site types found in the County are temporary occupation sites, followed by hunting/processing camps, habitation sites, milling stations, lithic scatters, rock features, quarry/single reduction loci, and rock art sites. The distribution of pre-contact sites is highly correlated to the presence of major Sacramento Valley watercourses, with their associated areas of high ground and natural levees, as well as creeks and minor drainages along the eastern slopes and valleys of the North Coast range.

The overall pre-contact archaeological sensitivity of the area is generally high, particularly in those areas near water sources, on terraces along watercourses, or along natural levees above sloughs in the Delta area. In particular, the Cache Creek watershed in the Capay Valley and the Putah Creek watershed possess river terraces that are rich in archaeological resources. In general, the lands on the margins of the Sacramento River are sensitive for pre-contact archaeological resources. Pre-contact archaeological sites often are located along riverbanks in the Central Valley, and are usually found on natural rises that protected the inhabitants from frequent floods. Sites exist along the Sacramento River in Yolo County, and there is the possibility that additional pre-contact deposits are at similar locations, in natural buried contexts (such as under alluvial deposits), as well as cultural buried contexts (such as below constructed levees or mixed in as a portion of levee fill material).

Historical Archaeological Resources. Historical site types include archaeological remains representing historical homesteading, ranching and agriculture, mining, town, and urban sites. The overall historical archaeological sensitivity of Yolo County area is generally high in those areas where historical records indicate the presence of transportation routes, agricultural settlements, communities, and mining.

Historic-Period Resources. Historic-period cultural resources generally include buildings, roads, trails, bridges, canals, and railroads associated with the time period that begins with the first contact between Euro-Americans and native cultures in California. Because non-native settlement of the County dates to the 1830s, the County is rich in historic-period cultural resources. In general, concentrations of historic-period resources in the County are expected to occur

- adjacent to transportation corridors (e.g., historical highways, railroads, and navigable sloughs);
- on historical ranches;
- in areas of historical rock, soil, and mineral extraction;
- former communities; and
- within historic neighborhoods and business districts.

Historic Properties in the State Database. The Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), which is maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation, lists recorded properties and their status with regard to eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The listing for the County indicates that more than 1,200 properties within the County have been inventoried. This includes several hundred properties that are listed or appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP. In general, listing a property in the NRHP involves submitting a formal nomination that requires concurrence from SHPO, the State Historical Resources Commission, and the Keeper of the National Register. Properties that are evaluated and found to be eligible for listing under one or more of the NRHP (but are never nominated) are afforded the same protections as listed properties. Properties listed or found

eligible for listing in the NRHP are also automatically eligible for the CRHR. The HRI also includes buildings that have been identified as historically significant by local government agencies. The numbers and types of properties in the County are discussed briefly below. It is important to note that this section describes resources identified by previous study; many more cultural resources that are significant but not yet identified may exist in the Draft General Plan area.

Brooks Area. One NRHP-listed building, the Canon School, is located in the vicinity of the historic community of Brooks in the Capay Valley. Located on State Route 16 and built in 1884, the Canon School was listed in the NRHP in 1972. Seven other historical resources in the vicinity appear in the HRI.

Capay Area. In Capay and the surrounding area, 15 properties have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None of these properties have been officially nominated for listing in the NRHP or CRHR.

Clarksburg Area. Within Clarksburg and the surrounding area, 37 properties, including a famous sugar mill, have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None of these properties has been officially nominated for listing in the NRHP or CRHR.

Davis Area. Buildings and structures in Davis were surveyed in 1986 and again 10 years later. These two comprehensive inventories, along with several smaller project-driven surveys, have identified 223 historical resources in and around the City of Davis. Of these, the University of California, Davis Animal Sciences Building, the Davis Subway, the Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer House (604 2nd Street), the Southern Pacific Railroad Station, and the Joshua B. Tufts House (434 J Street) are listed in the NRHP.

Dunnigan Area. Within Dunnigan and the surrounding area, 14 buildings and structures have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. The Union Church at 365 County Road 89A was listed in the NRHP in 2002.

Esparto Area. Twenty-one properties in and around Esparto have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None have been formally nominated and listed in the NRHP.

Guinda Area. In the Guinda and surrounding area, five buildings and structures have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None have been formally nominated and listed in the NRHP.

Knights Landing Area. Twenty-seven properties in and around Knights Landing have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None have been formally nominated and listed in the NRHP.

Madison Area. Fifteen buildings and structures in the vicinity of Madison have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None of these properties has been formally nominated and listed in the NRHP.

Rumsey Area. The town of Rumsey has seven properties that have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. The Rumsey Town Hall on Manzanita Street was listed in the NRHP in 1972.

West Sacramento. The HRI contains 52 buildings and structures in and around West Sacramento that have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or that are locally designated. Among these, the site of first Pacific Coast salmon cannery, the I Street Bridge, and the Tower Bridge have all been listed in the NRHP.

Winters Area. Surveys have identified 125 buildings and structures in the Winters area that meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or that have local designation. Among these are buildings that make up the Main Street Historic District, which was listed in the NRHP in 1997.

Woodland Area. Woodland includes some of the most important architectural cultural resources in the County. Surveys have identified 388 buildings and structures in the Woodland area that meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or that have local designation. Among these are buildings that comprise the Downtown Woodland Historic District, on Main Street from Elm Street to Third Street, and listed in the NRHP in 1999. Other individually eligible buildings in and around Woodland include the R. H. Beamer House (19 3rd Street), the William B. Gibson House (512 Gibson Road), the Hotel Woodland (426 Main Street), the International Order of Oddfellows (I.O.O.F) Hall (723 Main Street), the James Moore House, the Nelson Ranch, the Porter Building (501-511 Main Street), the Woodland Opera House (320 2nd Street), and the Woodland Public Library (250 1st Street).

Yolo Area. The town of Yolo includes 35 properties that have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP, the CRHR, or have local designation. The Yolo Branch Library (200 Sacramento Street) was listed in the NRHP in 1990.

Zamora. Twelve buildings and structures in the vicinity of Zamora have been determined to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP and/or the CRHR, or have local designation. None of these properties has been listed in the NRHP.

California State Historical Landmarks. The State of California officially began commemorating sites important to the history of the State in 1932 with California Historical Landmark designations. Originally, California Historical Landmarks emphasized well-known places and events with a focus on the missions, early settlements, and the Gold Rush. Over the years, the program has been refined to include those sites that are of statewide historical importance; that are associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California; or that are a prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction, or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

California Points of Historical Interest. California Points of Historical Interest are sites, buildings, features, or events that are of local (city or County) significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value. No historical resource may be designated as both a Landmark and a Point of Historical

Interest. If a Point of Historical Interest is subsequently granted status as a Landmark, the Point designation will be retired. The County contains eight California Points of Historical Interest:

- Russell Boulevard in Davis between Highway 113 and Road 98
- Mary's Chapel at the intersection of Road 15 and Road 98
- St. Agnes Church on Road 98 in Zamora
- Capay School on Route 16 in Capay
- Leonidas Taylor Monument on west bank of the Sacramento River, northwest of Sacramento
- Yolo County Courthouse at 725 Court Street in Woodland
- Yolo County Historical Museum at 512 Gibson Road in Woodland

There are others that may be eligible but are not currently listed.

(5) Recorded Paleontological Resources. A fossil locality search and relevant paleontological and geological literature for Yolo County were used to characterize the County's geology and paleontological sensitivity.

The fossil locality search identified eight fossil localities within or directly adjacent to the County. Five fossil localities with 46 Blancan-age vertebrates (bony fish, mammals, and reptiles) were found in the Pliocene Tehama Formation. One fossil locality with two Rancholabrean-age mammals (horses) was found in the Pleistocene Red Bluff formation. Two fossil localities with two Rancholabrean-age mammals were found in undifferentiated Pleistocene alluvium.
Three additional fossil localities with Rancholabrean-age vertebrate specimens have been identified along Putah Creek, but it is unknown whether these localities were on the Yolo or Solano County side of the creek. These fossils are in the Pleistocene-age Montezuma Formation.[30,31] The localities identified during the search occur in four distinguishable geologic formations, all of which are known to contain fossils. Most sedimentary geological units of Yolo County are paleontologically sensitive.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology website identified additional fossil localities that were not identified by the initial fossil locality search. These included: 15 Late Cretaceous microfossil localities; 27 Late Cretaceous invertebrate fossil localities; 32 fossil localities in the Eocene Capay formation; two Eocene fossil localities outside the Capay formation; seven fossil localities with 25 vertebrate (mammal) specimens in the Pliocene Tehama Formation; and six Pleistocene fossil localities with 17 vertebrate specimens.

On September 14, 2004 during aggregate excavations at the Granite Capay mining facility, the pelvis of a mammoth was discovered in the Tehama formation at the mouth of Capay Valley, where Cache Creek once formed a delta.[32] The excavation of the specimen by paleontologists indicated that it was an isolated discovery. According to paleontologists, it is not unusual to find these and other types of

[30] Wagner and Bortugno, op. cit.

[31] Wagner et al., op. cit.

[32] SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2005. *Final Report for the Esparto Mammoth*. March 1.

fossils in the Tehama Formation, such as giant tortoise, extinct cats, giant ground sloth, mastodon, bear, deer, camel, pond turtle, and various species of rodents and birds.[33]

b. Regulatory Framework. This section describes the laws, regulations, and codes that address cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area.

(1) California Environmental Quality Act. CEQA applies to all discretionary projects undertaken or subject to approval by the State's public agencies.[34] CEQA states that it is the policy of the State of California to "take all action necessary to provide the people of this State with… historic environmental qualities…and preserve for future generations examples of the major periods of California history."[35] Under the provisions of CEQA, "A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment."[36]

CEQA defines a "historical resource" as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources;
- listed in a local register of historical resources;[37]
- identified as significant in a historical resource survey;[38] or
- determined to be a historical resource by a project's lead agency.[39]

A historical resource consists of "Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California . . . Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be 'historically significant' if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources."[40]

CEQA requires that historical resources and unique archaeological resources be taken into consideration during the planning process.[41] If feasible, adverse effects on the significance of historical resources must be avoided or the effects mitigated.[42] The significance of a historical resource is impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those

[33] Sherwin, Elisabeth, 2008. Mammoth Bones Go On Display. *The Davis Enterprise*, December 22, 2008. Davis, California.

[34] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15002(i)

[35] California Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21001(b) and 21001(c)

[36] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(b)

[37] As defined at PRC Section 5020.1(k).

[38] As defined at PRC Section 5024.1(g).

[39] As described at *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a).

[40] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a)(3)

[41] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5; PRC Section 21083.2

[42] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(b)(4)

physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for the CRHR. If there is a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, the preparation of an environmental impact report may be required.[43]

Significant cultural resources under CEQA fall into one of two categories: historical resource or unique archaeological resource. If the cultural resource in question is an archaeological site, CEQA[44] requires that the lead agency first determine if the site is a historical resource.[45] If the site qualifies as a historical resource, then impacts to the site are considered under regulations provided for historical resources.[46] If the archaeological site does not qualify as a historical resource but does qualify as a unique archaeological site, then the site is considered under regulations provided for archaeological resources.[47] In practice, most archaeological sites that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource will also meet the definition of an historical resource.

CEQA defines a "unique archaeological resource" as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets one or more of the following criteria:[48]

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

If an impact on a historical or archaeological resource is significant, CEQA requires feasible measures to minimize the impact.[49] Mitigation of significant impacts must lessen or eliminate the physical impact that the project will have on the resource. Generally, the use of drawings, photographs, and/or displays does not mitigate the physical impact on the environment caused by demolition or destruction of a historical resource. However, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation be undertaken even if it does not mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level.[50,51]

[43] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15065(a)

[44] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(c)(1)

[45] As defined in PRC Section 21084.1.

[46] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a) and Section 15126.4(b)

[47] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(c)(2). Archaeological resources are treated under the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2.

[48] PRC Section 21083.2(g)

[49] *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.4(a)(1)

[50] PRC Section 21002.1(b)

[51] California Office of Historic Preservation, 2001, p. 6. *Technical Assistance Series #1: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Historical Resources.* URL: <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/ts01ca.pdf>.

(2) Regulations Concerning Native American Heritage. California PRC Section 5097.9 states that no public agency, or a private party on a public property, shall "interfere with the free expression or exercise of Native American Religion…." The code further states that:

> No such agency or party [shall] cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine…except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require. County and city lands are exempt from this provision, except for parklands larger than 100 acres.

In September 2004, Senate Bill 18, the Traditional Tribal Cultural Places Legislation, was signed into law.[52] This legislation stipulates that Native American tribal organizations must be afforded an opportunity to consult about impacts to cultural places when general or specific plans are adopted or amended, and when the designation of open space is proposed. In addition, Senate Bill 18 is intended to:

- Recognize that California Native American prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial places are essential elements in tribal cultural traditions, heritages, and identities.
- Establish meaningful consultations between California Native American tribal governments and California local governments at the earliest possible point in the local government land use planning process so that these places can be identified and considered.
- Establish government-to-government consultations regarding potential means to preserve those places, determine the level of necessary confidentiality of their specific location, and develop proper treatment and management plans.
- Ensure that local and tribal governments have information available early in the land use planning process to avoid potential conflicts over the preservation of California Native American prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial places.
- Enable California Native American tribes to manage and act as caretakers of California Native American prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial places.
- Encourage local governments to consider preservation of California Native American prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial places in their land use planning processes by placing them in open space.
- Encourage local governments to consider the cultural aspects of California Native American, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial places early in land use planning processes.

(3) Regulations Concerning Human Remains. The disturbance of human remains without authority of law is considered a felony.[53] If human remains are Native American in origin, they are within the jurisdiction of the NAHC.[54] According to State law,[55] if human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains.

[52] The regulations that implement Senate Bill 18 are found in Government Code §65352.3.

[53] California Health and Safety Code [HSC] Section 7052

[54] HSC Section 7052.5(c); PRC Section 5097.98

[55] HSC Section 7050.5; PRC Section 5097.98

The County coroner must be notified of the discovery of human remains and, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the NAHC is contacted to identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who may make recommendations on the appropriate treatment of the remains and associated items. The MLD has 48 hours from time of access to the location of the remains to make a recommendation to the landowner or his or her designee for means of treating or disposing of with appropriate dignity the human remains and any associated grave goods.[56] The following actions must be taken by the landowner whenever (1) the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD; (2) the MLD fails to make a recommendation; or (3) the landowner or authorized representative rejects the MLD's recommendations, and mediation[57] fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner:

- Re-interment of the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance; and
- Protection of the re-interment site by doing one or more of the following:

  (1) recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate information center of the California Historical Resources Information System;

  (2) utilizing an open-space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or

  (3) recording a document with the County in which the property is located.

(4) Yolo County Code. Chapter 8 of the Yolo County Code pertains to the treatment of local historic landmarks and historic districts. Overseen by the Historic Resources Commission, this section of the code provides for the identification, protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and use of cultural resources within the County that reflect elements of its cultural, agricultural, social economic, political, aesthetic, military, maritime, engineering, archaeological, religious, ethnic, natural, architectural and other
heritage.

A building, structure, object, particular place, vegetation, or geology, may be designated a County historic landmark if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

(1) It exemplifies or reflects valued elements of the County's cultural, agricultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, military, religious, ethnic, natural vegetation, architectural, maritime, engineering, archaeological, or geological history; or

(2) It is identified with persons or events important in local, State, or national history; or

(3) It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth and particular transportation modes; or

(4) It embodies distinguishing characteristics or an architectural style, type, period, or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or

(5) It is representative of the notable work of a builder, designer or architect; or

[56] As provided for in PRC Section 5097.98.

[57] As provided for in PRC Section 5097.94(k).

(6) It represents an important natural feature or design element that provides a visual point of reference to members of the community.

When an area includes at least two designated historic landmarks in such proximity that they create a setting historically or culturally significant to the local community, the State, or the nation, sufficiently distinguishable from other areas of the County, then a historic district may be established. Historic districts may include buildings, structures, and sites that individually do not meet criteria for landmark status, but that collectively express their historical significance.

With the exception of those types of projects specified in the design review guidelines or work authorized by the Building Official upon written approval of the Planning and Public Works Department for protection of public safety, projects that would demolish, move, remove, alter the exterior appearance of, or otherwise affect a designated historic landmark or any structure located in a designated historic district must first obtain written approval from the Historic Preservation Commission.

(5) Paleontological Resources. The excavation or removal of any vertebrate paleontological site…or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands is prohibited, except with express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Public lands are defined to include lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the State or any city, County, district, authority or public corporation, or any agency thereof. Any unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological materials or sites located on public lands is a misdemeanor.[58]

The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology has identified vertebrate fossils, their taphonomic and associated environmental indicators, and fossiliferous deposits as significant nonrenewable paleontological resources. Botanical and invertebrate fossils and assemblages may also be considered significant resources.[59]

2. Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan for Yolo County

Conservation and Open Space Element policies and actions related to cultural resources are listed below. These policies and actions mostly fall under Conservation and Open Space Element, but are also found in the Land Use and Community Character Element.

Land Use and Community Character Element

- Policy CC-4.11: Require site specific information appropriate to each application to enable informed decision-making, including but not limited to the following: biological resources assessment, noise analysis, traffic and circulation assessment, air quality calculations (including greenhouse gases), cultural resources assessment, geotechnical study, Phase One environmental site assessment, title report, storm drainage analysis, flood risk analysis, water supply assessment, sewer/septic capacity and service analysis and fiscal impact analysis.

[58] PRC Section 5097.5

[59] Society for Vertebrate Paleontology, 1995. *Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines.* Society for Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin 163: January.

- Policy CC-1.5: Significant site features, such as trees, water courses, rock outcroppings, historic structures and scenic views shall be used to guide site planning and design in new development. Where possible, these features shall become focal points of the development.
- Policy CC-1.15: The following features shall be protected and preserved along designated scenic roadways and routes, except where there are health and safety concerns:

(1) Trees and other natural or unique vegetation

(2) Landforms and natural or unique features

(3) Views and vistas

(4) Historic structures (where feasible), including buildings, bridges and signs

- Policy CC-1.17: Existing trees and vegetation and natural landforms along scenic roadways and routes shall be retained to the greatest feasible extent. Landscaping shall be required to enhance scenic qualities and/or screen unsightly views and shall emphasize the use of native plants and habitat restoration to the extent possible. Removal of trees, particularly those with scenic and/or historic value, shall be generally prohibited along the roadway or route.

Conservation and Open Space Element

- Policy CO-2.22: Prohibit development within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams. The setback will allow for fire and flood protection, a natural riparian corridor (or wetland vegetation), a planned recreational trail where applicable, and vegetated landscape for stormwater to pass through before it enters the water body. Exceptions to this action include irrigation pumps, roads and bridges, levees, docks, boat ramps, and similar uses.
- Policy CO-4.1: Identify and safeguard important cultural resources.
- Policy CO-4.2: Implement the provisions of the State Historical Building Code and Uniform Code for Building Conservation to balance the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act with preserving the architectural integrity of historic buildings and structures.
- Policy CO-4.3: Encourage owners of historic resources to preserve and rehabilitate their properties.
- Policy CO-4.4: Encourage historic resources to remain in their original use whenever possible. The adaptive use of historic resources is preferred when the original use can no longer be sustained. Older residences may be converted to office/retail use in commercial areas and to tourist use in agricultural areas, so long as their historical authenticity is maintained or enhanced.
- Policy CO-4.5: Increase knowledge of historic preservation through public education and outreach programs.
- Policy CO-4.6: Support historically oriented visitor programs at the local and regional level through the Yolo County Visitor's Bureau and similar efforts.
- Policy CO-4.7: Encourage the identification of historic resources through the integrated use of plaques and markers.
- Policy CO-4.8: Explore opportunities for promoting heritage tourism, including cooperation with regional and State marketing efforts.
- Policy CO-4.9: Promote the use of historic structures as museums, educational facilities, or other visitor-serving uses.
- Policy CO-4.10: Encourage voluntary landowner efforts to protect cultural resources consistent with State law.
- Policy CO-4.11: Honor and respect local tribal heritage.

- Policy CO-4.12: Work with culturally affiliated tribes to identify and appropriately address cultural resources and tribal sacred sites through the development review process.
- Policy CO-4.13: Avoid or mitigate to the maximum extent feasible the impacts of development on Native American archaeological and cultural resources.
- Policy CO-4.14: Within the Delta Primary Zone, ensure compatibility of permitted land use activities with applicable cultural resources policies of the Land Use and Resource Management Plan of the Delta Protection Commission.
- Action CO-A53: Update the Historic Preservation Ordinance on a regular basis to be consistent with applicable federal, State and local Historic Preservation requirements. (Policy CO-4. Policy CO-4.2)
- Action CO-A54: Update the historic resources surveys (including the Historic Features Inventory), as needed, to reflect changes due to the passage of time, loss of existing historic resources, and the availability of new or reinterpreted information. (Policy CO-4.1)
- Action CO-A55: Identify and establish historic districts, where appropriate, to better preserve individual historical resources and their context. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.4)
- Action CO-A56: Establish an inventory and map of known significant historic and cultural resources, as well as sensitive areas where such resources are likely to occur. Work with the Rumsey and Cortina Tribes to identify sacred sites and develop a cultural sensitivity map. This information is protected as confidential under State law. (Policy CO-4.1)
- Action CO-A57: Conduct historic resource surveys as a part of community and specific plan preparation to document and identify those resources that meet the criteria for listing at the local level, on the California Register of Historical Resources, and on the National Register of Historic Places. Policy CO-4.1)
- Action CO-A58: Review and monitor demolition permits, grading permits, building permits, and other approval procedures to reinforce preservation goals. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.2, Policy CO-4.3)
- Action CO-A59: Establish design guidelines for historic resources based on established federal and State standards and guidelines to address the adaptive reuse and modification of historic resources. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.2, Policy CO-4.4)
- Action CO-A60: Preserve historical records and make them accessible to the public by maintaining the Yolo County Archives and Record Center. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.5)

  (1) Provide additional space for accommodation of the growing Archives collections

  (2) Ensure that the collection is housed in an appropriate archival manner
- Action CO-A61: Require cultural resources inventories of all new development projects in areas where a preliminary site survey indicates a medium or high potential for archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources. In addition, require a mitigation plan to protect the resource before the issuance of permits. Mitigation may include:

  (1) Having a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist present during initial grading or trenching;

  (2) Redesign of the project to avoid historic or paleontological resources;

  (3) Capping the site with a layer of fill; and/or

  (4) Excavation and removal of the historical or paleontological resources and curation in an appropriate facility under the direction of a qualified professional. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.13)
- Action CO-A62: Require that discretionary projects which involve earth disturbing activities on previously undisturbed soils in an area determined to be archaeologically sensitive perform the following:

  (1) Enter into a cultural resources treatment agreement with the culturally affiliated tribe.

(2) Retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the site if cultural resources are discovered during the project construction. The archaeologist will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, in consultation with the culturally affiliated tribe and their designated monitors, to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property.

(3) Consult with the culturally-affiliated tribe to determine the extent of impacts to archaeological resources and to create appropriate mitigation to address any impacts.

(4) Arrange for the monitoring of earth disturbing activities by members of the culturally affiliated tribe, including all archaeological surveys, testing, and studies, to be compensated by the developer.

(5) Implement the archaeologist's recommendations, subject to County approval.

(6) Agree to relinquish ownership of all artifacts that are found on the project area to the culturally affiliated tribe for proper treatment and disposition. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.13)

- Action CO-A63: Require that when cultural resources (including non-tribal archeological and paleontological artifacts, as well as human remains) are encountered during site preparation or construction, all work within the vicinity of the discovery is immediately halted and the area protected from further disturbance. The project applicant shall immediately notify the County Coroner and the Planning and Public Works Department. Where human remains are determined to be Native American, the project applicant shall consult with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine the person most likely descended from the deceased. The applicant shall confer with the descendant to determine appropriate treatment for the human remains, consistent with State law. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.11, Policy CO-4.12, Policy CO-4.13)
- Action CO-64: Prohibit the removal of cultural resources from the project site except by a qualified consultant and after the County planning staff have been notified. Prehistoric resources include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, pestles, dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic resources include stone or adobe foundations and walls, structures and features with square nails, and refuse deposits often in old wells and privies. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.11)
- Action CO-A65: Consult with culturally affiliated tribes prior to amending the General Plan and adopting or amending specific plans, consistent with State law. (Policy CO-4.12, Policy CO-4.13)
- Action CO-A66: Confer with culturally affiliated tribes prior to designating open space that includes any identified cultural places and develop a treatment and management plan for their preservation. (Policy CO-4.12, Policy CO-4.13)
- Action CO-A67: Refer all development proposals that may adversely affect cultural resources to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University for review and comments. The NWIC will identify the presence or absence of known cultural resources and/or previously performed studies in or near a given project area and will offer recommendations regarding the need for additional studies, where necessary. If the NWIC recommends further study, the project applicant shall contract with a qualified professional to conduct the study and make recommendations designed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on cultural or historic resources and indicate whether further investigation is needed. All studies shall be completed and submitted to the County prior to the completion of any environmental document for the project. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.11)
- Action CO-A68: Refer draft environmental documents, including any studies and recommended mitigation measures, to the appropriate culturally-affiliated tribes for review and comment as part of the public review process. (Policy CO-4.1, Policy CO-4.11, Policy CO-4.12)

3. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section provides an assessment of potentially adverse impacts related to cultural resources associated with implementation of the Draft General Plan. It establishes the thresholds of significance for impacts and then evaluates the Draft General Plan. Where potentially significant impacts of the proposed project are identified, mitigation measures are recommended.

a. Significance Criteria. The Draft General Plan would have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in religious or sacred sites, or unique ethnic-cultural resources;
- Substantially conflict with applicable plans, policies and regulations of other agencies where such conflict would result in an adverse physical change in the environment; or
- Result in new policies that would result in significant adverse physical impacts as compared to the 1983 General Plan policies.

b. Impacts Analysis. This section evaluates the potential impacts to cultural resources that may result from the implementation of the Draft General Plan.

The following scenarios describe the types of general impacts to cultural resources that could result from the implementation of the Draft General Plan.[60] A discussion of impact categories and the Draft General Plan policies and actions to avoid, reduce, or offset such impacts follow these descriptions, and correspond to cultural resource impact criteria.

- Historical and pre-contact archaeological deposits that meet the definition of historical resources under PRC §21084.1 or archaeological resources under PRC §21083.2(g) could be damaged or destroyed by ground disturbing activities. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be materially impaired because their ability to convey the important scientific data they contain would be destroyed or greatly diminished. Descendant communities may also view the destruction of such sites as an impact to their cultural patrimony.
- Buildings, structures, or objects that meet the definition of historical resources under PRC §21084.1 could be demolished to facilitate development. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be materially impaired because of the loss of the materials, form, and design that constitute their historic fabric.

[60] Please note that archaeological deposits could qualify under CEQA as either historical resources or archaeological resources under CEQA.

- Areas that meet the definition of an historical district under PRC §21084.1 could be the location of new developments that clash with the internal or external architectural context of a given district. Should this occur, the significance of such resources may be materially impaired because the concentration, linkage, or continuity of contributing resources would be diminished by the introduction of incompatible architectural designs.
- Buildings and structures that meet the definition of historical resources under PRC §21084.1 could be altered to accommodate changes in land use or increased land use intensity. Should this occur, the significance of such resources may be materially impaired because distinctive architectural features could be damaged or otherwise compromised by changes that are not compatible with the architectural context. Significant concentrations, linkages, or continuities of contributing resources could be diminished by the introduction of incompatible architectural designs.
- Paleontological resources could be damaged or destroyed by ground disturbing activities. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be impaired because of the loss of their ability to convey the important scientific data.

(1) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Historical Resources. Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the construction of new buildings and infrastructure, and the modification of existing buildings and structures to accommodate increased land use intensity. Ground disturbing activities associated with mining, agriculture, and new construction; the demolition of existing buildings and structures; the introduction of incompatible architecture; and potential alteration of existing architectural properties are actions associated with the Draft General Plan that have the potential to impact cultural resources that qualify as historical resources under CEQA.

<u>Impact CULT-1</u>: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to architectural resources and archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources under CEQA. (S)

Impacts to an historical resource occur when the resource undergoes a substantial adverse change, which includes physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired. Two main categories of resources that may qualify as historical resources are discussed below: architectural resources and archaeological deposits.

Architectural Resources

The Draft General Plan allows for development that will result in the construction of new buildings and structures, as well as the modification of existing buildings and structures to accommodate increased land use intensity. These activities have the potential to damage or destroy architectural resources that meet the definition of historical resources. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be materially impaired because their ability to convey their significance would be destroyed or greatly diminished.

The Draft General Plan contains policies and actions that address architectural and built environment resources. Draft General Plan Policies CC-4.11; CO-4.1, -4.7, -4.12, -4.13; and Actions CO-A53, -

A54, -A55, -A56, -A57, -A58, and -A59 require consultation with tribal entities to identify and reduce impacts, completion of historic resource surveys and archival identification, permit and design review, and cultural resource assessments to identify resources and mitigate impacts in advance of development projects. Policies CO-4.13; CC-1.15, -1.17, and -1.5; and Actions CO-A59 and -A60 call for the mitigation of impacts to architectural resources, encourage the retention of historical structures and trees along scenic roads and in project sites, and provide for the input from preservation professionals and descendant communities in developing mitigation strategies. Policy CC-4.11 (as modified per Mitigation Measure LU-2b), in particular, addresses the project-specific identification of cultural resource issues for development pursuant to CC-3.14 and -3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments.

The policies and actions summarized above establish appropriate review procedures and consultation requirements, while also addressing the need for qualified preservation personnel to undertake technical analysis where necessary. The policies and actions provide for the identification and evaluation of cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area, as well as for the assessment of potential impacts to such resources and the development of mitigation strategies. Additionally, CEQA review and local regulatory review (e.g., Chapter 8 of the Yolo County Land Development and Zoning Code) provide additional levels of protection for known resources, and address the identification of as-yet unrecorded resources.

The Draft General Plan contains policies and actions to avoid or minimize effects to architectural and built environment cultural resources. These policies and actions emphasize the reuse of historical architecture and redevelopment that is sensitive to historical values, while acknowledging that the evolution of the built environment is a normal process. Although the Draft General Plan will minimize the severity of adverse effects associated with such change, impacts may occur that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level through mitigation.[61] For example, the demolition of architectural resources would materially impair their significance, and certain physical modifications could result in the same effect. While the Draft General Plan policies discussed in this section would help reduce potential effects, the potential remains for residual significant effects.

Archaeological Deposits

The Draft General Plan allows for development that will require ground disturbance for many activities including agriculture, mining, well drilling, installation of septic systems, and construction of facilities and infrastructure. These activities have the potential to damage or destroy historical and pre-contact archaeological deposits that meet the definition of historical resources. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be materially impaired because their ability to convey the important scientific data they contain would be destroyed or greatly diminished. Descendant communities may also view the destruction of such sites as an impact to their cultural patrimony.

Portions of the Draft General Plan area are sensitive for recorded and as-yet unrecorded archaeological deposits. Archaeological research indicates that the following factors correlate with the presence of archaeological deposits in the Draft General Plan area:

[61] Procedures are proposed to require special review and approval for development proposals that could impair the significance of locally designated County landmarks. However, a number of actions with the potential for impact are exempt from review (e.g., roofing, chimney, and foundation work; alteration or replacement of windows and exterior doors; solar collectors; and mechanical systems) (Chapter 8 of the Yolo County Land Development and Zoning Code).

Pre-Contact Archaeological Deposits

- Proximity to major Sacramento Valley watercourses;
- High ground near major watercourses;
- Natural levees above sloughs; and
- Creeks and drainages along the eastern slopes of the Coast range (especially at the mouth of such features).

Historical Archaeological Deposits

- Proximity to transportation corridors (e.g., historical highways, railroads, and navigable sloughs);
- Historical ranches;
- Areas of historical rock, soil, and mineral extraction;
- Defunct communities or settlements and
- Historic neighborhoods and business districts.

The Draft General Plan contains policies and actions that address archaeological deposits. Draft General Plan Policies CC-4.11; CO-4.1, CO-4.12, CO-4.13, CO-4.14; and Actions CO-A54, CO-A55, CO-56, CO-A59, CO-A60, CO-61, CO-A62, and CO-A65 provide for the identification of archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources and that may be subject to development impacts. These policies and actions require consultation with tribal entities, pre-permitting cultural resource assessments, and the development of feasible mitigation to minimize impacts in advance of development projects. Policy CO-4.13 and Actions CO-A62 specifically call for the mitigation of impacts to archaeological deposits, and provide for the input from preservation professionals and descendant communities in developing mitigation strategies. Policy CC-4.11 addresses the identification of cultural resource issues for the project-specific analysis of development pursuant to CC-3.14 and CC-3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments. Policy CO-2.22, in particular, provides a degree of protection for those archaeological deposits that are located within 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams.

Implementation of the Draft General Plan policies and actions described above, in conjunction with compliance with existing regulatory programs, would minimize the severity of impacts to archaeological deposits. The Draft General Plan requires the application of professional standards and consultation procedures for the recovery of scientific data contained in archaeological resources. The Draft General Plan includes policies that contain a high level of protection including protection of known and unknown resources, determination of areas of cultural resource sensitivity to ensure cultural resource assessments for projects in those locations, updating of the County's cultural resource data base and inventories, protection and reuse of historic structures, and others. However, despite this, significant impacts to archaeological deposits may nevertheless occur.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: None available.

While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of the impact to cultural resources, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (SU)

(2) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resource. If a cultural resource is archaeological and is subject to impact, CEQA requires that the lead agency first determine if the deposit is a historical resource as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a). If the deposit qualifies as a historical resource, potential adverse impacts are treated in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* sections 15064.5(a) and 15126.4. If the archaeological deposit does not qualify as a historical resource but does qualify as a unique archaeological resource, then the archaeological site is treated in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2.

Impact CULT-2: Build-out of the Draft General Plan would result in the potential for impacts to archaeological deposits that qualify as unique archaeological resources under CEQA. (S)

As described in the preceding section, the Draft General Plan allows for development that will require ground disturbing activities for many activities including agriculture, mining, well drilling, installation of septic systems, and construction of facilities and infrastructure. Build-out of the Draft General Plan has the potential to damage or destroy historical and pre-contact archaeological deposits that meet the definition of unique archaeological resources. Should this occur, the significance of such resources would be materially impaired because their ability to convey the important scientific data they contain would be destroyed or greatly diminished. Descendant communities may also view the destruction of such sites as an impact to their cultural patrimony.

The Draft General Plan contains policies and actions that address archaeological deposits. Draft General Plan Policies CC-4.11; CO-4.1, CO-4.12, CO-4.13, CO-4.14; and Actions CO-A54, CO-A55, CO-56, CO-A59, CO-A60, CO-61, CO-A62, and CO-A65 identify archaeological deposits that qualify as historical resources and that may be subject to development impacts. The policies and actions require consultation with tribal entities, pre-permitting cultural resource assessments, and the development of feasible mitigation to minimize impacts in advance of development projects. Policy CO-4.13 and Actions CO-A62 specifically call for the mitigation of impacts to archaeological deposits, and provide for the input from preservation professionals and descendant communities in developing mitigation strategies. Policy CC-4.11 addresses the project-specific identification of cultural resource issues for development pursuant to CC-3.14 and -3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments. Policy CO-2.22, in particular, provides a degree of protection for those archaeological deposits that are located within 100 feet from the top of banks for all lakes, perennial ponds, rivers, creeks, sloughs, and perennial streams.

Implementation of these policies and actions, in conjunction with compliance with existing regulatory programs, would minimize the severity of impacts to such resources. The Draft General Plan requires the application of professional standards and consultation procedures for the recovery of scientific data contained in archaeological resources. However, despite this, significant impacts to unique archaeological resources may occur.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: None available.

While implementation of the policies and actions included in the Draft General Plan would reduce the severity of this impact to unique archaeological resources, no additional feasible mitigation measures are available. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (SU)

(3) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site. Paleontological resources are known to occur in the Draft General Plan area, and the geological formations that underlie Yolo County are generally paleontologically sensitive. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in new construction, and the associated ground disturbing activities have the potential to impact paleontological resources. The Draft General Plan policies and actions discussed below reduce the likelihood and severity of such impacts.

Draft General Plan Policies CO-4.1 and Actions CO-A54, CO-A56, CO-A59, CO-A61, and CO-A62 are applicable to paleontological resources. Actions CO-A54 and CO-A56 provide for the early identification of possible adverse effects to paleontological resources by developments, as well as the enforcement of adopted mitigation measures. Actions CO-A59 and CO-A60 establish identification, evaluation, and mitigation requirements, as well as accidental discovery procedures, while CO-A62 prohibits the unauthorized collection of paleontological specimens. Policy CC-4.11 addresses the project-specific identification of cultural resource issues for development pursuant to CC-3.14 and CC-3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments. These policies and actions provide for the identification of recorded paleontological resources, project review to minimize potential for impacts to such resources, evaluation and mitigation procedures when conflicts arise, and discovery protocols. These policies and actions allow for the avoidance of paleontological resources where possible, and the recovery of scientifically consequential information from the resources when avoidance is not feasible. The recovery of such information would minimize the loss of the paleontological resource.

Impacts to paleontological resources may occur under the Draft General Plan. However, the Draft General Plan requires the application of professional standards for the recovery of scientific data from paleontological resources that may be affected. Therefore, implementation of the Draft General Plan policies and actions, in conjunction with compliance with existing State law, would reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

(4) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Disturb Human Remains. Human remains associated with historical and pre-contact archaeological deposits are known to exist in Yolo County, and have been encountered during development projects. Most of these discoveries are associated with pre-contact sites, and the majority of such sites in the Draft General Plan area are yet to be found. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in new construction, and the associated ground disturbing activities have the potential to impact human remains. The Draft General Plan policies and actions discussed below reduce the likelihood and severity of such impacts.

Draft General Plan policies and actions, as well as State law, provide for the identification and respectful treatment of human remains encountered during project activities. Draft General Plan Policies CO-4.1, CO-4.11, CO-4.12, CO-4.13, and Actions CO-A54, CO-A59, CO-A61, and CO-A62 directly pertain to pre-contact human remains, or archaeological sites with the potential to contain such remains. The policies and actions require close coordination with, and review opportunities for,

Native American organizations affiliated with remains that are know to occur, or may occur, in a given development area. Policy CO-4.12 and Action CO-A54 provide for pre-project coordination with tribal entities to identify areas that may contain human remains, and maintain a confidential map of such locations to facilitate project review if development encroaches. Policy CC-4.11 addresses the project-specific identification of cultural resource issues for development pursuant to CC-3.14 and CC-3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments. Action CO-A60 calls for tribal participation in impacts assessment and treatment protocols in areas of cultural resource sensitivity. Action CO-A61 reinforces the requirements of State law by requiring contact with the Native American Heritage Commission and the consideration of the recommendations of a Most Likely Descendant if human remains of Native American origin are identified during construction. Additionally, HSC Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98 include procedures for the protection of human remains and consultation protocols in the event of such discoveries.

Impacts to human remains may occur under the Draft General Plan. However, Draft General Plan policies require early and close consultation between the County and affected tribal entities to incorporate Native American opinions and concerns in the review process. Therefore, implementation of the Draft General Plan policies and actions, in conjunction with compliance with existing State law, would reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

(5) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in Religious, Sacred, or Unique Ethnic-Cultural Sites or Resources. Cultural places that have cultural or religious significance to Native American tribes are known to exist in Yolo County. The Native American Heritage Commission has confirmed that several properties in the Commission's confidential Sacred Lands File are in Yolo County. The File is not comprehensive, and it is likely that more places of traditional significance exist, but are not recorded in an inventory. While these cultural places may or may not qualify as historical resources under CEQA, they are nevertheless regarded as culturally significant by descendant communities. As such, these places possess qualities that could be affected by development allowed under the Draft General Plan. These effects may occur as a result of direct impacts, such as physical damage to a particular location, or indirect impacts such as visual or auditory intrusions. The Draft General Plan policies and actions discussed below reduce the likelihood and severity of such impacts.

The Draft General Plan emphasizes the importance of tribal participation in the treatment of sites with cultural or traditional value to Native Americans in Yolo County. Policies CO-4.1, CO-4.11, CO-4.12, CO-4.13 and Actions CO-A60, CO-A61, CO-A63, CO-A64, and CO-A66 specifically provide for consultation with Native American organizations, not only for project-by-project situations when known pre-contact resources are involved, but also for long-range planning efforts whereby unrecorded resources may be identified. Actions CO-A63 and CO-A64 include the consultation requirements of SB 18,[62] Action CO-A56 also specifically calls for cooperation with the Rumsey and Cortina bands to identify sacred sites and map such resources, if appropriate, to assist planning. Policy CC-4.11 addresses the project-specific identification of cultural resource issues for development pursuant to policy CC-3.14 and CC-3.15 by including pre-permitting resource assessments. While impacts to cultural places may not be completely avoided, especially as seen by the descendant community, the Draft General Plan requires that cooperative and consultative relationships be developed and project-specific review be undertaken to minimize potential conflicts.

[62] Government Code §65352.3.

Impacts to religious or sacred Native American places may occur under the Draft General Plan. However, Draft General Plan policies require early and close consultation between the County and affected tribal entities, and provides for the opportunity for tribal review and comment on impact assessment and mitigation measures. Therefore, implementation of the Draft General Plan policies and actions, in conjunction with compliance with existing State law, would reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

(6) Implementation of the Draft General Plan Could Conflict with Plans or Policies of Other Agencies. Yolo County agencies undertake a variety of missions, often requiring complex management documents or conservation plans. Often, these plans include measures that address cultural resources. The plans and programs listed below were reviewed to determine if any potential conflicts between their policies and those of the Draft General Plan.

The Draft General Plan policies and actions are far reaching and extensive in their consideration of cultural resources. These policies and actions broadly address the four-stage process for managing cultural resources in a regulatory framework: (1) identification prior to project initiation, or during project implementation; (2) evaluation against established significance criteria; (3) assessment of potential impacts using recognized impact thresholds; and (4) adoption of treatment strategies to avoid, reduce, or minimize adverse effects. The consideration of cultural resources in the Draft General Plan area is consistent with the cultural resource goals commonly advanced by land management and regional authorities in California. Avoidance is the preferred approach, but it is acknowledged that conflicts between the demands of society and resource values will arise. To address such conflicts, procedures for the identification and consideration of effects are established, with special emphasis given to Native American organizations where issues of cultural patrimony are involved. Action CO-A46 specifically requires that the County's Historic Preservation Ordinance be periodically updated to be consistent with federal, State, and local preservation requirements.

The Draft General Plan includes policies and actions that address the identification, evaluation, protection, and interpretation of cultural resources. These policies and actions are consistent with the overarching goals of local, State, and federal agencies and regulations to preserve resources significant for their historical, architectural, cultural, religious, or scientific values, regardless of the affiliated stakeholders. The Draft General Plan does not conflict with the regulatory environment regarding cultural resources of the California Environmental Quality Act; Government Code Section 65352.3 (Senate Bill 18); HSC Section 7050.5; PRC Section 5097.5 and Section 5097.98; and Chapter 8 of the Yolo County Land Development and Zoning Code. As a result, implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to policy conflicts with other plans and regulations for cultural resources.

(7) Result in Significant Adverse Physical Impacts as Compared to the 1983 General Plan Policies. The Draft General Plan expands the scope and content of goals, policies, and actions for the protection of cultural resources as compared to the 1983 General Plan. These measures broadly involve consultation, archival research, preservation incentives, field investigations, and administrative review functions, with the overall objective of identifying and avoiding or mitigating impacts to cultural resources. In those instances where cultural resources are physically altered as a result of Draft General Plan policies (e.g., the excavation of an archaeological site), these activities are done to address environmental review requirements and to gather the technical data necessary to

assess whether a project will exceed impact thresholds. The Draft General Plan takes a more comprehensive approach to resource identification, evaluation, and mitigation than the 1983 Draft General Plan, and will reduce the severity and result in fewer cultural resource impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Draft General Plan policies would not result in a significant adverse physical impact related to cultural resources as compared to the 1983 General Plan policies.