

5.5 Cultural Resources

“Cultural resources” is a broad term that includes, but is not limited to, historical resources and archaeological resources (which may be historic or prehistoric and can be historical resources or unique archaeological resources), which are defined below:

- **Historical Resources:** Historical resources are those listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or a local register, or are otherwise determined to be historical pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (Public Resources Code [PRC] section 21084.1, PRC section 5020.1, and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15064.5, respectively). Historical resources may be objects, buildings, structures, sites, areas, places, records, or manuscripts that are historically or archaeologically significant or significant in terms of California’s architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural records. Typically, historical resources are more than 50 years old.
- **Archaeological Resources:** Archaeological resources are archaeological artifacts, objects, or sites. They may be considered historical resources if they meet the definition of historical resources as defined by CEQA (PRC section 21084.1 and California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15064.5). If they are not determined to be historical resources, they may be determined “unique” as defined by CEQA (PRC section 21083.2(g)). Unique archaeological resources are archaeological artifacts, objects, or sites about which it can be clearly demonstrated that there is a high probability that they meet any of the following criteria: (1) they contain information needed to answer important scientific research questions, and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; (2) they have a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of their type or the best available example of their type; or (3) they are directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person. Non-unique archaeological resources are archaeological artifacts, objects, or sites that do not meet the above criteria, and they are not typically addressed under CEQA (PRC section 21083.2(h)).

Another type of cultural resource is a tribal cultural resource. These types of resources are discussed in Section 5.18, “Tribal Cultural Resources.”

5.5.1 Environmental Setting

Information presented in this section was compiled from *A Class III Cultural Resource Survey for a Proposed Buried Telecommunications Fiber-Optic Line in Happy Valley, Shasta County, California* (Howell and Copperstone 2017), TDS Telecom’s (TDS’s, or the applicant’s) Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (Tierra Right of Way Services, Ltd. 2015) and subsequent submittals from TDS (responses to data requests) for the proposed project, and the results of the CPUC’s consultation with California Native American tribes pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 regulations (further discussed in Section 5.18, “Tribal Cultural Resources”). The CPUC’s qualified consultant reviewed these documents, as well as other applicant-submitted information. In addition, the Shasta County General Plan provided additional local context with regard to cultural resources.

For the purposes of this evaluation, the environmental setting for which direct effects are considered includes a buffer of 29 feet to either side of the proposed project alignment (a total of 58 feet); this area is referred to as the area of direct impact (ADI). This includes a 25-foot buffer on either side of the proposed 8 feet for ground disturbance for the conduit. Adjacent parcels (i.e., those touching or encompassed by the buffer) also are considered with regard to potential indirect effects; these areas are referred to as the area of indirect impact (AII). Collectively, the ADI and AII form the area of potential impact (API). Records

1 searches extend beyond the API to include 0.5 mile on either side of the proposed project alignment to
2 provide a regional context for which the significance of resources may be derived.
3

4 **Regional Cultural Setting**

5 The regional cultural setting for the proposed project includes evidence for prehistoric Native American
6 settlement and use in Northern California; ethnographic or ethnohistoric documentation for Native
7 American tribes residing in, or otherwise using, the proposed project area at the time of contact with
8 European (Spanish and Russian) explorers and early Euro-American (Mexican and American) settlers;
9 and historic Euro-American and Native American settlement in Northern California and the general
10 vicinity of the proposed project area up to the present day. The prehistoric and historic cultural settings
11 for the proposed project are discussed in greater detail below. Section 5.18, "Tribal Cultural Resources,"
12 discusses the Native American cultural setting in more detail, including the ethnographic and
13 ethnohistoric setting.
14

15 ***Prehistoric Cultural Setting***

16 The archaeological record documenting the prehistory of Northern California suggests continuous human
17 occupation of northern California since ca. 6,000 B.C. Archaeological sites are associated with the Borax
18 Lake pattern (ca. 6,000 to 3,000 B.C.), the Squaw Creek pattern (ca. 3,000 to 1,000 B.C.), the
19 Whiskeytown pattern (ca. 1,000 B.C. to A.D. 200), the overlapping Tehama pattern (A.D. 100 to 450),
20 and the Shasta complex (A.D. 450 to 1539). The Borax Lake, Squaw Creek, Whiskeytown, and Tehama
21 patterns represent prehistoric cultural traditions present in Northern California prior to exploration and
22 settlement by Euro-Americans. Settlement during these cultural patterns consisted of seasonal camps,
23 likely to take advantage of seasonally available food resources, and is associated with Hokan-speaking
24 groups of Northern California.
25

26 Sites associated with the Shasta complex represent a prehistoric cultural tradition in Northern California
27 that began prior to, and was still present during, Euro-American exploration and settlement. Settlement
28 during this cultural pattern consisted of permanent settlements near streams and a riverine-oriented
29 hunting and gathering food procurement strategy, and is associated with Wintu groups that arrived in
30 Northern California around A.D. 450, pushing Hokan-speaking groups further east.
31

32 The Borax Lake pattern (ca. 6,000 to 3,000 B.C.) is represented by archaeological sites reflecting seasonal
33 occupation and characteristic artifact assemblages comprising large projectile points, manos, and
34 millingstones that reflect hunting and gathering activities for local animal and plant resources. The Squaw
35 Creek pattern (ca. 3,000 to 1,000 B.C.) is believed to have developed gradually out of the Borax Lake
36 pattern and is represented by archaeological sites reflecting seasonal occupation and characteristic artifact
37 assemblages comprising Squaw Creek Contracting Stem projectile points, leaf-shaped projectile points,
38 uniface stone tools, cobble spalls, and bowl-and-slab mortars and pestles that continue to reflect hunting
39 and gathering activities for local plant and animal resources.
40

41 The Whiskeytown pattern (ca. 1,000 B.C. to A.D. 200) followed the Squaw Creek pattern and is
42 represented by archaeological sites reflecting seasonal occupation and characteristic artifact assemblages
43 comprising large- and medium-sized corner- and side-notched projectile points, manos, millingstones, and
44 notched-pebble net-weights that continue to reflect hunting and gathering for local plant and animal
45 resources. The appearance of net-weights during the Whiskeytown pattern reflects an increased reliance
46 on riverine resources, such as fish that were more easily procured by using nets. Additionally, the
47 archaeological record shows evidence for using basketry for cooking. The Tehama pattern (ca. A.D. 100
48 to 450) overlapped slightly with the Whiskeytown pattern and is represented by archaeological sites
49 reflecting seasonal occupation and characteristic artifact assemblages that reflect the introduction of the
50 bow-and-arrow, with smaller side- and corner-notched projectile points, into hunting activities.
51

1 The Shasta complex (A.D. 450 to 1539) represents a break from earlier prehistoric cultural patterns in
2 Northern California. Sites associated with the Shasta complex are associated with Wintu-speaking groups
3 and are represented by archaeological sites reflecting permanent settlements near streams, with semi-
4 subterranean housing, to take advantage of riverine food resources, and characteristic artifact assemblages
5 that include hopper mortars and pestles. The settlement pattern, food procurement strategy, and
6 characteristic housing and artifact assemblage features of the Shasta complex were characteristic of
7 Wintu-speaking groups encountered by Euro-American explorers and early settlers and continued well
8 into the historic period.

9 10 **Historic Cultural Setting**

11 The historic cultural setting for California is typically divided into three broad periods: the Spanish Period
12 (A.D. 1539 to 1821), the Mexican Period (A.D. 1821 to 1848), and the American Period (A.D. 1848 to
13 1940).

14
15 **Spanish Period.** The Spanish Period is associated with the period of Spanish exploration and control of
16 California. Gabriel Morago was the first Spanish explorer to arrive in the Sacramento River valley,
17 arriving in 1808 at the end of an expedition to explore Northern California between 1806 and 1808,
18 although he does not appear to have reached the proposed project area in Happy Valley. No permanent
19 Spanish settlement occurred as a result of this contact, and local Hokan- and Wintu-speaking Native
20 American groups in the vicinity appear to have continued patterns and practices exhibited during the late
21 Shasta complex prehistoric period. It may be likely that local Native American groups had indirect
22 contact with the Spanish, and other Euro-American explorers such as Russians and Americans, via inter-
23 tribal connections with other Native American groups. Evidence for this indirect contact would be most
24 obviously expressed via the appearance of Euro-American trade goods in the material culture.

25
26 **Mexican Period.** The Mexican Period is associated with the period of Mexican control of California
27 following Mexico's independence from Spain, and also had very little direct influence in the Sacramento
28 River valley. While Mexico controlled the area where the proposed project would be located, early
29 American and Canadian explorers and trappers appear to have had a greater presence in this area than
30 Mexicans. During the Mexican period, members of the expeditions of the American Jediah Smith in
31 1826 and the Canadian Peter Ogden in 1827 were the first known Euro-Americans to contact Wintu
32 groups in Northern California, followed by subsequent visits by John Work of the Hudson Bay Company
33 in 1833 and the U.S. Exploring Expedition in 1841. As a result of this early Euro-American contact, the
34 local Wintu tribes were decimated by the introduction of malaria, which instigated long-term
35 consequences to the Wintu cultural fabric, weakening it by population loss and leaving them ill-equipped
36 to effectively deal with the coming incursions of Euro-American settlers into their traditional territories.

37
38 **American Period.** The American Period is associated with the period following the United States'
39 acquisition of California from Mexico, and California's subsequent elevation to statehood. This period
40 has had a direct influence in the Sacramento River Valley, including areas within and adjacent to the
41 proposed project. Acquisition of California by the United States coincided with the California Gold Rush,
42 which commenced in earnest following the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in the now abandoned
43 settlement of Coloma in El Dorado County, and mining has played an important role in the proposed
44 project area. Major Reading and his Indian laborers discovered the first gold in Shasta County in March
45 of 1848 on land within Rancho Bueno Ventura, at the mouth of Clear Creek, where it drains into the
46 Sacramento River (State of California 2017a, 2017b).

47
48 Large-scale mining operations began in the vicinity of the proposed project in 1851, following this first
49 discovery. Placer mining was practiced from 1848 to 1855, followed by hydraulic and drift mining from
50 the 1860s through the 1880s. Local communities were established during this time, including the city of
51 Redding, as well as the smaller communities of Piety Hill, Igo, and Ono. Chinese laborers were brought
52 into the area beginning in the 1860s to support hydraulic and drift mining activities associated with the

1 nearby Hardscrabble and Russell Mines near Igo. Many of the ditches built in the area, including the
2 Happy Valley Irrigation Ditch, were originally constructed by Chinese workers to support hydraulic
3 mining. Local tradition indicates that the names of the nearby communities of Igo and Ono derive from
4 pidgin English expressions used by Chinese laborers.
5

6 Mining continued to be the predominant industry in Shasta County until about 1900, by which time the
7 area's placer deposits had largely been depleted. Settlers and miners turned increasingly to farming and
8 ranching, and many mining settlements in the county were abandoned as people relocated to the Redding
9 area. During the 1930s, new mining technologies such as power shovels and dragline dredges led to a
10 resurgence of mining in the area. The dredging produced large amounts of waste material in the form of
11 rocks and sand, which was collected in dredge tailings that are visible in the landscape surrounding the
12 proposed project area. These dredge tailings are present along major waterbodies in the vicinity of the
13 proposed project area (such as Clear Creek, Niles Canyon, Spanish Canyon, the North and South Forks of
14 Gulch Spring, Dry Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and the Sacramento River).
15

16 **Results of the Records Search**

17 The records search for cultural resources was completed by consulting with the Northeast Information
18 Center (NEIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) on December 2, 2014
19 (State of California 2017c). In addition to the records search, archival material at the Shasta Historical
20 Society in Redding; the National Park Service's online databases, which identify historic properties; and
21 Government Land Office maps were reviewed (NPS 2017a, 2017b). The purpose of the records search
22 was to identify all previously conducted cultural resources or archeological surveys and all previously
23 recorded historical resources, historic properties, and archaeological sites within a 0.5-mile buffer zone
24 around the proposed project alignment.
25

26 The results of the records search indicate that 32 cultural surveys were previously conducted within 0.5
27 mile of the proposed project alignment between 1982 and 2013. The records search identified 19 cultural
28 sites that were previously recorded within 0.5 mile of the proposed project alignment:

- 29 • 17 historic archaeological resources (dating to the late 19th and early 20th centuries/American
30 Period);
- 31 • One late prehistoric archaeological resource (of unspecified date and cultural period); and
- 32 • One multi-component resource (unspecified prehistoric and American Period historic).¹
33

34 Of the 19 previously recorded cultural resources, two are located within the API for the proposed project:
35 historic archaeological sites CA-SHA-3373H (Landfill Mining Complex) and CA-SHA-3382H (Happy
36 Valley Ditch), which date to the American period (see Table 5.5-1). The proposed project area traverses
37 the northeastern edge of CA-SHA-3373H (the Landfill Mining Complex) and crosses the CA-SHA-3382
38 (Happy Valley Ditch). In addition to these two resources, the proposed project alignment would be
39 located within the Igo-Ono Gold District. This district is not listed in the National Register of Historic
40 Places (NRHP) or the CRHR.
41

¹ Three of these resources did not include locational information. They are noted only as being within the 0.5-mile search radius. Resources meeting these descriptions were not identified as part of the cultural resource survey performed for the proposed project.

Table 5.5-1 Cultural Resources within the Area of Potential Impact

Site Number	Site Name	Description	CRHR Eligibility Status ⁽¹⁾	Located within the Area of Direct Impact
Previously Recorded Resources				
CA-SHA-3373H	Landfill Mining Complex	Historic Archaeological Resource: numerous historic mining sites and features that appear to be associated with the former community of Piety Hill, a 19th century mining town	Recommended not eligible; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
CA-SHA-3382H	Happy Valley Ditch	Historic Linear Feature: segment of a historic water conveyance system originally built by Chinese laborers to support hydraulic mining operations and subsequently converted for irrigation for agricultural uses	Recommended not eligible; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	Piety Hill Historical Marker	CA Point of Interest – the Piety Hill Historical Marker was constructed near 14389 Cloverdale Road, Igo, CA 96047. The marker was built in 2010 (Historical Marker Database 2017).	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	No
Newly Recorded Resources				
N/A	Igo Inn	Historic Architectural Resource: historic building that was originally a fraternal lodge meeting hall, and was most recently renovated for use as a restaurant; possibly a structure that was originally constructed in the former community of Piety Hill, a 19th century mining town, which was moved to Igo when the community of Piety Hill was abandoned	Unevaluated; assumed eligible for this evaluation	No
N/A	Cloverdale Cemetery (also known as Oak Cemetery or Happy Valley Cemetery)	Historic Cemetery: historic cemetery that is still in use	Unevaluated; assumed to be a tribal cultural resource for this evaluation (see Section 5.18)	No
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: concrete and metal culvert used for water conveyance	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: glass and white earthenware scatter representing refuse	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: small concrete "box" (approximately 3 feet long by 4 feet wide by 0.5 feet high) representing a foundation for an unknown aboveground feature	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: raised concrete culvert, inscribed with a date of 1942 used for water conveyance	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: concrete pipe used for water conveyance	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: metal can representing refuse	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: metal can representing refuse	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: metal can representing refuse	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes

Table 5.5-1 Cultural Resources within the Area of Potential Impact

Site Number	Site Name	Description	CRHR Eligibility Status ⁽¹⁾	Located within the Area of Direct Impact
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: U.S. Coastal Geodetic Survey benchmark, inscribed with the number S 378 and a date of 1949	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes
N/A	N/A	Isolated occurrence: concrete structure, consisting of an L-shaped concrete feature approximately 4 feet long by 0.5 feet wide by 2 feet high on the longer side, and approximately 2 feet long by 0.5 feet wide by 0.5 feet high on the shorter side, representing a possible foundation for an unknown aboveground feature	Unevaluated; assumed not eligible for this evaluation	Yes

Source: Howell and Copperstone 2017; Historical Marker Database 2017.

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ In order to evaluate the potential impacts to historical resources and unique archaeological resources, information regarding their eligibility for the CRHR must be gathered. Two of the resources were previously evaluated and were recommended as not eligible for NRHP listing; per the applicant, this status also is applicable to the CRHR (i.e., the Landfill Mining Complex and the Happy Valley Ditch). Previous recommendations for eligibility were retained for this evaluation, unless evidence from site records and photographs suggested otherwise. For cultural resources that were not evaluated, site records and information presented within the cultural resources report were considered, where available. Among the considerations for architectural resources was the physical integrity of a structure and its ability to retain original architectural elements. If upon evaluation of this information, the potential eligibility for CRHR listing was unclear, the resource was considered eligible for the CRHR. Isolated occurrences were assumed to be ineligible, as resources found in isolation typically do not meet the criteria for listing.

Key:

CRHR California Register of Historic Resources
N/A not applicable
NRHP National Register of Historic Places

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Results of the Cultural Resources Survey

A cultural resources survey was conducted on February 24 to 26, 2015, for the proposed project by qualified cultural resources specialists. The purpose of this survey was to identify previously recorded cultural resources that were located within the API. In addition, the qualified cultural resource specialists surveyed for new, unrecorded cultural resources within the API. The survey area included a corridor width of 98 feet, centered on the proposed project alignment; this area incorporates a larger area than the API. The applicant submitted the report to the California Office of Historic Preservation for their review and comment.

The cultural resources specialists surveyed the two previously recorded cultural resources sites and identified 12 additional resources, described in Table 5.5-1. Among these resources are two historic architectural resources and 10 historic archaeological resources (isolated occurrences). In addition to these resources, the Piety Hill Historical Marker also is present; this resource, while included in Table 5.5-1, was not identified as part of the survey. It is noted herein as it is included as a resource to note in the mitigation measures (Section 5.5.3).

CA-SHA-3373H (Landfill Mining Complex). The archaeological resource CA-SHA-3373H (Landfill Mining Complex) was recorded in 2002. The Landfill Mining Complex is a collection of historic mining sites and features that dates to ca. 1850s to 1940s, placing it within the American Period (A.D. 1848 to 1940). This archaeological resource consists of several previously recorded historic mining sites, along with new mining features, and was identified as part of a survey of a parcel owned by Shasta County for a proposed landfill. It is possible that the mining sites and features of the Landfill Mining Complex are associated with the former community of Piety Hill, a 19th century mining town. The northeastern edge of the Landfill Mining Complex is located within the AII for the proposed project. The cultural resources specialists did not identify any additional features of, or associated with, this archaeological resource

1 during their 2015 survey. The Landfill Mining Complex was previously recommended not eligible for
2 listing in the NRHP. The applicant has indicated that the NRHP evaluation also applies to the eligibility
3 on the State Register. Therefore, the recommendation from the cultural resources specialists is that the
4 Landfill Mining Complex is not eligible for listing on the CRHR. No records of State Historic
5 Preservation Office comment regarding this site were available for this evaluation. Therefore, given the
6 previous recommendation of not eligible, for this evaluation under CEQA, the Landfill Mining Complex
7 is not considered a historical resource, as it is assumed not eligible for the CRHR.
8

9 **CA-SHA-3382H (Happy Valley Ditch).** The previously recorded resource Happy Valley Ditch, also
10 known as the Happy Valley Irrigation Canal, is a historic water conveyance system that dates to ca. 1853
11 to 1880. This site consists of a U-shaped earthen ditch (culverted in some locations where it passes
12 beneath existing roads) that extends from Igo to Olinda in Shasta County. It is approximately 2 to 3 feet
13 wide and 3 to 4 feet deep and may have been part of the Dry Creek Tunnel and Fluming Company's
14 Hardscrabble Mine ditch, forming a larger water conveyance system that served the local community of
15 Piety Hill and nearby mining operations from 1853 to 1880. Following closure of the Hardscrabble Mine,
16 the ditch was extended to the communities of Cloverdale and Olinda to supply water to local orchards and
17 farms. In 1905, the Happy Valley Land and Water Company extended its delivery capacity, but the ditch
18 fell into disuse after World War II, with the departure of many local farmers to larger communities.
19

20 Segments of Happy Valley Ditch were previously recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP. The
21 survey considered the portion of Happy Valley Ditch that crosses the proposed project alignment and
22 determined that the integrity of the ditch has been compromised as a result of construction of Cloverdale
23 Road, fencing of parcels along the ditch, and previous installation of utilities. Additionally, construction
24 on adjacent private property has destroyed some parts of the ditch, making it nonfunctional as a water
25 conveyance system. Therefore, the cultural resources specialists recommended the portions of Happy
26 Valley Ditch that cross the proposed project alignment as not eligible for listing on the NRHP. The
27 applicant has indicated that the NRHP evaluation also applies to the eligibility on the State Register.
28 Therefore, the recommendation from the cultural resources specialists is that the portions of the Happy
29 Valley Ditch that cross the proposed project alignment also are not eligible for listing on the CRHR. State
30 Historic Preservation Office comments regarding this site are pending for this evaluation. Therefore,
31 given the current recommendation as ineligible by the cultural resources specialists and the ineligibility of
32 other segments, for this evaluation under CEQA, Happy Valley Ditch is not considered a historical
33 resource for segments located within the ADI, as it is assumed not eligible for the CRHR.
34

35 **Piety Hill Historical Marker.** – The Piety Hill site was registered on May 6, 1969. It is located in Shasta
36 County. A marker notes the site of the community, which was established in 1849 (State of California
37 2017g, 2017h; Historical Marker Database 2017). This resource has been identified previously and is
38 noted as a point of interest in current California records (State of California 2017g). The marker itself was
39 constructed in 2010 (Historical Marker Database 2017). Only historical points of interest designated after
40 1997 and recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission are listed in the California Register
41 (State of California 2017g); therefore, this marker is not listed in the California Register and for the purposes
42 of this evaluation, is not considered a historical resource.
43

44 **Igo Inn.** The Igo Inn, formerly the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Welcome Lodge No. 209, is a two-
45 story meeting hall, fronting on South Fork Road, with a single-story dance hall addition at the rear of the
46 building. This resource is located within the AII; its address is 13976 South Fork Road, Igo, California.
47 The building consists of wooden horizontal sidings on top of a coursed stone foundation. The two-story
48 meeting hall portion of the building was either constructed at this location in 1885 or was moved there
49 from the former nearby community of Piety Hill in 1885. The dance hall addition was constructed in the
50 1920s. The building was abandoned after 1935 and was eventually deemed unsafe for public use until
51 remodeling was conducted in the 1990s to restore it.
52

1 The eligibility of the Igo Inn for listing in the CRHR is unknown. This resource was not identified as part
2 of the records review conducted for the proposed project; it was identified in the field by the cultural
3 resources specialists. They did not make a recommendation regarding the eligibility of this historic
4 building for listing in the CRHR. However, they did note a lack of integrity due to remodeling conducted
5 in the 1990s, as well as that the building does not appear to be representative of a particular architectural
6 style, is not associated with any specific architects or builders, and is unlikely to yield any information
7 significant to the history of Igo or to the American Period of history in the area. However, insufficient
8 information is available to definitively recommend this resource's eligibility status for listing on the
9 CRHR. Therefore, for this evaluation under CEQA, the Igo Inn is considered a historical resource, as it is
10 assumed eligible for the CRHR.

11
12 **Cloverdale Cemetery.** The Cloverdale Cemetery, also known as Oak Cemetery or Happy Valley
13 Cemetery, is a historic cemetery that was opened in 1892. It is still in use today and fronts the west side of
14 Oak Street. The cemetery is located within the AII. It has not been evaluated for listing in the CRHR.
15 However, this resource was noted as important to the Wintu Tribe of Northern California (Wintu).
16 Therefore, it is considered a tribal cultural resource for this evaluation and is discussed in Section 5.18,
17 "Tribal Cultural Resources." For this reason, it is not discussed separately as a historical resource with
18 regard to impacts in this section.

19
20 **Isolated Occurrences.** The cultural resources specialists identified 10 isolated occurrences that are
21 located within the ADI, as follows:

- 22
- 23 • Four miscellaneous refuse deposits;
- 24 • Three miscellaneous water conveyance structures or features;
- 25 • Two foundations for unknown aboveground features; and
- 26 • One national survey benchmark.
- 27

28 The cultural resources specialists recommended that the isolated occurrences are unlikely to yield
29 additional information beyond the information recorded during the survey. Additionally, the cultural
30 resources investigation recommended that the 10 isolated occurrences are not unique archaeological
31 resources as defined by CEQA. As isolated occurrences (or isolates) typically are not eligible for the
32 CRHR, for this evaluation under CEQA, these are not considered historical resources or unique
33 archaeological resources.

34 35 **5.5.2 Regulatory Setting**

36 37 **Federal**

38 No federal regulations related to cultural resources are applicable to the proposed project because no
39 federal lands, monies, or decisions are required for the proposed project.

40 41 **State**

42 **California Register of Historical Resources.** The CRHR is the authoritative guide to the state's
43 significant historical and archaeological resources. It is a program designed by the California State
44 Historical Resources Commission for use by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to
45 identify, evaluate, register, and protect California's historical resources. The CRHR encourages public
46 recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archeological, and cultural
47 significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for
48 state historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under CEQA (PRC § 5024.1(a))
49 (State of California 2017e).

To be considered significant at the local, state, or national level, a historical resource must meet one or more of the following four criteria:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States (Criterion 1).
2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history (Criterion 2).
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values (Criterion 3).
4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation (Criterion 4).

The CRHR includes resources listed in the NRHP and resources that are designated California Historical Landmarks (California Historical Landmarks #770 and above are automatically listed in the CRHR) or California Points of Historical Interest (California Points of Historical Interest designated after 1997 and recommended by the California State Historical Resources Commission) (State of California 2017f; California Office of Historic Preservation 1998).

California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines. Section 21084.1 of the PRC establishes that a substantial adverse effect on a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment. Under CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, a historical resource includes:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CRHR;
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources; and
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or that is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource will be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if it meets the following criteria for listing in the CRHR:
 - a. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
 - b. It is associated with the lives of persons who are important in our past.
 - c. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values.
 - d. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines explains what constitutes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. This may involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings, such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired.

1 Under CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(c), if an archaeological resource does not meet the criteria for a
2 historical resource, but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in PRC Section
3 21083.2, the site shall be protected per the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2. A unique archaeological
4 resource is defined as meeting one of the following conditions:
5

- 6 1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a
7 demonstrable public interest in that information.
- 8 2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available
9 example of its type.
- 10 3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or
11 person.
12

13 However, if the archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, then
14 the effects of a project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment.
15

16 Local

17 **Shasta County Objective HER-1.** The Shasta County General Plan’s Objective HER-1 provides for the
18 protection of significant prehistoric and historic cultural resources (Shasta County 2004). The Shasta
19 County General Plan identifies 51 Shasta County heritage resources, including resources listed in the
20 NRHP, the California Historical Landmarks program, or the California Points of Interest program. The
21 Shasta County General Plan also notes that in addition to these 51 Shasta County heritage resources, there
22 are approximately 500 additional known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological significance in
23 Shasta County. These additional known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological significance in
24 Shasta County are not included in the list of Shasta County heritage resources in order to protect these
25 resources, but their information is on file with the Cultural Resources Section of the California
26 Department of Parks and Recreation (Shasta County 2004).
27

28 **Shasta County Policy HER-1a.** The Shasta County General Plan’s Policy HER-1a specifies that
29 “development projects in areas of known heritage value shall be designed to minimize degradation of
30 these resources. Where conflicts are unavoidable, mitigation measures which reduce such impacts shall be
31 implemented. Possible mitigation measures may include clustering, buffer or nondisturbance (*sic*) zones,
32 and building siting requirements.” (Shasta County 2004)
33

34 5.5.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

35
36 The impact analysis below identifies and describes the proposed project’s potential impacts on cultural
37 resources within the proposed project area. Potential impacts were evaluated according to the significance
38 criteria presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and listed at the start of each impact analysis
39 section below. Both the construction and maintenance/operations phases were considered; however,
40 because the construction phase could result in physical changes to the environment, analysis of
41 construction phase effects warranted a more detailed evaluation.
42

43 Applicant Proposed Measures

44 The applicant would implement the following applicant-proposed measures (APMs) to minimize or avoid
45 impacts on cultural resources that are historical resources and/or unique archaeological resources. A list
46 of all project APMs is included in Table 4-2 in Chapter 4, “Project Description.” **APM CR-1** and **APM**
47 **CR-2** are not discussed in the impact analysis because these measures have already been incorporated
48 into the project design, and they are categorized as project design features in Chapter 4. The resources
49 addressed by these measures (the Happy Valley Ditch, Cloverdale Cemetery, and Igo Inn), however, are
50 within the AII. For this reason, they are still considered in this evaluation. Mitigation Measure (MM)

GEN-1 requires implementation of these APMs to mitigate impacts to cultural resources, and the impact analysis in this section applies to these APMs to reduce impacts.

APM CR-3: In the event that undiscovered historical or archaeological resources are encountered by construction personnel, all ground-disturbing activities within 30.5 m (100.0 feet) of the find in non-urban areas and 15.2 m (50.0 feet) in urban areas will be temporarily halted or diverted and a qualified archaeologist will be contacted to assess the discovery.

APM CR-4: If human remains are discovered or recognized in any location, construction personnel will suspend further excavation or disturbance of the site and any nearby areas reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required.

Significance Criteria

Table 5.5-2 describes the significance criteria from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines’ cultural resources section, which the CPUC used to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Table 5.5-2 Cultural Resources Checklist

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Items (a) and (b) of the cultural resources checklist are considered together for the purposes of this evaluation due the potential for similar impacts for resources that are archaeological in nature.

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

and

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

As outlined in Table 5.5-1, one historical resource² is present within the API, as part of the AII. For the purposes of this evaluation, the Igo Inn is considered a historical resource. No unique archaeological resources have been identified for the proposed project area.

The Igo Inn is located along the northern side of Place Road near the intersection of County Route A16. The proposed project would be installed on the southern (opposite) side of the existing roadway from the

² Please note, the Cloverdale Cemetery is discussed as a tribal cultural resource. As this resource has not been evaluated for its eligibility as a historical resource, it is being treated as a Tribal Cultural Resource per the lead agency’s discretion for this analysis.

1 Igo Inn. As this resource is located outside the ADI, it would not be subject to direct disturbance.
2 However, it may be subject to visual and auditory impacts associated with construction activities and
3 personnel that would be near its location. As the roadway acts as a buffer, the proposed project would not
4 likely cause vibratory impacts to the structure. The visual and auditory impacts would not constitute a
5 substantial adverse change, as they would not involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or
6 alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings. The impacts also would be temporary. For this
7 reason, the impacts associated with the Igo Inn would be less than significant. Operation and maintenance
8 activities would occur within areas already disturbed during construction of the proposed project.
9 Additionally, no ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas would occur during
10 operation and maintenance. Therefore, there would be no potential for the proposed project to impact
11 historical resources during operation and maintenance.

12
13 While only one of the resources (previously documented or newly identified) noted in Table 5.5-1 is
14 considered a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5, unanticipated cultural resources discoveries may
15 occur, including those that may be associated with the Igo Inn. Unanticipated discoveries also may
16 include the potential for unique archaeological resources.

17
18 **MM CUL-1** requires workers to be given an overview of the potential types of cultural resources that
19 may be uncovered during construction. **MM CUL-2** requires monitoring for cultural resources in the
20 vicinity of known archaeological sites (see Table 5.5-1) in order to address the potential for additional
21 cultural resources. **MM CUL-3** supplements **APM CR-3** by providing additional details outlining the
22 procedures that TDS would follow in the event of an unanticipated find. **MM CUL-4** would ensure that
23 construction activities would not occur within unsurveyed areas. Impacts on unanticipated finds that may
24 be eligible for listing in the CRHR (and thereby would be historical resources and/or unique
25 archaeological resources) would be less than significant with the implementation of these mitigation
26 measures.

27
28 **Significance: Less than significant with mitigation.**

29
30 *c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

31
32 The new high-speed internet broadband fiber optic transmission cable component of the proposed project
33 would be installed underground within 50 feet of the eastern side of the Cloverdale Cemetery (see
34 Sections 5.1, “Aesthetics” and 5.18, “Tribal Cultural Resources”). The proposed project alignment would
35 avoid any direct impact within the cemetery. Therefore, the proposed project is not likely to uncover
36 human remains associated with the cemetery.

37
38 However, in the event that unknown human remains are encountered during construction of the proposed
39 project, **APM CR-4** would require construction activities to halt and the County Coroner to be contacted.
40 Mitigation measures are needed to supplement this APM.

41
42 **MM CUL-1** requires workers to be given an overview of the potential for encountering human remains
43 during construction of the proposed project, including any that may be located in the vicinity of the
44 Cloverdale Cemetery. **MM CUL-2** requires monitoring for cultural resources by a CPUC-approved
45 archaeologist with experience in identifying human remains in the vicinity of the Cloverdale Cemetery.
46 **MM CUL-5** also supplements **APM CR-4** by providing further details outlining the procedures that TDS
47 would follow for treatment of any human remains discovered or recognized during construction of the
48 proposed project, including in the vicinity of the Cloverdale Cemetery.

49
50 Impacts on human remains, including those located within the Cloverdale Cemetery; in areas outside of,
51 but in association with, the Cloverdale Cemetery; and those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would

1 be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures to less than significant. Section 5.18, “Tribal
2 Cultural Resources” discusses the Cloverdale Cemetery as a tribal cultural resource.

3
4 **Significance: Less than significant with mitigation.**

5
6 **Mitigation Measures**

7 **MM CUL-1: Worker Education Program.** TDS shall design and implement a Worker Education
8 Program that requires training for all project personnel, including construction supervisors and field
9 personnel, who may encounter and/or alter previously identified, and as yet unidentified, archaeological
10 and/or architectural resources, including any that may be determined historical resources or unique
11 archaeological resources. All construction workers shall receive this Worker Education Program training
12 before engaging in field operations.

13
14 The Worker Education Program shall include training that covers, at a minimum, the following topics:

- 15
16 • A review of the prehistory, Native American ethnography/ethnohistory, and history of the
17 proposed project area;
- 18 • A review of the types of prehistoric, ethnographic/ethnohistoric, and historic archaeological and
19 architectural resources, including artifacts, features, and/or human remains, that could be
20 identified in the proposed project area. These may include, but are not limited to, those that could
21 be associated with historic archaeological site CA-SHA-3373H (Landfill Mining Complex), the
22 former community of Piety Hill, historic archaeological site CA-SHA-3382H (Happy Valley
23 Ditch), the historic Igo Inn, or the historic Cloverdale Cemetery (also known as Oak Cemetery or
24 Happy Valley Cemetery), which is still in use today.
- 25 • A review of applicable local, state, and federal ordinances, laws, and regulations pertaining to
26 archaeological resources, architectural or other built resources (including prehistoric and
27 ethnographic/ethnohistoric Native American and historic [Euro-American] archaeological and
28 architectural or other built resources), human remains, tribal cultural resources, cultural resources
29 management, and historic preservation;
- 30 • A discussion of procedures to be followed in the event that unanticipated cultural resources or
31 human remains are discovered during implementation of the proposed project;
- 32 • A discussion of disciplinary and other actions that could be taken against persons violating
33 historic preservation laws and TDS policies; and
- 34 • A statement by the construction company or applicable employer agreeing to abide by the Worker
35 Education Program, TDS policies and procedures, and other applicable local, state, and federal
36 ordinances, laws, and regulations.

37
38 A copy of the materials included as part of the worker education program will be provided to Native
39 American tribes participating in the AB 52 consultation with the CPUC, if requested.

40
41 This mitigation measure shall be coordinated with **MM Geology and Soils (GEO)-1**.

42
43 **MM CUL-2: Cultural Resources Monitoring.** For the purpose of this mitigation measure, “cultural
44 resources” refers to archaeological resources (prehistoric and historic, known or previously unidentified);
45 historic architectural resources (structures, buildings, and objects); and resources associated with
46 California Native American tribes (sub-surface or aboveground). Cultural resources is a general term and
47 does not account for significance (i.e., a historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or tribal
48 cultural resource). TDS shall ensure that a CPUC-approved archaeologist that meets the Secretary of
49 Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and has specific experience in the

1 identification of human remains conducts monitoring with regard to cultural resources during construction
2 of the proposed project. The qualified archaeologist shall be approved prior to the start of construction by
3 the CPUC Project Manager (PM).
4

5 The CPUC-approved archaeologist shall prepare a Monitoring and Treatment Plan for Cultural Resources.
6 Prior to commencement of construction, TDS shall submit the Monitoring and Treatment Plan to the CPUC
7 for review and approval. This plan will include a description of when the Wintu will be notified and when
8 they will conduct monitoring of the construction activities (see **MM TCR-2**). The CPUC PM will approve
9 or request changes to the Monitoring and Treatment Plan for Cultural Resources within seven days of
10 submittal by TDS. Once the CPUC PM approves the Monitoring and Treatment Plan for Cultural
11 Resources, TDS shall ensure that the CPUC-approved archaeologist implements the approved plan. A
12 courtesy copy will be provided to the Wintu Tribe.
13

14 The CPUC-approved archaeologist shall monitor the effects of all construction-related work conducted
15 within locations with the potential to contain previously unidentified cultural resources and within 200
16 feet of the known archaeological resources according to the Monitoring and Treatment Plan for Cultural
17 Resources.
18

19 TDS, in consultation with the CPUC-approved archaeologist, shall implement the following procedures
20 as part of the monitoring for cultural resources:
21

- 22 • A CPUC-approved archaeologist shall conduct monitoring during construction in locations
23 within the API with the potential to contain previously unidentified cultural resources, as
24 identified in the Monitoring and Treatment Plan.
 - 25 - These locations shall include areas within 200 feet of known archaeological resources,
26 consisting of sites CA-SHA-3373H and CA-SHA-3382H; within 200 feet of known historic
27 architectural resources, consisting of the Igo Inn and the Cloverdale Cemetery; and within
28 200 feet of the Piety Hill historical marker (State of California 2017g, 2017h; Historical
29 Marker Database 2017).
- 30 • TDS shall erect protective barriers with signage identifying any exclusion area due to the
31 presence of known cultural resources (if applicable) as an “environmentally sensitive area.”
32

33 The CPUC-approved archaeologist shall have the authority to implement the procedures in **MM CUL-3** if
34 an unanticipated cultural resource is discovered at any time and in any location during construction of the
35 proposed project, including in the vicinity of any known archaeological resources, known historic
36 architectural resources, and other resources.
37

38 At the conclusion of monitoring for cultural resources, TDS shall submit a Monitoring Report
39 documenting the results of the monitoring activities to the CPUC for review and approval. The report
40 shall be prepared by the CPUC-approved archaeologist. The CPUC PM will approve or request changes
41 to the report within seven days of submittal by TDS.
42

43 **MM CUL-3: Treatment for Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discoveries.** For the purpose of this
44 mitigation measure, “cultural resources” has the same definition as that included in MM CUL-2. TDS
45 shall immediately halt and exclude construction work within 100 feet of the discovery of an unanticipated
46 cultural resource, and the CPUC-approved archaeologist shall inspect the unanticipated resource. At the
47 request of the CPUC-approved archaeologist, TDS shall install protective barriers with signage
48 identifying the exclusion area as an “environmentally sensitive area.”
49

50 Per the CPUC-approved archaeologist’s discretion and knowledge of potential resources types, if the
51 resource has the potential to be important to a Native American tribe, **MM TCR-2** will be followed.

1
2 **Avoidance:** If the CPUC-approved archaeologist determines that the resource can be avoided, and no
3 impacts would occur, TDS shall notify the CPUC of the unanticipated resource within 24 hours of its
4 discovery and confirm that it can be avoided. As part of the notification, the resource will be described
5 with sufficient detail to allow the CPUC an understanding of how the resource will be avoided and how
6 no impacts would occur. TDS may proceed with construction work in the area of discovery.
7

8 TDS shall ensure that the CPUC-approved archaeologist records the unanticipated cultural resource on
9 the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms. TDS shall submit the
10 completed DPR 523 forms to the CPUC for review and approval within 48 hours of the find. The CPUC
11 PM will approve or request changes to the DPR 523 forms within seven days of submittal by TDS. Once
12 approved, TDS shall file the DPR 523 forms with the NEIC and shall provide a copy of the DPR 523
13 forms to the CPUC for its records.
14

15 **Evaluation:** If TDS determines that it cannot avoid the unanticipated resource, the CPUC-approved
16 archaeologist shall evaluate the resource to determine if there is a potential for it to be a historical
17 resource (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a)) or a unique archaeological resource (PRC 21083.2(g)).
18

19 The following procedures will be implemented, if the resource cannot be avoided:
20

- 21 • At the discretion of the CPUC-approved archaeologist, if the resource is not potentially a
22 historical or unique archaeological resource, TDS may proceed with construction upon
23 notification to the CPUC within 24 hours via email of the find and proper recordation on the
24 appropriate DPR 523 forms. TDS may proceed with construction work in the area of discovery.

25 TDS shall submit the DPR 523 forms to the CPUC for review and approval within 48 hours of
26 the find. The CPUC PM will approve or request changes to the DPR 523 forms within seven days
27 of submittal by TDS. Once approved, TDS shall file the completed DPR 523 forms with the
28 NEIC and shall provide a copy of the DPR 523 forms to the CPUC for its records.

- 29 • If the CPUC-approved archaeologist determines that the resource is potentially a historical or
30 unique archaeological resource, the CPUC-approved archaeologist shall prepare an Evaluation
31 Plan that details the procedures to be used to determine whether the resource is a historical or
32 unique archaeological resource. The CPUC PM will approve or request changes to the Evaluation
33 Plan within three days of submittal by TDS.
- 34 • Once the CPUC PM has approved the Evaluation Plan, TDS shall ensure that the CPUC-
35 approved archaeologist implements the approved Evaluation Plan.
36

37 **Evaluation Plan Implementation:** When fieldwork implemented as part of the approved Evaluation Plan
38 is completed, the CPUC-approved archaeologist shall prepare an Evaluation Memo that describes the
39 results of the evaluation. TDS shall submit the Evaluation Memo to the CPUC for review and approval.
40 The CPUC PM will approve or request changes to the Evaluation Memo within seven days of submittal
41 by TDS.
42

43 After implementation of the Evaluation Plan, TDS may proceed with work in the area of the discovery, if
44 the following occurs:
45

- 46 • The CPUC-approved archaeologist determines that the unanticipated resource is not a historical
47 or unique archaeological resource; and
- 48 • The CPUC PM concurs with that recommendation.
49

1 **Data Recovery Plan:** If, after implementation of the Evaluation Plan, the CPUC-approved archaeologist
2 recommends that the unanticipated find is a historical or unique archaeological resource, TDS shall
3 ensure that the CPUC-approved archaeologist prepares a Data Recovery Plan that would reduce impacts
4 on the potential historical or unique archaeological resource to less than significant.
5

6 TDS shall ensure that the Data Recovery Plan is prepared by the CPUC-approved archaeologist in
7 accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(C) and PRC section 21083.2 and describes
8 methods that will yield relevant information. TDS shall submit the Data Recovery Plan to the CPUC for
9 review and approval. The CPUC PM will approve or request changes to the Data Recovery Plan within
10 seven days of submittal by TDS. Once the CPUC PM approves the Data Recovery Plan, TDS shall ensure
11 that the CPUC-approved archaeologist implements the approved plan.
12

13 When fieldwork implemented as part of the approved Data Recovery Plan is completed, the CPUC-
14 approved archaeologist shall prepare a Data Recovery Field Memo that briefly describes the results of the
15 data and materials recovery. TDS shall submit the Data Recovery Field Memo to the CPUC for review
16 and approval. The CPUC PM will approve or request changes to the Data Recovery Field Memo within
17 seven days of submittal by TDS. Once the CPUC PM has approved the Data Recovery Field Memo, TDS
18 may proceed with construction work in the area of the discovery.
19

20 TDS shall ensure that the CPUC-approved archaeologist prepares a more detailed Data Recovery Report
21 within 90 days of the CPUC's approval of the Data Recovery Field Memo. TDS shall also ensure that the
22 Data Recovery Report includes a thorough discussion of the data recovery efforts, presents the
23 conclusions drawn from the data recovery work, and indicates where materials associated with the data
24 recovery will be curated; it shall also contain the appropriate completed California DPR 523 forms. TDS
25 shall submit the Data Recovery Report to the CPUC for review and approval. Once the CPUC PM
26 approves the Data Recovery Report, TDS shall file the Data Recovery Report and the appropriate
27 completed California DPR 523 forms with the NEIC.
28

29 **MM CUL-4: Conduct Class III cultural resources surveys for unsurveyed work areas.** Prior to
30 construction, TDS shall compare the limits of the proposed areas of disturbance (i.e., where surface
31 disturbance and sub-surface activities will occur) to the portion of the proposed project area for which a
32 Class III Cultural Resources Survey has been prepared (Howell and Copperstone 2017). TDS then shall
33 verify that all proposed areas of disturbance for the proposed project have been surveyed at the Class III
34 Cultural Resources Survey level. TDS shall provide this verification, consisting of a written statement and
35 accompanying project maps, to the CPUC for review and approval. Notification also will be sent as a
36 courtesy to the Wintu.
37

38 If the CPUC PM concurs that the 2014 Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the proposed project
39 (Howell and Copperstone 2017) sufficiently covered the proposed areas of disturbance, TDS may
40 commence construction work as follows:
41

- 42 • If no known resources are located in the areas of disturbance based on the 2014 Class III Cultural
43 Resources Survey, construction-related work for the proposed project can proceed.
- 44 • If known resources or areas of potential archaeological sensitivity are located in the areas of
45 disturbance based on the Class III Cultural Resources Survey, they must be monitored pursuant to
46 MM CUL-2.
- 47 • Any unanticipated cultural resources that are discovered during construction work activities shall
48 be subject to MM CUL-3.
49

50 If the 2014 Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the proposed project does not sufficiently cover the
51 proposed areas of disturbance, TDS shall notify the CPUC of this determination. TDS shall ensure that a

1 CPUC-approved archaeologist conducts a supplemental Class III Cultural Resources Survey of the
2 unsurveyed areas, and TDS shall provide the report documenting the results of the supplemental Class III
3 Cultural Resources Survey to the CPUC for review and approval. Any newly identified resources will be
4 treated similarly to an unanticipated discovery. Those that are not historical resources or unique
5 archaeological resources will be subject to monitoring, as noted in MM CUL-2; for those that may be
6 historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the procedures identified in MM CUL-3 shall be
7 followed. TDS shall not commence construction work until the CPUC PM reviews and approves the
8 results, conclusions, and recommendations of the supplemental Class III Cultural Resources Survey.
9 Copies of the documentation for these activities will be provided to the Wintu.

10 **MM CUL-5: Treatment of Human Remains.** In the event of the discovery or recognition of human
11 remains during construction, including, but not limited to, in the vicinity of the Cloverdale Cemetery, the
12 following steps shall be taken:
13

- 14 • TDS shall ensure that there is no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area
15 reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains while TDS, in consultation with the
16 CPUC PM and the Wintu, contacts the Shasta County Coroner, and the coroner works to
17 determine if the human remains are modern, historic, prehistoric, and/or Native American and to
18 determine whether an investigation of the cause of death is required.
- 19 • Further, pursuant to California PRC Section 5097.98(b), TDS shall ensure that the area containing
20 the discovered or recognized human remains is left in place and free from disturbance until the
21 landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work makes a final decision as to the
22 treatment and disposition of the human remains.
- 23 • For this proposed project, the CPUC considers “the site or any nearby area” to be the 100-foot
24 exclusion area developed for the Cloverdale Cemetery and the 200-foot monitoring area for the
25 Cloverdale Cemetery, within which cultural monitoring of the cemetery is being conducted
26 pursuant to MM CUL-2/3.
- 27 • If the Shasta County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, then the coroner
28 shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the
29 NAHC shall identify the person or persons from which the NAHC believes the deceased to be the
30 “most likely descendent.”
- 31 • The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person
32 responsible for the excavation work by which the human remains were discovered or recognized
33 regarding means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and
34 associated grave goods as provided in California PRC Section 5097.98.

35
36 TDS shall notify the CPUC within 24 hours of receiving notification of the landowner’s, or the person
37 responsible for the excavation work’s, decision for the final treatment or disposition of the human remains
38 and associated grave goods.
39

This page left blank intentionally