

---

---

#### 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

---

---

## 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

### **Introduction**

This section of the EIR describes the prehistoric and historic cultural resources known to be located within the Dixon Downs Horse Racetrack and Commercial Development Project area (Proposed Project). Prehistoric resources are those sites and artifacts associated with the indigenous, non-Euroamerican population, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historical resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region. The extent to which development of the Proposed Project could remove, damage, or destroy existing historic or prehistoric resources is evaluated.

Comments received in response to the NOP regarding cultural resources (see Appendix B) include potential impacts to cultural resources. Impacts to unique paleontological resources or geologic features were determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) and will not be further discussed in this section.

Information in this section was obtained from the *City of Dixon Northwest Quadrant Specific Plan (NQSP) Draft EIR (1994)* the Dixon 1993 General Plan, the *Cultural Resources Assessment of the Dixon Northeast Quadrant Annexation (1993)* prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc. as found in the *City of Dixon Northwest Quadrant Specific Plan Technical Appendices*, and a field survey of the project site.

### **Environmental Setting**

The 260-acre project site is located within the NQSP area. The site is located on the lower alluvial plains of the Dudley and Putah Creek drainage ways on the western margin of the Sacramento Valley. According to a records and literature review performed by the Northwest Information Center of the Archeological Sites Inventory at California State University, Sonoma, (September 1991), for the NQSP EIR, no formal cultural resources inventory has been conducted within the Specific Plan area, or in the immediate vicinity and no prehistoric resources recorded.<sup>1</sup> However, the project site is in an area which is inherently difficult to evaluate for potential impacts to prehistoric-era cultural resources because of the disturbance caused by intensive agricultural activities.

The natural water ways and wetland areas in the vicinity of the City of Dixon were once an area of Native American occupation, as evidenced by the recent discovery of a major site with minimal to no surface evidence west of the NQSP area.<sup>2</sup> Archeologically sensitive areas such as old water courses are often now invisible due to the pervasive and intensive grading, plowing and other earthworks conducted for agricultural purposes.

---

1 Northwest Information Center, Records search letter, September 1991.

2 Peak Associates, Inc., Cultural Resources Assessment of the Dixon Northwest Quadrant Assessment of the Dixon Northwest Quadrant Annexation, June 10, 1993, page 4.

A brief review of the area's prehistory background is included below.

## Ethnology

Over four thousand years ago, the Patwin group occupied the lower western half of the Sacramento Valley west of the Sacramento River from the small town of Princeton (north of Colusa along the Sacramento River), south to San Pablo and Suisun Bays.<sup>3</sup> Patwin territory extended approximately 90 miles north to south and 40 miles east to west. The term "Patwin" refers to the people belonging to the many small contiguous independent political entities in this area that shared linguistic and cultural similarities. Distinction is made between the River Patwin who resided in large villages near the Sacramento River, and the Hill Patwin, whose villages were situated in the small valleys along the lower hills of the Vaca Mountains and Coast Range, with concentrations in Long, Indian, Bear, Capay, Cortina, and Napa Valleys. Together, these two groups are classified as southern Wintun and belong to the Penutian language family, as do the languages of Miwok and Costanoan peoples.

Patwin territory included the riverine environment of the tule marshes, vines, and brush near the Sacramento River, the flat grasslands dotted with oak groves, and hills and small valleys of the Coast Ranges. The villages situated on small bluffs near the river were often large, estimated upwards at 1,000 residents at *Korn*, near Colusa. In the hills, the Patwin settled in the small valleys, particularly at Cache and Putah Creeks, where large populations were reported. The plains were least hospitable; there, villages were sparse because of winter flooding and lack of reliable water sources during the dry months. Within a village, the Patwin constructed earth-covered semi-subterranean structures.

Politically, the Patwin were organized in small tribes or tribelets, each consisting of a primary village with satellite villages. Tribelets were autonomous and differed from other such units in minor cultural variations. Dialects might encompass several tribelets. Territories were vaguely defined, but included fishing and gathering areas used by the group. In each village, the leader or chief administered subsistence ventures, such as hunting or gathering, and presided over ceremonies. Social and economic activities were divided among families within a village, with certain families responsible for different specialties such as trapping ducks, collecting salt, making foot drums, or performing particular dances or shamanistic rituals.

## History

Indigenous peoples occupied what is now the Dixon area for many years before the first European settlers arrived. In 1840, the Mexican governor of the territory gave four Mexican leagues in an area then known as the Rancho Los Putos (located in the extreme northern portion of what is now Solano County) to William Wolfskill. By the 1850s traffic between San Francisco and Sacramento through what is now the Dixon area had increased as a result of the Gold Rush.

Development of the area centered on farms and transportation facilities necessary to bring farm products to market. An early settler in the vicinity was Elijah Silvey, who settled on property along the old road from Napa to Sacramento in 1852. He built a house and corral, and established a herd of approximately 100 milk cows, which became a way station on the road. Eventually a trade center named Silveyville developed around the spot. This was short-lived as the whole community was moved five miles east to the line of the railroad upon its construction in 1868. The Silveyville Township persisted until the town

---

3 Peak Associates, Inc., Cultural Resources Assessment of the Dixon Northwest Quadrant Assessment of the Dixon Northwest Quadrant Annexation, June 10, 1993, page 1.

completely disappeared after the establishment of Dixon as the main freight depot in the area. The Silveyville post office was closed in 1871.

The town of Dixon was originally named Dickson after Thomas Dickson who donated 10 acres of land for the town site and freight depot. Possible explanations for the change in spelling of the town's name include an error by the postal service, or the first freight sent to the new depot was labeled Dixon. The original spelling is retained in the name of the creek that borders the town site on the north and east. Dixon grew as a shipping and marketing point for the extensive agricultural industry that developed in Solano County. In 1883, the commercial district suffered a fire, and nine years later a major earthquake.

The project vicinity, being convenient to the new station, went into agricultural production. The 1890 county map shows all the land around Dixon in private ownership, the town limit, indicating agriculture and pasture were the primary land uses.

Within the Dixon city limits there are over 40 residential structures, which were constructed prior to 1900. The City has grown from a population of 1,108 in 1940 to a current population of over 17,179, according to the January 2005 Department of Finance projections.

### **Proposed Project Site**

The Proposed Project site is located in northern Dixon adjacent to I-80. There are no structures located on the site and there are no known prehistoric resources. A large concrete pad, formerly the site of a large farm shed, barn, or farmhouse occupies a small area of the site and residential debris litters this part of the site. A cluster of ornamental, non-native trees and plants to the west of this area also contains some debris and evidence of a former residential structure. Old water courses evident throughout the Specific Plan area indicate potential archaeologically sensitive areas both on the project site and in the project vicinity.

### **Existing Uses**

All of the Proposed Project site is agricultural land in active use (see Section 4.7, Land Use, Planning and Agricultural Resources, for a discussion on existing and planned land uses) with the exception of a small area formerly occupied by structures (see above). Irrigation canals and dirt and gravel roads transverse the site.

### **Regulatory Framework**

Federal, State and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by actions that they undertake or regulate. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are the basic federal and state laws governing preservation of historic and archaeological resources of national, regional, State and/or local significance.

### **Federal Regulations**

Federal regulations for cultural resources are primarily governed by Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, which applies to actions taken by federal agencies. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites, which are determined eligible for listing on the NRHP. The criteria for determining National Register eligibility are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Section 106 of NHPA requires

Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and affords the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Council's implementing regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties," are found in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. The National Register of Historic Places criteria (contained in 36 CFR 60.4) are used to evaluate resources when complying with NHPA Section 106. Those criteria state that eligible resources comprise:

...[D]istricts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that (a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (d) that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

Archaeological site evaluation assesses the potential of each site to meet one or more of the criteria for NRHP eligibility based upon visual surface and subsurface evidence (if available) at each site location, information gathered during the literature and record searches, and the researcher's knowledge of and familiarity with the historic or prehistoric context associated with each site.

The NRHP was established to recognize resources associated with the country's history and heritage. Guidelines for nomination are based on significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture that also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Title 42 United States Code, Section 1996, protects Native American religious practices, ethnic heritage sites, and land uses.

## State Regulations

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both "historical resources" and "unique archaeological resources." Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.1, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on "unique archaeological resources."

"Historical resource" is a term of art with a defined statutory meaning. (See Public Resources Code, § 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.5, subds. (a), (b).) The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be "historical resources" for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Public Resources Code, § 5024.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 4850). Unless a resource listed in a survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource to be potentially eligible for the CRHR.

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the CRHR criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts to historical resources (Public Resources Code, § 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.5, subd. (a)(3)). In general, an historical resource, under this approach, is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- (a) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- (b) Meets any of the following criteria:
  1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
  2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
  3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
  4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.5, subd. (a)(3).) Archaeological resources can sometimes qualify as "historical resources." (*Id.*, subd. (c)(1).) Additionally, Public Resources Code 5024 requires consultation with the Office of Historic Preservation when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

For historic structures, §15064.5(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), shall mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant. Potential eligibility also rests upon the integrity of the resource. Integrity is defined as the retention of the resource's physical identity that existed during its period of significance. Integrity is determined through considering the setting, design, workmanship, materials, location, feeling and association of the resource.

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact "unique archaeological resources." Public Resources Code section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that "'unique archaeological resource' means 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 any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person." (Public Resources Code, § 21083.2, subd. (g).)

Treatment options under §21083.2 of CEQA include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under §21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a “unique archaeological resource”).

Advice on procedures to identify cultural resources, evaluate their importance and estimate potential effects is given in several agency publications such as the series produced by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The technical advice series produced by OPR strongly recommends that Native American concerns and the concerns of other interested persons and corporate entities, including but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associations and societies, be solicited as part of the process of cultural resources inventory. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains.

Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered. The code states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains 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 remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(e) requires that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency to consult with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Senate Bill 18, enacted on March 1, 2005, requires preparation of city and county General Plans include a requirement to consult with Native American tribes for the preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to specified Native American places, features, and objects. SB 18 also requires that if an amendment to a general plan is proposed that Native American tribes be consulted prior to amending the city and/or county general plan, for the purpose of preserving specified places, features, or objects located within that jurisdiction. SB 18 applies to the Dixon Downs project, because the applicant submitted a revised project application after March 1, 2005 (see Office of Planning and Research, “Tribal Consultation Guidelines (Interim)” p. 13 (March 1, 2005)).

### California Historic Register

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) also maintains the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Properties that are listed on the NRHP are automatically listed on the CRHR, along with State Landmarks and Points of Interest. The CRHR can also include properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

## Local Regulations

### City of Dixon General Plan

The Dixon General Plan contains goals and policies related to the protection and maintenance of cultural resources of an area.

#### URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY DESIGN

##### Goals

- To protect, preserve and enhance the significant historic features of the Dixon area to the maximum extent feasible.
- To establish historic areas for the restoration of those structures which are of historic, cultural and/or architectural significance.
- To preserve individual structure of historic value.

##### Policies

13. The City shall promote the preservation of historic buildings and other landmarks that give residents a tie with the past.
15. The City shall consider the establishment of procedures and criteria to coordinate and encourage historic preservation efforts in Dixon.
16. The City shall encourage the use of federal, state and local funds for the restoration of historic structures.
17. The City shall support federal, state and local legislation, which provides incentives for maintaining historic structures.

### Northeast Quadrant Specific Plan

The NQSP, adopted in 1995, includes goals and policies to guide future development within this area of the City. The following Resource Management Policy is applicable to the Proposed Project.

#### 5.9 Resource Management Policies

##### 5.9.8 Historical and Cultural Resources

In the event any previously unidentified historic surface or subsurface archaeological features or deposits are uncovered during construction, work in that immediate vicinity should cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist should be contacted immediately for determination of resource significance. In addition, the State Office of Historic Preservation should be notified.

The NQSP EIR included mitigation measures to address potential impacts to cultural resources. Mitigation Measure C-A is listed below.

- C-A Consult with a qualified archaeologist if buried archaeological deposits are discovered during construction.



**Standards of Significance**

As stated above, impacts to unique paleontological resources or geologic features were determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study (see Appendix A).

For the purposes of this EIR, an impact would be considered significant if the Proposed Project would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in § 21083.2 of CEQA and §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, respectively; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines “substantial adverse change” as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings.

**Methods of Analysis**

A cultural resource evaluation was prepared by Peak & Associates, Inc. in 1993 for the NQSP EIR. As part of this evaluation a records search was completed for the NQSP area, which includes the Proposed Project area, by the California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Information Center (NWIC). NWIC files were searched for information on previous prehistoric and historic surveys and recorded sites for the Specific Plan area and within a 1/4-mile radius to identify and evaluate the potential for the presence of cultural resources. Search of their files included a review of the *National Register of Historic Places*, the *California Register of Historical Resources*, the *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976), the *California Historical Landmarks* (1996), the *California Points of Historical Interest* listing (May 1992 and updates), the *Historic Property Data File* (Office of Historic Preservation current computer list, October 2003), the *Survey of Surveys* (1989), General Land Office (GLO) Plats, and other pertinent historic data available at the NWIC for each specific county.

Information from the 1994 EIR prepared for the NQSP was referenced during preparation of this section.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact 4.4-1</b>	<b>The Proposed Project could disturb or destroy any unidentified subsurface archaeological resources during construction.</b>
Applicable Policies and Regulations	General Plan polices 13, 15-17; California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code 21083.2, 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines 15064.5.
Significance before Mitigation	Phase 1: Potentially Significant Phases 1 and 2: Potentially Significant
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	None
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1: 4.4-1 (a) and (b) Phases 1 and 2: 4.4-1 (a) and (b)
Significance after Mitigation Measures	Phase 1: Less than Significant Phases 1 and 2: Less than Significant

## Phase 1

There are no buildings or structures located on the project site; therefore, there is no potential for built historic resources to be located on the site that could be adversely affected by the project. The NQSP EIR states that there are no reported prehistoric or historic resources within the project site, or in the immediate vicinity of the project area and that no prehistoric resources have been recorded in the project vicinity.<sup>4</sup> However, because the area was known to be occupied by Native Americans there is a possibility subsurface historical resources or unique archaeological resources exist on the project site that could be uncovered during grading, excavation, and other earth-moving activities during construction. If encountered during construction such resources could be damaged or destroyed. This would be considered a *potentially significant impact*.

While the potential impacts associated with construction activities could result in damage or destruction of undiscovered archaeological, paleontological, or prehistoric resources, it is likely that any resource of value would have been previously disturbed due the intensity of agricultural production within the project site over the last 100 years. However, in the event of discovery of resources such as fossils, flakes, projectile points, mortars and pestles, bones, and shells prior to and during construction, mitigation measures below require that a qualified archaeologist be consulted and the applicant would be required to temporarily halt construction and retain a qualified professional to assess the resource and establish a recovery, recordation, and preservation plan for consideration by the City.

In addition, adherence to Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety code would protect any previously unidentified buried human remains. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (a) and (b) requires that any prehistoric or historic subsurface archeological material that is discovered be evaluated by the appropriate individual/group and handled appropriately as described below. Mitigation Measure C-A from the NQSP EIR called for consulting with a qualified archaeologist if buried deposits are found during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 replaces mitigation C-A because it provides more detail if any resources are uncovered and explains how those resources should be handled.

## Phases 1 and 2

Development of Phase 2 would occur after completion of Phase 1. Some or all of the Phase 2 project area would be paved and used as a parking lot as a part of the Phase 1 development. Depending on the extent of grading and excavation that would be necessary to complete the parking lot in Phase 1 verses the extent that would be required to complete the construction of Phase 2, the potential to disturb unknown subsurface resources could exist during implementation of Phase 2. Because of the potential for damage to such resources, this would be considered a *potentially significant impact*.

### Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (a) and (b) requires that any prehistoric or historic subsurface archeological material that is discovered be evaluated by the appropriate individual/group and handled appropriately as described below. In addition, adherence to Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety code would protect any previously unidentified buried human remains.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a *less-than-significant level*.

---

4 Northwest Information Center, Records search letter, September 1991.

4.4-1(a) (Phases 1 and 2)

*In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil (“midden”), that could conceal cultural deposits, animal bone, obsidian and/or mortar are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the City shall be notified. The City shall consult with a qualified archeologist to assess the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), then representatives of the City and the qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action, with the City making the final decision. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist/paleontologist according to current professional standards.*

4.4-1(b) (Phases 1 and 2)

*If a Native American site is discovered, then the evaluation process shall include the following steps.*

*When Native American archaeological, ethnographic, or spiritual resources are involved, all identification and treatment shall be conducted by qualified archaeologists who are either certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or meet the federal standards as stated in the Code of Federal Regulations (36 C.F.R. 61), and Native American representatives who are approved by the local Native American community as scholars of the cultural traditions.*

*In the event that no such Native American is available, persons who represent tribal governments and/or organizations in the locale in which resources could be affected shall be consulted. When historic archaeological sites or historic architectural features are involved, all identified and treatment is to be carried out by historical archaeologists or architectural historians. These individuals shall meet either SOPA or 36 C.F.R. 61 requirements.*

*If human remains are discovered at any project construction sites during any phase of construction, work within 50 feet of the remains shall be suspended immediately, and the City of Dixon Community Development Department and the county coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the county coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The City or the project proponent shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience who shall conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC who responds in a timely manner (i.e., within 24 hours after being notified by NAHC). As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The City will be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation as it deems appropriate, taking account of the provisions of state law, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The City or the project proponent shall implement approved mitigation before the resumption of activities at the site where the remains were discovered.*

## **Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The cumulative analysis for impacts to cultural resources involves a discussion of current and future development projects within the vicinity of the Proposed Project that may add additional impacts when

combined with the impacts associated upon buildout of the City. The cumulative context for the cultural resources analysis for the Proposed Project includes buildout of the City of Dixon and the lower western half of the Sacramento Valley and portions of Solano County.

<b>Impact 4.4-2</b>	<b>The Proposed Project, in combination with surrounding development, could disturb or destroy unidentified subsurface archeological resources during construction pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</b>
Applicable Policies and Regulations	General Plan polices 13, 15-17; California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code 21083.2, 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines 15064.5.
Significance with Policies and Regulations	Phase 1: Potentially Significant Phases 1 and 2: Potentially Significant
Applicable NQSP Mitigation Measures	None
Mitigation Measures	Phase 1: 4.4-2 Phases 1 and 2: 4.4-2
Significance after Mitigation	Phase 1: Less than Significant Phases 1 and 2: Less than Significant

**Phases 1 and 2**

Based upon previous cultural resource surveys and research, communities in the vicinity of Dixon and throughout California, have been inhabited by prehistoric and historic peoples for thousands of years. The Proposed Project, in addition to other development within the City of Dixon and the lower western half of the Sacramento Valley and portions of eastern Solano County could contribute to the loss of significant cultural resources.

Under Phase 1 the potential loss or disturbance to any unidentified subsurface cultural resource was determined to be a significant impact. Because a majority of the site would be disturbed under Phase 1, the future development of Phase 2 would also contribute to the potential loss of any unidentified resources. However, compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would ensure that project-specific impacts to these resources associated with development of Phase 1 or 2 could be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Because all significant cultural resources are unique and non-renewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one archaeological site affects all others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The boundaries of an archaeologically important site extend beyond the property boundaries. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on project or parcel boundaries. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains. In this case, development within the City of Dixon as well as the lower half of western Sacramento County and portions of eastern Solano County could potentially disturb any known or unknown cultural resources. Upon buildout of the City’s General Plan (1993) the City of Dixon is anticipating much of the land within its current boundaries will be developed contributing to the potential loss of subsurface cultural resources. As of 2005, the City includes a total of

3,860 +/- acres. The 260-acre project site represents approximately 40 percent of the 643-acre NQSP area and a small portion of the city and the region as a whole.

Proper planning and appropriate mitigation can help to capture and preserve knowledge of such resources and can provide opportunities for increasing our understanding of the past environmental conditions and cultures by recording data about sites discovered and preserving artifacts found. Federal, State and local laws are also in place, as discussed above, that protect these resources; in addition, compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (a) and (b) would ensure the proper steps are taken in the event any resources are discovered for the proper handling and treatment. However, the project's cumulative contribution would be considerable, resulting in a ***potentially significant cumulative impact***.

#### Mitigation Measures

Compliance with Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (a) and (b) would reduce the severity of the cumulative impact to a *less-than-significant level*.

4.4-2 (Phases 1 and 2)

*Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (a) and (b).*