

VII. CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES CULTRAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

These resources are defined as buildings, sites, structures, or objects that may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance. Preservation of the Town of Loomis Study Area’s cultural heritage should be considered when planning for the future.

~~Section 4. Archaeological Resources, Parks & Recreation~~

Introduction

~~Cultural resources, parks and recreational resources are important to identify and evaluate because they provide a significant measure of the physical quality of life in a community. Not only do they enhance the aesthetic qualities, but how they are managed affects the health of the Town’s environment, and residents’ perceptions and enjoyment of the Town.~~

~~This section identifies information that will be used in the development of policies to manage these resources. In depth information on related topics such as biological resources including water, air, and soil resources is provided in Chapter 3, *Natural Resources*. A detailed assessment of safety issues related to geologic hazards and flooding is provided in Chapter 7, *Safety and Noise Issues*.~~

Archaeological Resources

~~This section summarizes the archaeological resources in the planning area, based on previous reports published for projects throughout the area. It also discusses the potential for discovering paleontological resources (fossils) in the planning area.~~

KEY TERMS

The complete General Plan Glossary can be found in Volume II; however, the following terms are included for reader comprehension.

Archeology. The study of historic or prehistoric peoples and their cultures by analysis of their artifacts and sites.

Complex. A patterned grouping of similar artifact assemblages from two or more sites, presumed to represent an archaeological culture.

Ethnology. The study of different societies and cultures.

Midden. A deposit marking a former habitation site and containing such materials as discarded artifacts, bone and shell fragments, food refuse, charcoal, ash, rock, human remains, structural remnants, and other cultural leavings.

Paleontology. The science of the forms of life existing in former geologic periods, as represented by their fossils.

1 **REGULATORY SETTING**

2 **Federal**

3 **National Historic Preservation Act**

4 Most regulations at the Federal level stem from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and historic
5 preservation legislation such as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended.
6 NHPA established guidelines to “preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national
7 heritage, and to maintain, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and a variety of
8 individual choice.” The NHPA includes regulations specifically for Federal land-holding agencies, but also
9 includes regulations (Section 106) which pertain to all projects that are funded, permitted, or approved by
10 any Federal agency and which have the potential to affect cultural resources. All projects that are subject
11 to NEPA are also subject to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA requirements concerning
12 cultural resources. Provisions of NHPA establish a National Register of Historic Places (The National
13 Register) maintained by the National Park Service, the Advisory Councils on Historic Preservation, State
14 Historic Preservation Offices, and grants-in-aid programs.

15 **American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Native American Graves and Repatriation Act**

16 The American Indian Religious Freedom Act recognizes that Native American religious practices, sacred
17 sites, and sacred objects have not been properly protected under other statutes. It establishes as national
18 policy that traditional practices and beliefs, sites (including right of access), and the use of sacred objects
19 shall be protected and preserved. Additionally, Native American remains are protected by the Native
20 American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1990.

21 **Other Federal Legislation**

22 Historic preservation legislation was initiated by the Antiquities Act of 1966, which aimed to protect
23 important historic and archaeological sites. It established a system of permits for conducting archaeological
24 studies on Federal land, as well as setting penalties for noncompliance. This permit process controls the
25 disturbance of archaeological sites on Federal land. New permits are currently issued under the
26 Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979. The purpose of ARPA is to enhance preservation
27 and protection of archaeological resources on public and Native American lands. The Historic Sites Act of
28 1935 declared that it is national policy to “Preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of
29 national significance.”

30 **State**

31 **California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)**

32 California State law also provides for the protection of cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the
33 significance of prehistoric and historic resources identified in documents prepared pursuant to the California
34 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under CEQA, a cultural resource is considered an important historical
35 resource if it meets any of the criteria found in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Criteria
36 identified in the CEQA Guidelines are similar to those described under the NHPA. The State Historic
37 Preservation Office (SHPO) maintains the CRHR. Historic properties listed, or formally designated for
38 eligibility to be listed, on The National Register are automatically listed on the CRHR. State Landmarks
39 and Points of Interest are also automatically listed. The CRHR can also include properties designated under
40 local preservation ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

41 **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

42 CEQA requires that lead agencies determine whether projects may have a significant effect on
43 archaeological and historical resources. This determination applies to those resources which meet

1 significance criteria qualifying them as “unique,” “important,” listed on the California Register of Historic
2 Resources (CRHR), or eligible for listing on the CRHR. If the agency determines that a project may have
3 a significant effect on a significant resource, the project is determined to have a significant effect on the
4 environment, and these effects must be addressed. If a cultural resource is found not to be significant under
5 the qualifying criteria, it need not be considered further in the planning process.

6 CEQA emphasizes avoidance of archaeological and historical resources as the preferred means of reducing
7 potential significant environmental effects resulting from projects. If avoidance is not feasible, an
8 excavation program or some other form of mitigation must be developed to mitigate the impacts. In order
9 to adequately address the level of potential impacts, and thereby design appropriate mitigation measures,
10 the significance and nature of the cultural resources must be determined. The following are steps typically
11 taken to assess and mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources for the purposes of CEQA:

- 12 • identify cultural resources,
- 13 • evaluate the significance of the cultural resources found,
- 14 • evaluate the effects of the project on cultural resources, and
- 15 • develop and implement measures to mitigate the effects of the project on cultural resources that
16 would be significantly affected.

17 Treatment of paleontological resources under CEQA is generally similar to treatment of cultural resources,
18 requiring evaluation of resources in a project’s area of potential affect, assessment of potential impacts on
19 significant or unique resources, and development of mitigation measures for potentially significant impacts,
20 which may include monitoring combined with data recovery and/or avoidance.

21 **State Laws Pertaining to Human Remains**

22 Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requires that construction or excavation be stopped
23 in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the county coroner can determine whether the remains
24 are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must
25 contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5) specify
26 the procedures to be followed in case of the discovery of human remains on non-Federal land. The
27 disposition of Native American burials falls within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage
28 Commission.

29 Several sections of the California Public Resources Code protect paleontological resources.

30 Section 5097.5 prohibits “knowing and willful” excavation, removal, destruction, injury, and defacement
31 of any “vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints,” on public lands, except where the
32 agency with jurisdiction has granted express permission. “As used in this section, ‘public lands’ means
33 lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the state, or any city, county, district, authority, or public
34 corporation, or any agency thereof.”

35 California Public Resources Code, Section 30244 requires reasonable mitigation for impacts on
36 paleontological resources that occur as a result of development on public lands.

37 The sections of the California Administrative Code relating to the State Division of Beaches and Parks
38 (now Department of Parks and Recreation) afford protection to geologic features and “paleontological
39 materials” but grant the director of the State park system authority to issue permits for specific activities
40 that may result in damage to such resources, if the activities are in the interest of the State Park system and
41 for State Park purposes (California Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 4307–4309).

1 **Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes 2004)**

2 SB 18, authored by Senator John Burton and signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in
3 September 2004, requires local (city and county) governments to consult with California Native American
4 tribes to aid in the protection of traditional tribal cultural places (“cultural places”) through local land use
5 planning. This legislation, which amended §65040.2, §65092, §65351, §65352, and §65560, and added
6 §65352.3, §653524, and §65562.5 to the Government Code; also requires the Governor’s Office of Planning
7 and Research (OPR) to include in the General Plan Guidelines advice to local governments on how to
8 conduct these consultations. The intent of SB 18 is to provide California Native American tribes an
9 opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage, for the purpose of protecting,
10 or mitigating impacts to, cultural places. These consultation and notice requirements apply to adoption and
11 amendment of both general plans (defined in Government Code §65300 et seq.) and specific plans (defined
12 in Government Code §65450 et seq.).

13 **Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014)**

14 Assembly Bill (“AB”) 52 establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes as part of CEQA
15 and equates significant impacts on “tribal cultural resources” with significant environmental impacts (PRC
16 Section 21084.2). AB 52 defines a “California Native American Tribe” as a Native American tribe located
17 in California, and included on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission.
18 AB 52 requires formal consultation with California Native American Tribes prior to determining the level
19 of environmental document if a tribe has requested to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects.
20 AB 52 also requires that the consultation address project alternatives and mitigation measures, for
21 significant effects, if requested by the California Native American Tribe, and that consultation be
22 considered concluded when either the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, or
23 the agency concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

24 **Local**

25 The Town of Loomis General Plan goals and policies can be found in the Conservation of Resources
26 Element (Chapter VII) in General Plan Volume I. The Town’s goals are to preserve and replicate historic
27 areas of town that contribute to the Town’s distinct character and to encourage cultural facilities and events.
28 Policies address historic building revitalization and restoration, expansion of cultural facilities and
29 programs, and protection of archaeological sites.

30 ***Ethnographic Background***

31 **Prehistoric Period**

32 The Loomis planning area is located within the region that was occupied by the Nisenan or
33 Southern Maidu at the time of Euro-American contact. Nisenan territory included the drainages
34 of the Yuba, Bear, Feather, and American Rivers. Their villages were commonly located on ridges
35 or large flats along major streams. The region provided an abundance of resources, which
36 supported numerous villages in the area. However, the discovery of gold and subsequent influx
37 of Euro-Americans in the mid-19th century caused resulted in the near extinction of the native
38 population, culture and language.

39 Nisenan political organization was based on kinship. A community group controlled subsistence
40 resources, such as hunting and fishing grounds and plant gathering areas. Subsistence activities
41 were seasonal, taking advantage of availability of foods. Salmon were caught in rivers and creeks
42 when they ascended shallow stretches. Eels and other fish were caught using nets or soaproot

1 poison. Acorns were the primary staple of Nisenan life. They were harvested in great numbers
2 when plentiful, and stored in large granaries for yearly consumption. In some years when oaks
3 did not produce, buckeyes were processed by leaching.

4 Pits in the granite bedrock were used to process acorns and other plant foods. Therefore, village
5 locations and food processing locales were often associated with granite outcrops and available
6 water. Numerous surveys around the Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville areas have demonstrated
7 this pattern in archaeological remains.

8 The Nisenan built two types of permanent structures, the dwelling and the dance house. While
9 valley people tended to build earth covered houses, in the foothills, the cedar bark house and
10 lean to were more common. These could be covered with deer skins as well as bark slabs. The
11 dance house was an important ceremonial center for Nisenan people. It was used for meetings,
12 dances, and ceremonials. It ranged in size from 35 to 90 feet and was excavated several feet into
13 the earth.

14 Major Nisenan settlements were concentrated along the larger streams where village sites often
15 occupied low hills with a southern exposure. Typically, four to twelve family dwellings measuring
16 ten to twelve feet in diameter would constitute a village. Sweathouses were also prominent.
17 They were formed from poles and deer skins and had medicinal and cleansing purposes. A large
18 dance house and numerous acorn granaries might also be present.

19 **Historic Period**

20 The first historical exploration of the Loomis area was conducted by the Spanish under Gabriel
21 Moraga between 1806 and 1808. The purpose of his expedition was to search for possible
22 mission sites, find any runaway Indians, and to punish those hostile to Spanish rule. Jedediah
23 Smith and his party of fur trappers are credited with next visiting the project vicinity in historic
24 times. In 1827-28, he trapped beaver from camps near Roseville.

25 The 1852 California State Census of Placer County lists 730 Indian residents. Meanwhile, the
26 discovery of gold brought over 10,000 people to Placer County during the 1850s and 1860s. After
27 the gold rush, ranching and farming became the dominant industries of Roseville, Rocklin, and
28 Loomis. Quarries in Rocklin, Loomis, and Penryn areas supplied granite blocks to areas as far
29 away as Honolulu.

30 **Prehistory**

31 Until recent years, few archeological studies have been conducted in this region. Early excavations had focused
32 either on the large, rich village sites in the Delta region and along the major waterways in the Central Valley or
33 on the higher elevation sites in proposed reservoir areas, along major Sierra Nevada waterways. As a result,
34 chronological sequences have been established for each region, with later work emphasizing refinement of
35 these sequences.

36 Increasing urbanization in the Sacramento region over the past twenty years has pushed development further
37 from the major drainages and into the margin of the Sacramento Valley and the Sierra Nevada foothills. There
38 is no established archeological sequence for the region, but the ties seem to be stronger to the Sierra Nevada.

39 The project is located in an interesting area for archeological research because it is between three areas with
40 defined archeological sequences: the Oroville locality to the north, the Central Sierra area to the east and the

1 Central Valley/Delta area to the west. These sequences include many similar artifact types and dates for major
2 cultural changes, but there are also significant differences between them. It is an important goal of archeology
3 to determine how these differences relate to different cultural traditions, cultural adaptation to differing
4 environmental conditions or other natural or cultural influences. It is not clear at present which of these
5 sequences best reflects the prehistory of the project vicinity or if a separate local sequence is necessary to
6 adequately describe the area.

7 An excavation project by Chavez in 1982 on sites on Linda Creek and Strap Ravine corroborated the findings
8 of earlier work that indicated that the strong Central Valley association characteristic of the late prehistoric
9 cultures in the foothill area might not extend to earlier cultures. Although there are many similarities with the
10 material culture of the Late Horizon of the Central Valley, there are also significant points of diversion.

11 It is clear that the most recent prehistoric cultures of the area reflect, in general, the late cultures of the Central
12 Valley, though there are interesting local variations. Some of the differences clearly result from the greater
13 wealth and population in the valley, but other differences may reflect a technological response to differing
14 ecological settings and resource exploitation techniques.

15 In the preceding phase of prehistory there is a consistent expression of high Sierra Nevada and Great Basin
16 relationships of some sort. However, the projectile points that reflect this connection are often produced on
17 material imported from the Coast Ranges, although manufacture on locally available non-obsidian materials is
18 much more common. The reasons for this situation are not clear. This could also be a response to differing
19 ecological settings, but the relationship between foothill sites and the Martis Culture proper is an open question.

20 **Ethnology**

21 At the time of the gold rush, the Loomis area was occupied by the Nisenan Indians, identified by the language
22 they spoke. There have been several general treatments of the Nisenan culture by Beals 1933; Kroeber 1929,
23 1953; Littlejohn 1928; and Wilson and Towne 1978, Wilson 1982. There are also several more specific articles
24 on various aspects of their culture as reported in the bibliography and elsewhere. The following text by Norman
25 Wilson, where not cited, is derived from Wilson and Towne 1978 and Wilson 1982.

26 The Nisenan peoples occupied the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and the American Rivers from the Sacramento
27 River on the west to the summit of the Sierra in the east. The Foothill and Hill Nisenan peoples were distinctive
28 from the Valley Nisenan and were loosely organized into tribelets or districts with large central villages,
29 surrounded by smaller villages. These are often referred to as winter villages by older Indians. These central
30 villages and their leaders seemed to have had power or control over the surrounding smaller villages and camps
31 and specific surrounding territory (Beals 1933; Littlejohn 1928; Wilson and Towne 1978). These districts were
32 oriented to the natural resources and the landforms. In the foothills and mountains, the major drainages became
33 formal or informal boundaries with the land in between forming the district. Thus, the Placerville District is
34 between the Cosumnes River and the Middle Fork of the American River, the Auburn District between the
35 Middle Fork of the American River and the Bear River and the Nevada City District between the Bear River
36 and the Yuba River. There were other villages and headmen in these districts that also held significant power
37 and at the present time it is not clear where most of these were.

38 In the valley there is also the pattern of major villages controlling land and local groups of Indians. Different
39 than the hills, the land between drainages becomes the separation between districts with the controlling villages
40 situated along the major rivers. *Pujuni* at the mouth of the American River is a good example. There also seems
41 to be a separation of the Valley Nisenan and the Foothill Nisenan near the edge of the valley where the foothills
42 start. The valley peoples were more oriented to the Sacramento, American, Yuba, Feather and the Bear rivers
43 on the valley floor. Their large villages with their complex and rich culture are usually found along these water
44 courses. It is believed that they occupied both sides of the rivers and used the river courses for communication
45 and major resource exploitation. Smaller stream courses were often occupied with permanent villages and

1 seasonal camp sites. They were not large villages, and some may reflect a budding-off of valley peoples as
2 populations expanded in late times.

3 All the Nisenan depended on activities attuned to the seasonal ripening of plant foods and the seasonal
4 movements and migration of the animals and the runs of fish. With the flooding of the valley in the winter and
5 spring a great number of animals such as elk, antelope and bears moved to the natural levees along the rivers
6 and up into the lower foothills. Along the foothill margins they joined the resident and migratory deer herds.
7 Huge flocks of waterfowl visited the flooded areas between the rivers and the foothills, coveys of quail gathered
8 in the fall, and pigeons were common in the fall and spring. Steelhead and salmon ran up most of the major
9 streams including Secret Ravine and Auburn Ravine in the fall, winter and spring. The hunting of these plentiful
10 resources was part of the foothill lifeway. This same bounty was available to the river-oriented valley peoples
11 out on the valley floor and along the natural levees of the rivers. There was probably not a great deal of
12 competition for resources at this time except in lean years. Both the valley and foothill peoples lived at the
13 edges of rich ecotones: the rivers and the valley floor; and the valley floor and the foothills.

14 The valley floors between the rivers were not permanently occupied and became seasonal resource bases. In
15 many places the areas between the rivers were shallow overflow basins that flooded in the winter and spring
16 creating great tule forests, ponds and swampy areas, in some areas there were oxbow lakes and other permanent
17 ponds. These were hard to cross until summer and became a major resource base for the valley groups. Often
18 access was made possible by the burning of the tule. These areas were rich with plant and animal resources
19 including herds of deer, elk and grizzly bears, and were exploited by the surrounding Indian people.

20 Two kinds of family houses were made. One was a more permanent winter house (*hu*) with a strong frame and
21 covered with brush, mud or cedar or pine bark. It was partially excavated with an inside hearth and in some
22 cases a portable mortar set into the ground. Sleeping was done around the edges on mats and skins, with benches
23 or shelves to hold equipment and foods (Beals 1933, Wilson n.d.). It was often up to 15 feet in diameter and
24 provided shelter for several persons. These are often associated with the dance house (*kum*), sweat houses, and
25 acorn granaries, and were part of the permanent villages.

26 **Historic Period Background**

27 The early history of the region after the discovery of gold along the American River in January 1848 focuses
28 to the many miners who checked all likely drainages for the presence of gold. Early mining efforts were
29 designed to extract the placer gold from creeks and rivers, by individuals and small groups. After the gold
30 became tougher to find, and the seasonality of mining related to the months when the creeks carried water
31 from rainfall and snow melt, the control of water sources became an important issues, and corporate
32 enterprises that built dams and excavated ditches that extended the mining to the entire year, took over
33 control of much of the mining in the region. Corporate interests could also create larger mining enterprises,
34 hiring workers at an hourly or daily rate.

35 The gold in the region lay in the gravels and earth: this area is not one in which hard rock deposits are
36 present. All gold mining operations undertaken were forms of placer mining.

37 The early mining in the region as well as the need for overnight lodgings for both individuals and for
38 freighting teams pulling loads of goods from the riverfront in Sacramento led to the development of Pine
39 Grove House, an early inn along Secret Ravine. The freighting teams were important in providing supplies
40 to the many small towns and camps that grew up rapidly in the mining areas.

41 Very early on, a community began to grow around the Pine Grove House, with mining remaining an
42 important industry with both dry diggings and other placer mining with water from the Bear River Ditch.
43 The community was named for a local resident, Lew G. Smith (*Placer Herald* 17 April 1858; 31 December
44 1859). Smith & Hubble's store was one of the early businesses. Other newspaper articles describe a

1 courthouse, a three-story brick building, hotels, lumber yard, black smith and carpenter shops, a plaza, a
2 theater, and a horse race course (*Placer Herald* 21 August 1858; *Auburn Journal* 6 November 1913). The
3 townsite is shown on early maps about 0.75 miles mile south of the center of the old town of Loomis.

4 With many individual miners failing to strike it rich after the best claims were taken up by others or rapidly
5 worked out, the new Californians soon recognized the agricultural value of the landscape. Many of the early
6 agricultural efforts involved grain crops and grazing cattle and sheep. The livestock pursuits were limited
7 by the climate, with the natural grasses and browse drying up by mid to late spring. The ranchers needed to
8 acquire acreage in the mountains, and drive their herds to the verdant pastures of the Sierra Nevada,
9 returning to the home ranch in the fall when grass began to re-grow when the rains started again. This
10 seasonal practice of transhumance is an ancient practice, still used in California and throughout other
11 countries to take advantage of seasonal resources.

12 The early development of water systems led to permanent settlement, and ranchers situated near the
13 drainages and mining ditches could move into different types of agriculture, planting orchards in many
14 regions. The Loomis Basin proved especially fertile for orchards and vineyards. An 1890 newspaper story
15 presented the order of the popularity of various farm products: peach, cherries, pears, apricots, apples,
16 plums, prunes, table grapes, wine grapes, olives, orange, fig, small berries and vegetables (*Placer Argus* 25
17 January 1890).

18 In addition, the Placer Citrus Colony to the north of the Town, established in 1888 by J. Parker Whitney,
19 the first agricultural colony in Placer County. Lands were divided into blocks of ten, twenty, forty and
20 eighty acres, leading to the division of the lands now comprising the town into similar tracts (*Sacramento*
21 *Daily Union* 12 January 1891).

22 The construction of the Central Pacific Railroad brought many changes to the region. This section was
23 completed in the early 1860s, with the head of freighting moving further eastward as new sections were
24 completed. The railroad provided expanded markets for the fruits and vegetables grown in the region,
25 shipping from Pino Station in town.

26 The 1893 birds-eye view of Newcastle includes views of the overall landscape including what lands are
27 included in the Town of Loomis. There is a small concentration of buildings on both sides of the railroad
28 tracks, but the other lands have scattered ranches with orchards.

29 Another industry that expanded in the project area is granite quarrying. Penryn and Rocklin had established
30 quarries. In the mid-1870s, a new quarry was established on the ranch of J. Turner as the Smithville Quarry
31 (*Placer Herald* 22 December 1877). A list of several other quarry names in the Loomis Area include
32 Carlow, Grant, Healy and Cook quarries (Loomis Basin Historical Society 2009).

33 Initially, the post office in the area was called “Placer”, established in 1861. The name of the post office at
34 Pine Grove was officially changed to Smithville in March of 1862 (*Sonoma Democrat* 6 March 1862).
35 Smithville was discontinued in 1869, moving to “Pino.”

36 The name Pino was used until 1890 (Frickstad 1955). The railroad station was Pino Station; the railroad
37 and express office were called Loomis and the school district was Smithville. In 1890, the postmaster had
38 the name officially changed to Loomis, with the Board of Supervisors renaming the school district at the
39 same time (*Sacramento Daily Union* 12 June 1890; *Placer Herald* 19 July 1890).

40 Mining continued in the region in phases, with new technologies adopted over time. One such mine was
41 the Laird Hydraulic mine. As with many hydraulic pit mines, it was worked in the 1870s-1890s, and the
42 mine opened again in 1909. A final phase appears to have occurred in the 1930s, with dredge mining
43 undertaken in the Depression years, in about 1935.

1 By 1900, much of the land in the northern portion of the study area had been divided into smaller ten-acre
2 parcels, with a number of parcels owned by Sacramento residents (Map of the Citrus Colony 1900). They
3 may have been holding the land as an investment for later sale or had tenants working the land.

4 With the intensity of fruit production in the region, fruit packing became an important industry. Harvested
5 goods could be shipped westward to Sacramento or the Bay Area, or eastward to markets in the Midwest
6 or in the eastern states. By 1913, Pacific Gas and Electric Company had completed many parts of their
7 system, using waters from the high Sierra, stored seasonally in reservoirs, could be delivered to through the
8 associated ditch system to allow most acreage to be cultivated. In 1913, there were six fruit shipping firms
9 in Loomis: Producer's Fruit Co., Law Bros., Earl Fruit Company, Rowell Fruit Company, and The Loomis
10 Fruit Growers' Association. (Auburn Journal 6 November 1913).

11 At the same time, the booming economy resulted in a number of new residences in the Town and the country
12 around the town. The town could also boast about good schools, lodges, churches, and a great place to raise
13 a family (Auburn Journal 6 November 1913).

14 The Loomis Fruit Growers Association was established in 1901 to provide fruit packing and transport
15 services for local fruit ranchers. A group of progressive farmers started the Bank of Loomis in 1915,
16 and by the 1920s Loomis had become the second-largest fruit-shipping station in the County, after
17 Newcastle.

18 A large fire destroyed most of the downtown business core in 1915. By the early 1920s, almost every
19 destroyed building in Loomis had been rebuilt with brick, concrete or tile, including the Town's bank,
20 veterinary stables, fruit-shipping warehouse, butcher shop and community churches. Outside of the
21 downtown core, large orchards of budded and grafted fruit stock still spanned the countryside.

22 A former resident who became a significant person in California history is William Dana Perkins. Perkins,
23 as a young man, owned Pine Grove House in 1860, and became a land agent for the Central Pacific Railroad.
24 In later years, he lived in Rocklin and became appointed the State Librarian.

25 With the active industries, many members of different ethnic groups began to settle in the Loomis area,
26 with additional family and neighbors migrating to the region. The 1920 Federal Census for Township 9, the
27 larger area that includes the current study area, had a number of Japanese, Finnish, Spanish, and Indian
28 residents, many of whom worked on fruit farms. The establishment of supporting community features such
29 as the Japanese churches, dating to 1911, and a store in Loomis also opened to provide cultural amenities
30 and social support for the newer residents (<http://japantownatlas.com/map-placer.html>).

31 The Town of Loomis incorporated in 1984, including adjacent unincorporated lands of Placer County. It
32 remains a small town with surrounding larger acreage in part in agricultural use, and unlike its neighbors
33 Rocklin and Lincoln, has not grown exponentially with residential subdivisions and supporting commercial
34 enterprises in the last 35 to 40 years.

Known Archaeological Resources

36 The planning area was included in an overall resources survey conducted by Placer County in
37 the early 1990s. A comprehensive records search conducted at the North Central Information
38 Center of the California Archaeological Inventory at CSU Sacramento in early 1992 showed 634
39 recorded prehistoric and historic sites countywide. Of this number, 52 were recorded in the
40 general vicinity of the planning area, including the upstream areas toward Penryn and Newcastle
41 (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR*, 1993). The sites included 6
42 prehistoric villages with surface artifacts and bedrock mortars. Most other sites also included

1 bedrock mortars. Historical sites in the area are generally associated with 19th-century mining
2 operations, and include ditches, foundations, and mining equipment.

3 While the number of recorded sites appears impressive, it is estimated that less than 5 percent
4 of the general area has been surveyed. Consequently, the potential for finding other
5 archaeological resources in the area is very high, particularly in the types of areas where such
6 resources have already been found near streams or springs, in open fields, on ridges, and on or
7 near granite outcrops. According to the Placer County Department of Museums, the probability
8 of prehistoric sites being found on any given parcel is moderate to high (Placer County,
9 *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan EIR, 1993*).

10 Given this, it is interesting that recent cultural resources surveys prepared within Loomis have
11 found relatively few archaeological sites. A survey of an undeveloped 322-acre site north of
12 Wells Avenue found no sites in spite of the presence of many rock outcroppings, a conclusion
13 the report's author found "surprising" (Town of Loomis, *Loomis Hills Draft EIR, 1998*). No sites
14 were found for surveys associated with other recent projects, including the Town of Loomis
15 Specific Plan (1988), a proposed elementary school near No Name Lane (1994), and the Loomis
16 Ranch subdivision southeast of the intersection of English Colony Road and Sierra College
17 Boulevard (1997). The 1986 survey for the 105-acre St. Francis Woods project (southeast of the
18 Rocklin Road/Barton Road intersection) found a single prehistoric milling station, but noted
19 several nearby sites just outside the project area. Other recent development proposals, such as
20 the one for the 22-acre Heritage Park Estates project, dismissed potential impacts to cultural
21 resources in the Initial Study for the EIR.

22 **Cultural Resources in the Town of Loomis**

23 Sixty-five cultural resources have been identified within The Town of Loomis General Plan Study Area,
24 according to files maintained by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical
25 Resources Information System (CHRIS). The sixty-five recorded cultural resources represent both the
26 prehistoric and historic periods (see Table 1).

TABLE 1: RESOURCES LISTED WITH THE NORTH CENTRAL INFORMATION CENTER, CHRIS

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
P-31-000094	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Isolated artifact	Not Listed
P-31-000122	6201 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ House site	Not Listed
P-31-000123/ CA-PLA-807H	6262 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ House/outbuilding site	Not Listed
P-31-000124/ CA-PLA-808H	6262 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Granite foundation	Not Listed
P-31-000125/ CA-PLA-809	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling feature	Not Listed
P-31-000126/ CA-PLA-810/H	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling feature Historic/ Mining features, refuse scatter	Not Listed
P-31-000179/ CA-PLA-153	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling features, lithic scatter	Not Listed
P-31-000423/	Not Listed	Prehistoric/	Not Listed

TABLE 1: RESOURCES LISTED WITH THE NORTH CENTRAL INFORMATION CENTER, CHRIS

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
<u>CA-PLA-297/H</u>		<u>Bedrock milling features</u> <u>Historic/</u> <u>Granite quarry</u>	
<u>P-31-000618/</u> <u>CA-PLA-492/H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Hotel site, refuse scatter</u>	<u>Bradley House</u>
<u>P-31-000620/</u> <u>CA-PLA-494</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Prehistoric/</u> <u>Bedrock milling features</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-000796/</u> <u>CA-PLA-760H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Boardman Canal segment</u>
<u>P-31-000845/</u> <u>CA-PLA-719</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Prehistoric/</u> <u>Bedrock milling feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-000964/</u> <u>CA-PLA-841H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Railroad</u>	<u>Southern Pacific Railroad</u>
<u>P-31-001006/</u> <u>CA-PLA-880H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Mining features</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001208</u>	<u>3342 Humphrey Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>House site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001209</u>	<u>3342 Humphrey Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Outbuilding site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001211/</u> <u>CA-PLA-966H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Red Ravine Canal segment</u>
<u>P-31-001240/</u> <u>CA-PLA-982H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Railroad features</u>	<u>Southern Pacific Railroad</u>
<u>P-31-001293/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1000H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Refuse scatter</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001295/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1003H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Roadway</u>	<u>Lincoln-Victory Highway/</u> <u>US Highway 40</u>
<u>P-31-001507/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1172H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Antelope Canal segment</u>
<u>P-31-001508/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1173H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Rock wall</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001514</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001515</u>	<u>5373 No Name Lane</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001516</u>	<u>3300 Humphry Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001517</u>	<u>3296 Humphrey Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001524/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1182H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Mining features</u>	<u>Laird Hydraulic Mine</u>
<u>P-31-001525/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1193H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>House site</u>	<u>Laird House</u>
<u>P-31-001531/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1189H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>House, outbuilding site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-001552/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1208H</u>	<u>5775 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Railroad depot</u>	<u>Loomis Depot</u>
<u>P-31-001553/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1209H</u>	<u>5750 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Commercial building</u>	<u>Blue Anchor Fruit Packing</u> <u>Shed</u>
<u>P-31-002466/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1763H</u>	<u>3241 Taylor Road</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Commercial building</u>	<u>Alice's Fruit Stand</u>
<u>P-31-003154/</u> <u>CA-PLA-1271H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Water retention feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003262</u>	<u>3616 Laird Street</u>	<u>Historic/</u> <u>Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>

TABLE 1: RESOURCES LISTED WITH THE NORTH CENTRAL INFORMATION CENTER, CHRIS

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
<u>P-31-003263</u>	<u>3621 Laird Street</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003264</u>	<u>3661 Library Drive</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003265</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Outbuilding</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003266</u>	<u>5913 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Commercial building</u>	<u>Valerie's Gallery</u>
<u>P-31-003267</u>	<u>5907 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003268</u>	<u>5901 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003269</u>	<u>5885 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003270</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Horse trailer</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003271</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ granite blocks, orchard</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003272</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003273</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Mining features</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003274</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003514</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Isolated artifact</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003515</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Prehistoric/ Isolated artifact</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-003516</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Fence</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-004342</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-005050</u>	<u>7590 Dick Cook Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-005067</u>	<u>3104 Humphrey Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-005091</u>	<u>3900 Twin Palms Lane</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-005418</u>	<u>3636 Taylor Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Commercial building</u>	<u>Taco Tree</u>
<u>P-31-005980</u>	<u>5575 Cavitt Stallman Road</u>	<u>Historic/ Ranch complex</u>	<u>Hawk Ranch</u>
<u>P-31-006029</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ House site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006030</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ House site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006051/ CA-PLA-2601H</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006108</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006109</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006110</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Water conveyance feature</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006111</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Outbuilding site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>

TABLE 1: RESOURCES LISTED WITH THE NORTH CENTRAL INFORMATION CENTER, CHRIS

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
<u>P-31-006112</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Historic/ Outbuilding site</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006113</u>	<u>5145 James Drive</u>	<u>Historic/ Single family property, outbuildings</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>
<u>P-31-006147</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>	<u>Prehistoric/ Rock art</u>	<u>Not Listed</u>

1 SOURCE: NORTH CENTRAL INFORMATION CENTER, CHRIS, FILES

2 Four buildings within The Town of Loomis General Plan Study Area are identified on the Placer County
 3 Built Environment Resource Directory but are not included in the list of resources provided by NCIC (Table
 4 1). The four buildings are listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2: BUILT ENVIRONMENT RESOURCE DIRECTORY – TOWN OF LOOMIS GENERAL PLAN STUDY AREA

Property #	Address	Year Built	Name
<u>108889</u>	<u>Not listed</u>	<u>1890</u>	<u>Not listed</u>
<u>109407</u>	<u>6731 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>Not listed</u>
<u>109408</u>	<u>6961 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>Not listed</u>
<u>109411</u>	<u>6990 Horseshoe Bar Road</u>	<u>Not listed</u>	<u>Not listed</u>

5 SOURCE: PLACER COUNTY BUILT ENVIRONMENT RESOURCE DIRECTORY

6 There are no properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places within the Town of Loomis
 7 General Plan Study Area (www.nrhp.gov).

8 **Consultation**

9 A check of the Sacred Lands files was made through the Native American Heritage Commission on August
 10 13, 2020. The NAHC identified contacts for the Loomis area, and letters dated August 17, 2020 were sent
 11 on August 18, 2020 to Grayson Coney, Cultural Director, Tsi Akim Maidu; Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson,
 12 United Auburn Indian Community; Clyde Prout, Chairperson, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe;
 13 and Pamela Cubbler, Treasurer, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe. The letter to Mr. Coney was
 14 returned; it was resent on August 28, 2020 to an email address provided on the NAHC list.

15 A letter and map of the City boundaries was sent on May 15, 2020 to the Loomis Basin Historical Society
 16 requesting information on their concerns. A second letter was sent to the group on August 27, 2020. No
 17 reply has been received to date from the group.

18 **Paleontology**

19 Among the natural resources deserving conservation and preservation, and possibly existing within the
 20 Town of Loomis General Plan study area, are the often-unseen records of past life buried in the sediments
 21 and rocks below the pavement, buildings, soils, and vegetation which now cover most of the area. Fossils
 22 constitute a non-renewable resource: Once lost or destroyed, the exact information they contained can never
 23 be reproduced.

24 Paleontology is the science that attempts to unravel the meaning of these fossils in terms of the organisms
 25 they represent, the ages and geographic distribution of those organisms, how they interacted in ancient
 26 ecosystems and responded to past climatic changes, and the changes through time of all of these aspects.

1 The sensitivity of a given area or body of sediment with respect to paleontological resources is a function
2 of both the potential for the existence of fossils and the predicted significance of any fossils which may be
3 found there. The primary consideration in the determination of paleontological sensitivity of a given area,
4 body of sediment, or rock formation is its potential to include fossils. Information that can contribute to
5 assessment of this potential includes: 1) direct observation of fossils within the project area; 2) the existence
6 of known fossil localities or documented absence of fossils in the same geologic unit (e.g., "Formation" or
7 one of its subunits); 3) descriptive nature of sedimentary deposits (such as size of included particles or
8 clasts, color, and bedding type) in the area of interest compared with those of similar deposits known
9 elsewhere to favor or disfavor inclusion of fossils; and 4) interpretation of sediment details and known
10 geologic history of the sedimentary body of interest in terms of the ancient environments in which they
11 were deposited, followed by assessment of the favorability of those environments for the preservation of
12 fossils.

13 The most general paleontological information can be obtained from geologic maps, but geologic cross
14 sections (slices of the layer cake to view the third dimension) must be reviewed for each area in question.
15 These usually accompany geologic maps or technical reports. Once it can be determined which formations
16 may be present in the subsurface, the question of paleontological resources must be addressed. Even though
17 a formation is known to contain fossils, they are not usually distributed uniformly throughout the many
18 square miles the formation may cover. If the fossils were part of a bay environment when they died, perhaps
19 a scattered layer of shells will be preserved over large areas. If on the other hand, a whale died in this bay,
20 you might expect to find fossil whalebone only in one small area of less than a few hundred square feet.
21 Other resources to be considered in the determination of paleontological potential are regional geologic
22 reports, site records on file with paleontological repositories and site-specific field surveys.

23 Paleontologists consider all vertebrate fossils to be of significance. Fossils of other types are considered
24 significant if they represent a new record, new species, an oldest occurring species, the most complete
25 specimen of its kind, a rare species worldwide, or a species helpful in the dating of formations. However,
26 even a previously designated low potential site may yield significant fossils.

27 ***Paleontology***

28 ~~The geology of the planning area includes Cenozoic-era sedimentary rock formations, which~~
29 ~~potentially contain fossils. However, the expected abundance and kinds of fossils varies~~
30 ~~widely from place to place, according to the underlying geologic rock unit.~~

31 ~~The foothills of the Sierra Nevada are of particular interest to paleontologists because the~~
32 ~~area was once at or near the shoreline of an ancient sea that occupied the Central Valley. Sea~~
33 ~~level fluctuations caused alternating deposition of marine and non-marine sediments,~~
34 ~~creating conditions favorable for preserving fossils.~~

35 ~~All but the youngest geologic formations have been tilted upward by the rise of the Sierra~~
36 ~~Nevada. Gradual long-term erosion has removed parts of these formations, exposing rocks~~
37 ~~that may contain fossils. In some places, such rocks may be overlaid by a thin layer of recently~~
38 ~~deposited sediment or soil.~~

39 ~~The areas with the greatest potential to contain fossils are those underlain by Mehrten~~
40 ~~conglomerate; low-lying areas south of Horseshoe Bar Road are also considered highly~~
41 ~~sensitive (Placer County, *Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Draft Community Plan EIR*, 1993). For a more~~
42 ~~detailed description of the geology of the area, please refer to *Soils and Mineral Resources*~~
43 ~~discussion in Section 3.~~

References

- 1 **References**
- 2
- 3 Angel, Myron
- 4 1882 *History of Placer County, California.* Thompson & West, Oakland.
- 5 Beals, Ralph L.
- 6 1933 *Ethnology of the Nisenan. University of California Publications in American Archaeology*
- 7 *and Ethnology* 31(6): 335-413. Berkeley.
- 8 California Bureau of Mines
- 9 1917 *Mines of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento and Yuba Counties.* Reprinted 2014.
- 10 Clark, William B.
- 11 1992 *Gold Districts of California.* Bulletin 193. California Division of Mines and Geology,
- 12 Sacramento.
- 13 Davis, Leonard M.
- 14 1975 *The Historic Sacramento-Auburn Road from Miner's Trail to Interstate Freeway.* Ms. on
- 15 file, California State Library.
- 16 Frickstad, Walter N.
- 17 1955 *A Century of California Post Offices.: 1848-1934.* Pacific Rotapress, Oakland.
- 18 Gudde, Erwin G.
- 19 1975 *California Gold Camps.* University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 20 1969 *California Place Names.* University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 21 Hoover, Mildred, Hero E. Rensch, Ethel G. Rensch and William N. Abeloe
- 22 1970 *Historic Spots in California* (Third Edition). Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- 23 Lardner, W.B. and M.J. Brock
- 24 1924 *History of Placer and Nevada Counties.* Historic Record Company, Los Angeles.
- 25 Littlejohn, H.W.
- 26 1928 *Nisenan Geography.* Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology Archives, Document 18,
- 27 Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- 28 Loomis Basin Historical Society
- 29 2009 *Images of America: Loomis.* Arcadia Books, Charleston, S.C.
- 30 Steele R.J., James P. Bull and F.I. Houston
- 31 1861 *Placer County Directory of 1861.* San Francisco. Reprinted by the Placer County
- 32 Historical Society, 1989. Auburn, CA.
- 33 Takaki, Ronal
- 34 1989 *A History of Asian Americans: Strangers from a Different Shore.* Penguin Books, New
- 35 York.
- 36 Wilson, Norman L.
- 37 n.d. *Miscellaneous Unpublished Field Notes, Maps and Files.* Ms., formerly in Norman Wilson's
- 38 possession, Auburn.
- 39 1982 *The Nisenan.* Phantom Press, Sacramento.
- 40 Wilson, Norman L. and Arlene Towne
- 41 1978 *Nisenan.* In: *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, Volume 8, edited by Robert
- 42 F. Heizer. William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
- 43