

1 VII. CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

5 KEY TERMS

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

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

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

12 **Ethnology.** The study of different societies and cultures.

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

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

18 REGULATORY SETTING

19 Federal

20 National Historic Preservation Act

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

32 American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Native American Graves and Repatriation Act

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

1 Other Federal Legislation

2 Historic preservation legislation was initiated by the Antiquities Act of 1966, which aimed to protect
3 important historic and archaeological sites. It established a system of permits for conducting archaeological
4 studies on Federal land, as well as setting penalties for noncompliance. This permit process controls the
5 disturbance of archaeological sites on Federal land. New permits are currently issued under the
6 Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979. The purpose of ARPA is to enhance preservation
7 and protection of archaeological resources on public and Native American lands. The Historic Sites Act of
8 1935 declared that it is national policy to “Preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of
9 national significance.”

10 State**11 California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)**

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

21 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

22 CEQA requires that lead agencies determine whether projects may have a significant effect on
23 archaeological and historical resources. This determination applies to those resources which meet
24 significance criteria qualifying them as “unique,” “important,” listed on the California Register of Historic
25 Resources (CRHR), or eligible for listing on the CRHR. If the agency determines that a project may have
26 a significant effect on a significant resource, the project is determined to have a significant effect on the
27 environment, and these effects must be addressed. If a cultural resource is found not to be significant under
28 the qualifying criteria, it need not be considered further in the planning process.

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

- 35 • identify cultural resources,
- 36 • evaluate the significance of the cultural resources found,
- 37 • evaluate the effects of the project on cultural resources, and
- 38 • develop and implement measures to mitigate the effects of the project on cultural resources that
39 would be significantly affected.

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

1 State Laws Pertaining to Human Remains

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

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

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

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

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

22 Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes 2004)

23 SB 18, authored by Senator John Burton and signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in
24 September 2004, requires local (city and county) governments to consult with California Native American
25 tribes to aid in the protection of traditional tribal cultural places (“cultural places”) through local land use
26 planning. This legislation, which amended §65040.2, §65092, §65351, §65352, and §65560, and added
27 §65352.3, §653524, and §65562.5 to the Government Code; also requires the Governor’s Office of Planning
28 and Research (OPR) to include in the General Plan Guidelines advice to local governments on how to
29 conduct these consultations. The intent of SB 18 is to provide California Native American tribes an
30 opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage, for the purpose of protecting,
31 or mitigating impacts to, cultural places. These consultation and notice requirements apply to adoption and
32 amendment of both general plans (defined in Government Code §65300 et seq.) and specific plans (defined
33 in Government Code §65450 et seq.).

34 Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014)

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

45

1 Local

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

7 RESOURCE SETTING**8 Prehistory**

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

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

17 The project is located in an interesting area for archeological research because it is between three areas with
18 defined archeological sequences: the Oroville locality to the north, the Central Sierra area to the east and the
19 Central Valley/Delta area to the west. These sequences include many similar artifact types and dates for major
20 cultural changes, but there are also significant differences between them. It is an important goal of archeology
21 to determine how these differences relate to different cultural traditions, cultural adaptation to differing
22 environmental conditions or other natural or cultural influences. It is not clear at present which of these
23 sequences best reflects the prehistory of the project vicinity or if a separate local sequence is necessary to
24 adequately describe the area.

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

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

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

38 Ethnology

39 At the time of the gold rush, the Loomis area was occupied by the Nisenan Indians, identified by the language
40 they spoke. There have been several general treatments of the Nisenan culture by Beals 1933; Kroeber 1929,
41 1953; Littlejohn 1928; and Wilson and Towne 1978, Wilson 1982. There are also several more specific articles

1 on various aspects of their culture as reported in the bibliography and elsewhere. The following text by Norman
2 Wilson, where not cited, is derived from Wilson and Towne 1978 and Wilson 1982.

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

15 In the valley there is also the pattern of major villages controlling land and local groups of Indians. Different
16 than the hills, the land between drainages becomes the separation between districts with the controlling villages
17 situated along the major rivers. *Pujuni* at the mouth of the American River is a good example. There also seems
18 to be a separation of the Valley Nisenan and the Foothill Nisenan near the edge of the valley where the foothills
19 start. The valley peoples were more oriented to the Sacramento, American, Yuba, Feather and the Bear rivers
20 on the valley floor. Their large villages with their complex and rich culture are usually found along these water
21 courses. It is believed that they occupied both sides of the rivers and used the river courses for communication
22 and major resource exploitation. Smaller stream courses were often occupied with permanent villages and
23 seasonal camp sites. They were not large villages, and some may reflect a budding-off of valley peoples as
24 populations expanded in late times.

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

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

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

1 Historic Period Background

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

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

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

16 Very early on, a community began to grow around the Pine Grove House, with mining remaining an
17 important industry with both dry diggings and other placer mining with water from the Bear River Ditch.
18 The community was named for a local resident, Lew G. Smith (*Placer Herald* 17 April 1858; 31 December
19 1859). Smith & Hubble's store was one of the early businesses. Other newspaper articles describe a
20 courthouse, a three-story brick building, hotels, lumber yard, black smith and carpenter shops, a plaza, a
21 theater, and a horse race course (*Placer Herald* 21 August 1858; *Auburn Journal* 6 November 1913). The
22 townsite is shown on early maps about 0.75 miles mile south of the center of the old town of Loomis.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 The population of what became Loomis is a bit difficult to distinguish in the Federal Census records, with
20 the now Town appearing to be located in Township 9. Township 9 as a whole included record of residents
21 that included various subdivisions by towns, with names changing, preventing a good analysis of numbers
22 of different ethnic groups. In 1860, the area of Secret Ravine included a number of individuals born in
23 China, working primarily as placer miners. Ten years later, an area of the Township was distinguished as
24 Pino. Population numbers are much lower, perhaps due to the gold bearing sediments having been worked
25 out by placer mining. Ten of the 61 households in Pino were composed of Chinese men.

26 Again, trying to track Loomis is difficult. In 1880, there were still a number of households comprised of
27 Chinese born men, some working as farm laborers and the majority as miners. Prejudice against Chinese
28 miners began in the late 1840s, even before Statehood, and continued, pushed by labor organizations in
29 California. In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act that excluded immigration from China for
30 ten years; the act was renewed in 1892 and made permanent in 1902. Acts of violence against the Chinese
31 were numerous, and gradually, many moved to more urban areas with established Chinese communities.

32 At the same time, agriculture in California needed workers. In the late 1880s-1890s, immigration from
33 Japan began. There is no 1890 census to review, but the 1900 federal census still shows some Chinese
34 residents, but a number of Japanese born men now lived in the Loomis area, working in agriculture.

35 Eventually, the Japanese also became targeted, and Japanese immigration was slowed to California, with a
36 “Gentlemen’s Agreement”, a series of notes between the nations in 1907-1908, with Japan agreeing to stop
37 issuing passports to Japanese men to come to work as laborers (Daniels 1962:44;1993: 13).

38 The California legislature passed the Alien Land Law in 1913, preventing Japanese Issei (immigrants, first
39 generation) from land ownership. There were loopholes that allowed the land to be placed in the name of
40 their children born in the United States (Nissei) or they could lease the land from white landlords (Takaki
41 1989:203-205).

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 Unfortunately, the fate of Japanese Issei and their children was sealed by the advent of World War II. With
32 unjustified fears about the loyalty of the immigrant Japanese and their American-born children after Pearl
33 Harbor in December 1941, President Roosevelt ordered the internment of the families through Executive
34 Order 9066. Many Loomis residents were placed in camps throughout the war. Specific impacts on different
35 families as a result of this incarceration is a subject deserving much more study—some may have lost their
36 land and possessions in addition to the years unfairly spent in the camps.

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

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

42 Sixty-five cultural resources have been identified within The Town of Loomis General Plan Study Area,
43 according to files maintained by the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical

- 1 Resources Information System (CHRIS). The sixty-five recorded cultural resources represent both the
 2 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/ CA-PLA-297/H	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling features Historic/ Granite quarry	Not Listed
P-31-000618/ CA-PLA-492/H	Not Listed	Historic/ Hotel site, refuse scatter	Bradley House
P-31-000620/ CA-PLA-494	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling features	Not Listed
P-31-000796/ CA-PLA-760H	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Boardman Canal segment
P-31-000845/ CA-PLA-719	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling feature	Not Listed
P-31-000964/ CA-PLA-841H	Not Listed	Historic/ Railroad	Southern Pacific Railroad
P-31-001006/ CA-PLA-880H	Not Listed	Historic/ Mining features	Not Listed
P-31-001208	3342 Humphrey Road	Historic/ House site	Not Listed
P-31-001209	3342 Humphrey Road	Historic/ Outbuilding site	Not Listed
P-31-001211/ CA-PLA-966H	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Red Ravine Canal segment
P-31-001240/ CA-PLA-982H	Not Listed	Historic/ Railroad features	Southern Pacific Railroad
P-31-001293/ CA-PLA-1000H	Not Listed	Historic/ Refuse scatter	Not Listed
P-31-001295/ CA-PLA-1003H	Not Listed	Historic/ Roadway	Lincoln-Victory Highway/ US Highway 40
P-31-001507/ CA-PLA-1172H	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Antelope Canal segment
P-31-001508/ CA-PLA-1173H	Not Listed	Historic/ Rock wall	Not Listed
P-31-001514	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-001515	5373 No Name Lane	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed

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

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
P-31-001516	3300 Humphry Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-001517	3296 Humphrey Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-001524/ CA-PLA-1182H	Not Listed	Historic/ Mining features	Laird Hydraulic Mine
P-31-001525/ CA-PLA-1193H	Not Listed	Historic/ House site	Laird House
P-31-001531/ CA-PLA-1189H	Not Listed	Historic/ House, outbuilding site	Not Listed
P-31-001552/ CA-PLA-1208H	5775 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Railroad depot	Loomis Depot
P-31-001553/ CA-PLA-1209H	5750 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Commercial building	Blue Anchor Fruit Packing Shed
P-31-002466/ CA-PLA-1763H	3241 Taylor Road	Historic/ Commercial building	Alice's Fruit Stand
P-31-003154/ CA-PLA-1271H	Not Listed	Historic/ Water retention feature	Not Listed
P-31-003262	3616 Laird Street	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003263	3621 Laird Street	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003264	3661 Library Drive	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003265	Not Listed	Historic/ Outbuilding	Not Listed
P-31-003266	5913 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Commercial building	Valerie's Gallery
P-31-003267	5907 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003268	5901 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003269	5885 Horseshoe Bar Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-003270	Not Listed	Historic/ Horse trailer	Not Listed
P-31-003271	Not Listed	Historic/ granite blocks, orchard	Not Listed
P-31-003272	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-003273	Not Listed	Historic/ Mining features	Not Listed
P-31-003274	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-003514	Not Listed	Historic/ Isolated artifact	Not Listed
P-31-003515	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Isolated artifact	Not Listed
P-31-003516	Not Listed	Historic/ Fence	Not Listed
P-31-004342	Not Listed	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-005050	7590 Dick Cook Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed

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

Resource #	Address	Period/Type	Name
P-31-005067	3104 Humphrey Road	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-005091	3900 Twin Palms Lane	Historic/ Single family property	Not Listed
P-31-005418	3636 Taylor Road	Historic/ Commercial building	Taco Tree
P-31-005980	5575 Cavitt Stallman Road	Historic/ Ranch complex	Hawk Ranch
P-31-006029	Not Listed	Historic/ House site	Not Listed
P-31-006030	Not Listed	Historic/ House site	Not Listed
P-31-006051/ CA-PLA-2601H	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-006108	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Bedrock milling feature	Not Listed
P-31-006109	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-006110	Not Listed	Historic/ Water conveyance feature	Not Listed
P-31-006111	Not Listed	Historic/ Outbuilding site	Not Listed
P-31-006112	Not Listed	Historic/ Outbuilding site	Not Listed
P-31-006113	5145 James Drive	Historic/ Single family property, outbuildings	Not Listed
P-31-006147	Not Listed	Prehistoric/ Rock art	Not Listed

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
108889	Not listed	1890	Not listed
109407	6731 Horseshoe Bar Road	1900	Not listed
109408	6961 Horseshoe Bar Road	1900	Not listed
109411	6990 Horseshoe Bar Road	Not listed	Not listed

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.nrh.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;

1 and Pamela Cubbler, Treasurer, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe. The letter to Mr. Coney was
2 returned; it was resent on August 28, 2020 to an email address provided on the NAHC list.

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

6 **Paleontology**

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

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

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

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

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

41

References

- Angel, Myron
1882 *History of Placer County, California*. Thompson & West, Oakland.
- Beals, Ralph L.
1933 Ethnology of the Nisenan. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 31(6): 335-413. Berkeley.
- California Bureau of Mines
1917 Mines of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento and Yuba Counties. Reprinted 2014.
- Clark, William B.
1992 *Gold Districts of California*. Bulletin 193. California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento.
- Daniels, Roger
1962 *The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Davis, Leonard M.
1975 The Historic Sacramento-Auburn Road from Miner's Trail to Interstate Freeway. Ms. on file, California State Library.
- Frickstad, Walter N.
1955 A Century of California Post Offices.: 1848-1934. Pacific Rotapress, Oakland.
- Gudde, Erwin G.
1975 *California Gold Camps*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
1969 *California Place Names*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Hoover, Mildred, Hero E. Rensch, Ethel G. Rensch and William N. Abeloe
1970 *Historic Spots in California* (Third Edition). Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Lardner, W.B. and M.J. Brock
1924 *History of Placer and Nevada Counties*. Historic Record Company, Los Angeles.
- Littlejohn, H.W.
1928 Nisenan Geography. Ms. on file, Department of Anthropology Archives, Document 18, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- Loomis Basin Historical Society
2009 *Images of America: Loomis*. Arcadia Books, Charleston, S.C.
- Steele R.J., James P. Bull and F.I. Houston
1861 *Placer County Directory of 1861*. San Francisco. Reprinted by the Placer County Historical Society, 1989. Auburn, CA.
- Takaki, Ronald
1989 *A History of Asian Americans: Strangers from a Different Shore*. Penguin Books, New York.
- Wilson, Norman L.
n.d. Miscellaneous Unpublished Field Notes, Maps and Files. Ms., formerly in Norman Wilson's possession, Auburn.
1982 *The Nisenan*. Phantom Press, Sacramento.
- Wilson, Norman L. and Arlene Towne
1978 Nisenan. In: *Handbook of North American Indians: California*, Volume 8, edited by Robert F. Heizer. William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

Commented [CC1]: Moved to References document in Appendix of Volume III