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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc. (Far Western) conducted cultural resources studies in support of a general plan amendment and rezoning of the proposed Stonegate Vesting Tentative Subdivision in southeast Chico, Butte County, California. The proposed project will rezone four vacant parcels, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 002-190-041 and 018-510-007, -008, and -009 to include open space, public right-of-way, a park, single- and multi-family residential homes, and commercial buildings. The project requires a permit from the City of Chico and may also require a 404 permit from the US Army, Corps of Engineers.

A records search showed that eight previous studies and two previously recorded resources overlap with the project Area of Potential Effects (APE). A pedestrian survey of the APE at 15- to 20-meter intervals was undertaken on August 2–3, 2016. Surface visibility was poor, ranging from about 10% to 20%. Both previously recorded sites were re-located and two new historic-era cultural resources (the Crouch Ditch and a series of mine tailings) and one new prehistoric isolate (a single flake) were identified within the APE. The Native American Heritage Commission and interested Native American parties were contacted, but no additional resources or areas of concern were identified. Far Western also contacted the Butte County Historical Society but has not received a reply to date.

The two previously recorded resources ("rock wall" and building foundation) were recommended ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register; Jensen and Associates 1992), although it appears that no formal testing was carried out at that time. It is worth noting that "rock walls" (more accurately described as fences) are called out in the City of Chico’s General Plan as features of local significance. We recommend, therefore, that impacts to these resources be avoided during project planning and implementation, or that they be more-formally evaluated. Incorporation of the stone fences into open space or a park, along with public interpretation, might serve as avoidance while also helping to mitigate project impacts to the parcel as a whole.

Archival research for the newly identified resources suggests that the Crouch Ditch is associated with the development of agriculture in Butte County and with the Crouch family, early pioneers in the county. It therefore appears to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources under Criteria 1 and 2 at the local level of significance, but not at the state or national level. It does not appear to meet the criterion for inclusion on the National Register. We further conclude that the recordation and archival research presented in this study serve to mitigate any project impacts to the section of the resource within the project area of potential effect.

As for the mine tailings, an extended metal detector survey conducted on February 11, 2017, indicated that the tailings are part of a larger mining landscape that includes a late nineteenth-early twentieth-century artifact concentration, a possible privy pit, several sediment piles, and additional rock piles. As most of the artifacts were below the surface (found by the metal detector), it is likely that the scatter is larger and/or more dense than what is shown on the current site map; for this reason, a formal site evaluation is recommended if the site will be subject to project impacts. Alternatively, eligibility could be assumed for the purposes of the project, with the stipulation that mitigation (data recovery) would take place at the site before any project impacts occurred.
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I – INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., (Far Western) conducted cultural resource studies for the proposed general plan amendment and rezoning of the Stonegate Vesting Tentative Subdivision in Butte County, California (Figures 1 and 2). The proposed project will rezone four vacant parcels, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) 002-190-041 and 018-510-007, -008, and -009 to include open space, public right-of-way, park space, single-family residential and multi-family residential, and commercial uses.

This project is privately funded but requires permitting from the City of Chico; it therefore falls under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project also may be subject to a future Section 404 permit application with the US Army Corps of Engineers, which will require compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This study has consequently been designed to meet requirements of both CEQA and Section 106.

This report details efforts by Far Western to identify and assess cultural resources in the project area. These efforts included an archival records search at the Northeast Information Center at California State University, Chico, and on-line research of historical maps and land records (https://glorecords.blm.gov/default.aspx; https://nationalmap.gov/historical/; http://archives.csuchico.edu/cdm/landingpage/collection/coll28); a buried site sensitivity analysis, Native American and Historical Society consultation; and an intensive pedestrian survey and partial metal detector survey.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Chico Community Development Department – Planning Division (City) requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report in support of a general plan amendment and rezoning for the Epick Homes proposed Stonegate subdivision in southeastern Chico. The 302-acre project site includes four vacant parcels that would be rezoned to include open space, public right-of-way, a park, single-family residential standard and half-acre lots, multi-family residential lots, and commercial use. Parcels in the Project area are currently vacant, undeveloped land. This land was historically open grazing land but has not been used within the last 25 years.

Project objectives include the subdivision of the property, construction of infrastructure, preservation of 108.2 acres of open space for the maintenance of biological resources (including the Butte Creek Diversion Channel and riparian habitat), provision of a significant number of residential units to help meet the City’s need for housing, provision of community commercial areas, and provision of revenue to local businesses during project construction (City of Chico 2016).

PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located in the southeastern section of the city of Chico, in Butte County, California. This area lies at the northeastern edge of the Sacramento Valley, approximately 90 miles north of Sacramento and 80 miles south of Redding. The project area is approximately two miles east of State Highway 99 and a half-mile south of State Highway 32, along both sides of Bruce Road between East 20th Street and Skyway Road. It incorporates Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 002-190-041, which is 48.05 acres, 018-510-007 at 97.73 acres, 018-510-008 at 102.62 acres, and 018-510-009 at 53.69 acres.
Figure 1. Project Vicinity.
Figure 2. Project Location.
AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) includes all areas that may be subject to ground disturbance as a result of the proposed project (Figure 3). These include the complete footprint of the proposed Stonegate Subdivision, as depicted in the Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report (City of Chico 2016). Vertical impacts are not currently defined, but they will likely include excavations for building foundations, installation of utilities, and roadbed construction; as such, the study also includes an assessment of the potential for buried resources.
Figure 3. Area of Potential Effects.
II – BACKGROUND (with Adrian R. Whitaker)

The project area is situated in the northeastern edge of the Sacramento Valley, between Big Chico Creek and Butte Creek drainages, and along Little Chico Creek. This area was the ethnographic home of the Konkow at Contact. In this section, we detail the natural setting of the project area, ethnography of the pre-European occupants of Butte County, the prehistoric record of the region, and post-contact history. Environmental and cultural backgrounds are excerpted and adapted from Meyer and Rosenthal’s (2008) *A Geoarchaeological Overview and Assessment of Caltrans District 3*.

ENVIRONMENT

The study parcels are situated in the northern end of the Sacramento Valley, which is the northern portion of the Great Central Valley drained by Sacramento River. The Sacramento Valley is bounded on the east by the Sierra Nevada Mountains, on the west by the Coast Ranges, the Siskiyou Ranges to the north, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to the south. The principal feature of the valley is the Sacramento River flowing southeast for about 240 kilometers (149 miles) along the valley axis until it merges with San Joaquin River to form the Delta before draining into San Francisco Bay. The Sacramento River is fed by several tributaries; the American and Feather rivers are among the largest. The level valley floor is underlain by alluvial sediments up to 17 meters (55.8 feet) thick, derived mostly from sierra streams.

Non-tidal marshlands in the Sacramento Valley formed a continuous strip along the Sacramento River to approximately the modern town of Willows (Bay Institute 1998:2–39; Küchler 1977). Extensive tule marshes were also found in the natural flood basins which occupied much of the lower valley between the narrow river levees and mountain-front alluvial fans (Bay Institute 1998; Küchler 1977). Combined, these marshlands are estimated to have once covered some 300,000 acres (Bay Institute 1998).

In addition to the Sacramento River, all of the major watercourses draining the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Range, including the Cosumnes, American, Yuba, and Feather rivers, were largely or partially flanked by broad gallery forests. Modern estimates suggest that as much as 364,000 acres of the Sacramento Valley was once covered by distinct riparian vegetation including valley oak woodlands and river-bank forests (Bay Institute 1998:2–30). The breadth of these habitats varied depending on the width of the natural levees, but is thought to have ranged from as much as five miles wide along lower portions of the Sacramento River to less than one to two miles along the smaller tributaries (Bay Institute 1998; Burcham 1982; Küchler 1977; Thompson 1961). While these communities would have been found west of the project area, they would have represented the most resource-rich habitats in the region and therefore exerted a strong influence on prehistoric settlement.

Riparian forests along the middle and lower reaches of these rivers often formed dense, multi-tiered canopies of primarily deciduous species. The lowest terraces were occupied by a thick forest of willows and Fremont cottonwood (West 1977). On the adjacent levees and floodplains, the over-story was dominated by cottonwood (*Populus* sp.), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), Oregon ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*), and black walnut (*Juglans nigra*). The subcanopy commonly included white alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*), box elder (*Acer negundo*), buckeye (*Aesculus californica*), big leaf maple, and elderberry (*Sambucus nigra* subsp. *caerulea*), while the understory was composed of willows (*Salix* sp.), grape vine (*Vitus* sp.), blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), poison oak (*Toxicodendron pubescens*), and numerous other shrubs and herbaceous species forming dense thickets (Burcham 1982; Thompson 1961; West 1977).

Farther from the rivers and streams, oak woodlands formed uniform tracts up to three to five kilometers (about two to four miles) wide, consisting almost exclusively of valley oak. These forests were more common on the eastern side of the valley and often created a dense canopy. The underlying savanna
was open, carpeted by native bunch and annual grasses including abundant wild rye (*Elymus triticoides*; Griffin 1977; West 1977). A sparse understory in the oak woodland also included poison oak, elderberry, buckeye, and wild rose (*Rosa californica*; West 1977).

Large expanses of the valley between the oak savanna and the lower foothills were blanketed by open grassland of the California prairie. Covering much of the deep alluvial fans and floodplains along the valley margins, the pristine Central Valley prairie formed a thick mat of annual and perennial grasses (Burcham 1982). Perennial purple needlegrass (*Stipa pulchra*) is thought to have been a dominant species, along with nodding needlegrass (*Stipa cernua*), blue wild rye (*Elymus glaucus*), pine bluegrass (*Poa secunda ssp. secunda*), and deergrass (*Muhlenbergia rigens*; Burcham 1982:80).

**Sacramento Valley Fauna**

Among the most prominent mammals in the Sacramento Valley were three species of ungulate: tule elk (*Cervus elaphus*); pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*); and black-tailed deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*). Early historical accounts suggest that elk were common in all habitats on the valley floor (Schulz 1981). Historically, the valley is estimated to have had one of the largest populations of pronghorn in North America (Burcham 1982:96; California Department of Fish and Game 1990:19; Yoakum 1978:114). These animals would have been found throughout the prairie grasslands from the outer border of the riparian forests and marshes to the lower limits of the foothill woodland (Burcham 1982:96–97). Black-tailed deer would have been most common in the riparian forests and oak woodlands, but reached highest densities in the chaparral and woodlands of the surrounding foothills. Deer, unlike other ungulates of the Sacramento Valley, tend to be more solitary, residing individually or in groups of just a few animals (Dassman and Taber 1956).

Grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) were once common throughout the Sacramento Valley, as were black bears. Puma (*Felis concolor*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), and coyote (*Canus latrans*) were the principal carnivores, along with badger (*Taxidea taxus*), spotted skunk (*Spilogale gracilis*), and striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*); all could have been found in a variety of valley habitats. A host of other smaller mammals were common in the riparian and woodland communities including beaver (*Castor canadensis*), weasel (*Mustela frenata*), mink (*Neovison vision*), and river otter (*Lutra canadensis*), as well as raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), ringtail (*Bassariscus astutus*), gray squirrel (*Sciurus griseus*), ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), woodrat (*Neotoma sp.*), cottontail rabbit (*Sylvilagus spp.*), and brush rabbit.

Marsh, grassland, and riparian habitats were home to resident waterfowl such as ducks (*Aythya spp.*), coots (*Fulica americana*), cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), grebes (*Aechmophorus occidentalis*), herons (*Ardeidae*), cranes (*Grus spp.*), egrets (*Ardea spp.*), and gulls (*Larus spp.*). Between about November and February, enormous flocks of waterfowl migrating along the Pacific Flyway arrived in the Sacramento Valley. These included as many as 39 different species of ducks, geese (*Anser spp. and Chen spp.*), brants (*Branta spp.*), and swans (*Cygnus spp.*). Although much reduced from the historic period, modern single-season population counts of migratory waterfowl reach as many as 335,000 individuals (Shuford et al. 1998). In the spring, these species migrate as far north as Alaska and the Bering Strait to breed.

A diverse resident avifauna was also present historically in the Sacramento Valley, composed primarily of hawks, eagles, doves (*Columbinae*), quail, flicker, woodpeckers (*Picidae*), various other accipiters (*Accipitridae*), owls (*Tytonidae and Strigidae*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), and numerous passerine (i.e., perching) birds.

Open channels and lentic habitats of the river system each supported different types of fishes. In the open fast-moving waters of the rivers and larger streams were found resident hardhead and sculpins. Sacramento sucker and western pike-minnow were common in both fast- and slow-water habitats, while the calmer waters of the Delta and rivers were home to splittail (*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus*), hitch (*Lavinia
exilicauda), thicktail chub (Gila crassicauda), Sacramento blackfish (Orthodon microlepidotus), Sacramento perch (Archoplites interruptus), and tule perch.

While all five species of Pacific west coast salmon are known from the Sacramento Valley, Chinook salmon is the principal species (Herbold and Moyle 1989). Four large runs of Chinook occurred annually in the Sacramento-San Joaquin system, with fall and spring runs the most significant (Herbold and Moyle 1989; Yoshiyama et al. 1996). It is estimated that each year, Native American fishers in the Central Valley harvested upwards of 8.5 million pounds of salmon (Yoshiyama et al. 1996). Other economically important anadromous fishes in the river system included white and green sturgeon (Acipenser spp.), Pacific lamprey (Lampetra lethophaga), and steelhead rainbow trout. Aquatic environments also supported pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata) and populations of freshwater mussel including ridged mussel (Gonidea angulata) and pearl mussel (Margaritifera spp.).

**PREHISTORY (with Adrian Whitaker)**

The archaeological record of the Sacramento Valley is complicated by a variety of factors, some caused by geomorphic processes and others resulting from the high degree of cultural diversity that characterized much of northern California de eph into prehistory. As a result of geomorphic processes in the oft-flooded Sacramento River Valley, there is a lack of appreciable material pre-dating 4300 cal BP from the lowlands, and information about the post-4300 cal BP record is relatively sparse when compared to the surrounding foothill and mountainous areas.

**Paleoindian Period (13,500–10,000 cal BP)**

The earliest evidence of human occupation in north-central California comes from isolated projectile points found in just a few locations adjacent to the Sacramento Valley. These distinctive artifacts are morphologically similar to Clovis points which have been traditionally dated to a relatively brief interval at the end of the Pleistocene between 13,500 and 11,500 cal BP (Fiedel 1999). A recent reconsideration of radiocarbon dates from Clovis sites has led Waters and Stafford (2007) to conclude that these projectile points may have been in use for a much shorter period—just 450 years—between 13,250 and 12,800 cal BP. They believe that the widespread distribution of Clovis points across much of North and South America was the result of technological diffusion rather than cultural migration. If so, they suggest that a pre-Clovis human population must have existed in the Americas, a contention that remains highly controversial but is beginning to be more widely accepted by archaeologists.

No fluted projectile points have yet been reported from the Sacramento Valley, but isolated Clovis-like points have been recovered in the adjacent North Coast Ranges and Sierra Nevada, including finds made near Thomes Creek in Tehama County (Dillon and Murphy 1994), at Big Meadows in Plumas County (Kowta 1988), and near Loyalton in Sierra County (Kowta 1988). The most substantial collection of fluted points and other early tools in northern California, however, comes from the Borax Lake site (CA-LAK-36) located southwest of the current study area in the Clear Lake Basin (Harrington 1938, 1948). Meighan and Haynes (1970) have shown that fluted points from LAK-36 are contained in a Holocene-age debris flow and are mixed with substantially younger archaeological materials. This has made interpretation of the Borax Lake assemblage difficult, despite strong evidence for paleoindian occupation of the site (Fredrickson and White 1988; Meighan and Haynes 1970).

**Lower Archaic Period (10,000–7500 cal BP)**

More definite evidence of human occupation in the Sacramento Valley region emerges after 9000 cal BP, but not within the valley itself. Most of the artifacts dating to this time are found in upland areas to the north and west and are affiliated with the *Borax Lake Pattern* (Hildebrandt 2007; Sundahl 1992). The
Borax Lake Pattern spans a great deal of time (9000 to 5000 cal BP) and is defined by wide-stemmed projectile points, handstones, millingslabs, ovoid flake tools, and a variety of other utilitarian items (Clewett and Sundahl 1983; Fitzgerald and Hildebrandt 2002; Hildebrandt and Hayes 1983, 1993; Kowta et al. 2000; Sundahl 1988, 1992; Sundahl and Henn 1993). Most sites appear to represent short-term residential areas created by small family bands that used a subsistence-settlement strategy characterized by high degrees of mobility. This system, often referred to as a “forager” adaptation (sensu Binford 1980), focused on moving human groups from one resource patch to another as the seasons changed throughout the year. Although residential sites have not been found on the valley bottom, largely due to the high rates of alluvial deposition mentioned previously, it seems likely that these habitats were also important parts of the larger subsistence-settlement system.

**Middle Archaic Period (7500–2500 cal BP)**

Little is known about what Meyer and Rosenthal (2008) call the Early Middle Archaic (7500 to 5000 cal BP), as no sites dating to this interval have ever been excavated in local valley settings. Our knowledge increases significantly for the post-5000 cal BP period, here identified as the Late Middle Archaic. During this period, cultural diversity increased, and our first glimpse of the valley bottom archaeological record emerges. White (2003) collected several auger samples from the Reservation Road site (COL-247) and discovered a deeply buried component (3.0 to 3.5 meters below surface) dating to 6020 cal BP, but was not able to formally excavate it. Archaeological samples improve at about 4300 cal BP, as residential midden deposits have been excavated at COL-247 (Stratum 3; 4385 to 3575 cal BP; White 2003) and Llano Seco (BUT-233; 4300 to 2200 cal BP; Dreyer and Kowta 1984). These components include a combination of contracting-stemmed, notched, and concave-base dart points that are somewhat consistent with Middle Archaic findings in the larger region, but do not reflect clear associations with either the Martis (Bucks Lake) or Squaw Creek patterns defined for the outlying areas. Artifact assemblages from these sites are variable in size, but include a wide diversity of domestic tools and the first evidence for the use of mortars and pestles in the local area. Acorn macrofossils have also been found in both sites, clearly documenting the long-term importance of this dietary staple.

**Upper Archaic Period (2500–1000 cal BP)**

Although not matching up precisely with the Middle-Upper Archaic boundary defined by Rosenthal et al. (2007), the Sacramento Valley sequence shows a major break in the archaeological record at about 3000 cal BP. The Whiskeytown Pattern of the Upper Sacramento is characterized by a wide range of corner- and side-notched dart points, handstones, millingslabs, notched pebble net weights, and a limited number of mortars and pestles (see also the Deadman and Kingsley complexes in Tehama County; Greenway 1982; Johnson 1984).

White’s (2003) discovery of a component dating between 3222 and 2750 cal BP at COL-247 seems to represent a permanent village with affinities to those associated with Windmiller Pattern sites in the Delta and Berkeley Pattern (Houx Aspect) settlements in the Clear Lake Basin. Major residential components have also been identified at BUT-233 (Dreyer and Kowta 1984), the Cana Highway site (BUT-288; Deal 1987), and the Wurlitzer site (BUT-294; Dreyer and Kowta 1984), although their relationships to other cultural complexes have not been proposed. Artifact assemblages from these sites reflect a greater reliance on mortar-pestle technology, have a wide range of cooking features, show more intensive use of bone tools, and where analyzed, tend to have floral and faunal remains reflecting multiple seasons of occupation. Combined, these attributes appear to represent the development of a fundamentally new collector adaptation (sensu Binford 1980) where centralized villages were supported by logistical forays to outlying areas, exchange relationships with neighboring groups, and greater dependence on long-term storage.
Emergent Period (Post-1000 cal BP)

Many significant changes took place throughout northern California by the Emergent Period, increasing the cultural complexity and diversity of the region. The Augustine pattern developed along the Colusa Reach (White 2003) and down into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Rosenthal et al. 2007). The Augustine reflects the establishment of large riverine villages supported by intensified subsistence economies with increasing dependencies on fish. Bow and arrow technology appears for the first time (represented by Gunther Barbed and later Desert Side-notched projectile points), as do a variety of fishing implements including composite harpoons and bone fishhooks. Large numbers of hopper mortars and pestles reflect the intensive use of plant foods, while the artistic and recreational parts of culture are revealed through items like incised bone and stone pendants, abalone shell pendants, bone gaming pieces, and a variety of shell beads. Clam disk beads became popular after 500 cal BP, and were commonly used as money throughout the region.

The large village sites of the Augustine Pattern contain the remains of house structures, cooking features, and formal cemetery areas. Dark charcoal-rich midden deposits are also quite common and include freshwater shellfish, butchered mammal bone, and an abundance of fish bone (including salmon in northern latitudes), as well as the charred remains of acorns, small seeds, and a variety of other plant foods. These findings clearly show that the mobile settlement systems of the Whiskeytown and Mendocino patterns along the northern and western reaches of the Sacramento Valley were a thing of the past, as the local populations settled into more permanent villages made possible by the large-scale storage of fish and acorns, and the inter-regional exchange of other important commodities.

ETHNOGRAPHY (by Laura Leach-Palm)

Following is a brief overview of the lifeways of the Konkow. For a thorough, recent study of the Konkow Peoples the reader is referred to McCarthy (2004), which includes detailed ethnographic, ethnohistoric, and historical information. McCarthy’s report includes the Mechoopda, their interactions with John Bidwell, and the effects of the Euro-American community on the environment and lifeways of the Native Americans.

The project parcel is within the traditional range of the Northwestern Maidu, though the dividing lines between the Northeastern Maidu to the east, Nisenan (or Southern Maidu) to the south, and Yana to the north are not well-established for the protohistoric period. The name Konkow, an anglicization of the Maidu word kóyo·mkàwi for “meadowland,” has more commonly been assigned to groups living in this area, following the work of Riddell (1978). However, Konkow (a.k.a. Cou-Cou, Cancow, KanKau) may actually refer to the more specific tribelet of Northwestern Maidu living in the Konkow Valley near Oroville. This term has since been applied to all Northwestern Maidu groups. Maidu living in the region today generally self-recognize as Konkow, and this term is retained below.

Konkow, along with Nisenan and Maidu (or Northeastern Maidu) is one of three major subgroups of the Maiduan language family, which itself is part of the Penutian stock (Shipley 1961, 1963). Divisions of Konkow are recognized, including Foothill and Valley (or Mechoopda), which at the time of contact could be further divided into regional dialects. According to information presented by Forbes (1989) and Riddell (1978), the 645-acre parcel falls within Valley Konkow territory.

Ethnographic information indicates that at the time of contact, Konkow were organized into village communities of approximately 150–400 individuals. The village community was an autonomous unit consisting of several nearby and self-sufficient villages, each of which may have housed 40 or more people. Villages were usually located on higher ridges or knolls overlooking more permanent creeks and rivers, particularly the North, Middle, and South Forks of the Feather and Sacramento rivers. Such locations provided views of the surrounding landscape and gave protection from high water during floods. Rathbun
identified 14 such village communities in the Butte County area, one of which is Chico or Michupta. The Mechoopda Tribe is active today.

Village communities owned fixed fishing, hunting, and gathering territories, the boundaries of which were actively protected against poachers and intruders. A large semi-subterranean earth-covered lodge, or kùmi, served as an assembly chamber in the central, though not necessarily the most populous, village. Often, the headman in the village community would live in and keep up the kùmi. This person was selected based on his ability, generosity, maturity, and wealth. While they could influence or encourage others to behave in particular ways (i.e., authority), headmen did not have any true power over other villages or people.

The traditional Konkow subsistence economy was based on a hunting and gathering way of life. Small seeds and acorns formed the staple of the diet, though fishing and hunting provided sustenance as well. Mobility, both logistical and residential, was an important facet of the subsistence-settlement pattern to exploit locally abundant and spatially variable food resources. Hunting and gathering, however, does not indicate a passive harvesting of available resources from the landscape. Grasslands and other environments were carefully managed and manipulated by Konkow and other Native Californians through clearing, pruning, sowing seeds, and especially burning (Anderson 1991, 1999; Lewis 1973; Riddell 1978).

The seasonal round was organized around various activities. In spring, families would collect various small seeds and leafy greens as they would ripen, especially Indian rice grass, in the valley bottom. Seeds may have been collected on a logistical basis, with groups of women making daily forays into the surrounding area to harvest seeds with seed beaters and burden baskets. Seeds were likely parched and ground into a flour prior to consumption. Men would hunt and fish to supplement the gathered food resources. In most years, spring salmon runs would have been an important source of food. During this time, families resided in valley bottom base camps in more substantial and formal semi-subterranean houses.

In the summer, men would venture into the nearby Sierra foothills and mountains to fish and hunt deer, which were brought back to the base camp. Occasionally, the entire village would relocate to these areas to inhabit summer camps. During occupation, families would live in open (i.e., roofless) and more ephemeral brush enclosures. While the men would fish and hunt, women would gather various seeds, roots, and other plant products. Families might stay in these higher-elevation base camps through early fall to gather pine nuts, manzanita berries, acorns, and buckeye. The latter two resources required extensive processing (i.e., leaching) to remove various toxins (tannic and prussic acids) and were typically boiled in baskets using heated stones. Other resources collected during this time might include various insects and berries. Many of these resources would be over-harvested and stored in anticipation of winter.

If they had summered in the Sierran foothills, groups would move back to the valley-bottom base camp in winter. People would live off of stored goods harvested in the summer and fall, as well as winter runs of salmon and migratory waterfowl. Because fewer foods are available in winter, wintertime activities may have included production of various material goods, such as basketry items, clothing, cordage, stone tools, and decorative ornaments.

While much time was surely spent foraging and producing the material goods used in those activities (e.g., baskets, grinding stones, bows, projectile points, nets), the hunting and gathering lifestyle of the Konkow undoubtedly afforded much time for socializing—talking, storytelling, dancing, gambling, visiting family and friends, etc.—trading goods and information, and performing rituals. Konkow mythology deals mainly with animals, such as hummingbird, lizard, dog, rattlesnake, and coyote, and their interactions within and with the natural landscape and the supernatural. These myths served to embody Konkow values and world views, and were told to children by elders on various occasions. Singing, dancing, and feasting marked different events, both happy and sad, including male and female initiation into adulthood, death, and the passing of various seasons. Associated rituals observed at these events often served an important role
in maintaining balance in both the natural and spiritual worlds. Singing, dancing, and gambling also served as a form of pleasure and amusement during more normal or every-day types of activities (Riddell 1978). Although these activities would have been of much importance in prehistoric times, as they continue to be among present-day Konkow, they are, unfortunately, less visible in the archaeological record.

Ethnohistoric Context

The first contacts with Euro-Americans probably occurred in the early part of the nineteenth century. Gabriel Moraga seems to have been one of the earliest explorers moving through this section of the Sacramento Valley (Cutter 1957). Moraga was looking for mission sites and apparently met with Maidu near the Sutter Buttes. Other early explorers included Padre Arbella in 1811 and Captain Lewis Arguello in 1820 (Forbes 1989; Riddell 1978). These early contacts seem to have had only minimal effects on Native lifeways.

Although no settlements were established by Spanish explorers, beginning in 1824, the Mexican regime divided California lands into large parcels referred to as ranchos. Land grants were awarded in the Central Valley, including the “Boga,” or Butte grant, covering acreage within present-day Sutter and Butte counties and “New Helvetia” John A. Sutter’s 1839 grant of lands in Sutter, Sacramento, and Yuba counties (Beck and Haase 1974). The Boga was a 22,185-acre grant north of Sutter Buttes.

The pace of Euro-American contact increased from 1820 to 1848. Various trappers, the occasional homesteader, and different exploration teams moved through the valley, interacting with Maidu inhabitants, some in negative and racist ways and others indifferently (Riddell 1978). More drastic, diseases were introduced and quickly spread among the Maidu in this period (Cook 1939, 1955). Several epidemics, including smallpox and malaria, were responsible for many deaths among the Konkow, which had devastating and lasting effects on social conditions.

With the 1848 discovery of Sierran gold, traditional Maidu lands were overrun with gold miners. Explorers, miners, and settlers brought livestock that changed the ecology of native lands, reducing food resources, and eventually becoming targets for people whose food was becoming scarce or extinct (Johnston 1978; Riddell 1978). Cook (1943) estimates that Konkow and Nisenan populations were nearly halved between 1846 and 1850. In the years that tens of thousands of miners and accompanying settlers flocked to the state, they invaded Konkow territory and created tensions, often violent, between the two ethnic groups. Killings are reported on both sides, though Euro-Americans had greater access to guns and were backed by lawmakers (who were also white) and were responsible for greater numbers of homicides. Native people were often killed indiscriminately and villages burned when oxen or other livestock went missing (Riddell 1978). In many cases, Native people may not even have been involved, and the disappearance of livestock presented a convenient excuse to help exterminate and remove the Maidu from their land. Moreover, grazing, farming, and the spread of introduced species caused great ecological change, restructuring the availability of hunted and gathered food sources and placing further stress on Maidu populations.

McCarthy (2004) relates that despite strained relations, Indians often worked for the miners and ranchers. John Bidwell was one of those who profited from Indian labor for both mining and ranching endeavors. There are different views about John Bidwell’s treatment of local Indians. The Maidu village of “Mechoopda” may have existed prior to Bidwell’s Rancho or formed serving Bidwell’s operations, but a substantial settlement existed near the Rancho Chico headquarters beginning in 1849. The Bidwells deeded an allotment of Ranch lands to the Mechoopda Rancheria holdings (White 2002:4). It is said by some that he was a fair man and a protector of his Indians, but others considered him harsh.

The state attempted to settle conflicts through the establishment of a reservation, and in 1854 a Konkow Reservation was established at Nome Lackee. However, in 1863 its residents were forced to abandon the reservation and march to the Round Valley Reservation in Mendocino County. Of the 461
people leaving Nome Lackee, only 277 arrived in Round Valley, many having been killed or dying along the way (Forbes 1989). As well, poor conditions in Round Valley prompted many to return to Butte County and the traditional Konkow homeland, where they worked as wage laborers on mines and ranches, along with the small number of Konkow who had never left.

By now their traditional subsistence and settlement activities were no longer possible, and Konkow were forced to assimilate into the dominant White culture. As a result, a great loss of language and traditional culture ensued. However, this process was not complete, and many traditional crafts, dances, and myths continue to be passed down through the generations, in one form or another. As well, there have been recent attempts to revive the language and other elements of traditional culture.

HISTORY OF CENTRAL BUTTE COUNTY (by Laura Leach-Palm)

The history of Butte County centers around the diversified themes of mining, cattle ranching, agriculture, and the timber industry, interspersed with continued growth in population, cities, and transportation. However, the history of central Butte County is largely centered on cattle ranching. Butte County was organized in 1850 as one of California’s original counties, including within its boundaries areas of what later became Lassen, Plumas, Tehama, Colusa, and Sutter counties. It received its name from the Sutter Buttes, now located in Sutter County. Hamilton was the original county seat until 1853, when it was moved to Bidwell’s Bar, before finally being transferred to Oroville in 1856 (Mansfield 1918:139).

The beginning of ranching in Butte County can be traced to 1845, when Samuel Neal and David Dutton settled on the 22,000-acre Esquon Grant, seven miles south of Chico near Durham, bringing in cattle acquired from John Sutter. There were eight other early land grants in Butte County, including John Bidwell’s Rancho del Arroyo Chico to the north, but Neal is generally credited with establishing the cattle industry in the county (Mansfield 1918:38–40; Talbitzer 1987:21).

Shortly after the discovery of gold at Coloma in 1848, Bidwell, Neal and others left their ranchos to search for gold, making discoveries at various places along the Feather River, including Bidwell’s Bar, Monterey Bar, and Adamstown, near Oroville. Gold hunters swarmed to the area, and by the end of 1850 there were 214 mining camps in Butte County. Travel increased through the area with the opening of the Beckwourth Trail (later the Oroville-Quincy Wagon Road incorporated into State Route 70) through Bidwell Bar to Marysville in 1851. Butte County was one of the chief gold-producing sections of the state, with conservative estimates of production by the turn of the twentieth century exceeding $200 million (Mansfield 1918:73; Talbitzer 1987:21–31).

With the rush for gold came a need for supplies for the growing towns and camps in the region. Sam Neal returned to his ranch in 1849 with $110,000 he earned from gold mining, and stocked it with cattle and horses. The Esquon Rancho was confirmed to Neal in 1852, and a patent was issued in 1860 for the 22,000-acre ranch. In 1852, he built a sawmill at the head of Little Butte Creek, leading the way in the developing timber industry in the county. Thirteen other mills were in operation by the end of 1852 (Mansfield 1918:280; Talbitzer 1987:46–48).

Also in 1849, John Bidwell closed his gold diggings and turned to agriculture and merchandise to supply the swelling population of the state (see White 2002 for more detail). He acquired the Rancho del Arroyo Chico, a 22,214.47 acre land grant in two purchases in 1849 and 1851. Bidwell’s Rancho Chico headquarters had included multiple structures and ranch operations, some just south of the proposed project area. Between 1849 and 1892, Bidwell was active in California State politics, and served one term in Congress from 1865 to 1867. He is considered a builder of the California commonwealth.

The cattle business in Butte County thrived owing to the demand for meat produced by the mining and lumbering communities, and the railroads rushed to provide freight service for these expanding industries. The first train arrived in the region at Oroville in 1864 on the Northern California Railroad from
Marysville. The town of Chico, which had been growing since 1849 on Big Chico Creek on Bidwell’s Rancho, was founded in 1860 and became one of the largest settlements in the area, surpassing Oroville by 1870. In that year, the Central Pacific celebrated the opening of its line to Chico (the California and Oregon Railroad). The California and Oregon Railroad stopped at Chico to take advantage of the cattle, agricultural, and timber industries there. The towns of Gridley, Biggs, Nelson, and Durham sprang up along the railroad. Also in 1870 the California Pacific Railroad was completed to Marysville, where a connection was made with the California Northern to Oroville (Mansfield 1918:264; Talbitzer 1987:66–68). The Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) acquired the California & Oregon Railroad in 1889. The SPRR (now the Union Pacific Railroad) ran through the west side of Butte County, through Chico, with a branch line from Marysville to Oroville, while the Western Pacific ran through the Feather River Canyon on the east side. The Sacramento Northern, now abandoned, ran southeast from Chico to Oroville Junction.

While the cattle and timber businesses boomed in Butte County, agriculture continued to hold promise. By 1857, Bidwell had 350 acres at Rancho Chico under cultivation for tree and row crops. By 1867, there were 240,664 acres enclosed, and by 1915, more than 275,000 acres were available for agriculture, encompassing the eastern half of the county closest to the Sacramento River. The central part of the county, from Neal’s land east to the foothills, was heavily used for cattle and sheep raising, while the timber industry thrived in the northern and western part of the county (Mansfield 1918:410; Talbitzer 1987:67).

Increased attention to roads and bridges followed as a result of mining, agriculture, increased population and stable settlements. By 1895, Butte County had 100 miles of graveled road and 600 miles of graded roads. One of these roads, existing by 1886 was a road from Oroville to Chico, later called the Oroville-Chico Highway.

In 1860, Bidwell founded the town of Chico on his ranch and later donated land for a public school, and a large area for the Northern Branch State Normal School, started in 1887, which is today California State University, Chico. Bidwell died in Chico in 1900, and with his wife’s death in 1918 the proposed site for the Natural History Museum was deeded from the Bidwell estate to the state along with the Bidwell Mansion and some lands.
III – SOURCES CONSULTED

Prefield archival research included a records search at the Northeast Information Center, online research of historical maps and land patent information, and Native American consultation.

INFORMATION CENTER RECORDS SEARCH

A records search of the Northeast Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System in Chico, California, was conducted on July 5, 2016, by Far Western staff archaeologist Laurel Engbring. The records search included a one-quarter mile buffer around the APE. The following sources were reviewed:

- National Register of Historic Places listings
- California Office of Historic Preservation Historic Properties and Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility Data Files
- California Inventory of Historic Resources
- California Department of Transportation Historic Bridge Survey
- General Land Office Plat Maps
- 1912 Chico US Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic map
- 1895 Chico US Geological Survey 30-minute topographic map

Two cultural resources were identified within the APE, and an additional four resources were identified within the one-quarter mile buffer zone. Six previous studies have been conducted within the APE, 13 additional studies have been conducted within the larger records search area, and one regional study was identified which encompasses the entire APE and records search area.

Previous Archaeological Studies

Six previous studies included portions of the APE, approximately 50% of which had been previously surveyed. Thirteen additional cultural resources studies were identified within the one-quarter mile records search buffer zone (Figure 4). One regional study, Kowta (1988), was also mapped as enveloping the entirety of the APE and records search area. Details are provided in Table 1.

Previously Recorded Resources

Two previously recorded resources were identified within the APE: a historic-era rock wall and a building foundation. Four previously recorded cultural resources were identified within one-quarter mile but will not be affected by development of the parcels (Figure 5). Details are provided in Table 2. Three of the cultural resources within the records search area date to the historic period, while the fourth is a prehistoric bedrock mortar complex which was documented as a result of a phone call to the Northeast Information Center without any formal recordation forms or mapping provided.

Resources within the Area of Potential Effects

CA-BUT-1281H (P-04-001281)

Site BUT-1281H consists of a historic-era basalt “rock wall” (more accurately, a stone fence) that was probably built between 1870 and 1900.
Figure 4. Previous Studies within One-quarter Mile of the Area of Potential Effects.
It appears that different segments have been recorded under different trinomials, some as BUT-1281H and others as BUT-1071H. The segment in our study area was recorded in 1992 by Jensen and Associates. The wall was initially recommended ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), but no formal determination was made (Jensen and Associates 1992). It is worth noting that “rock walls” (more accurately described as fences) are called out in the City of Chico’s General Plan as features of local significance.
Figure 5. Previously Identified Resources within One-quarter Mile of the Area of Potential Effects.

THIS FIGURE CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE LOCATION INFORMATION AND HAS BEEN REDACTED
Table 2. Previous Archaeological Resources within One-quarter Mile of the Area of Potential Effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY NO. (P-04-)</th>
<th>TRINOMIAL (CA-BUT-)</th>
<th>OTHER DESIGNATION</th>
<th>RESOURCE AGE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE RECORDED</th>
<th>WITHIN APE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001281</td>
<td>1281H</td>
<td>Stonegate #2</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Rock Wall</td>
<td>2/13/1992</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002207</td>
<td>2207H</td>
<td>Stonegate #1</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>2/13/1992</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Stone Fence</td>
<td>5/10/1977</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001542</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Warfield Site #1-H</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Rock Wall</td>
<td>5/17/1991</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CASCO #1</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Residence, Silos, Ditch</td>
<td>1/19/1998</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IDR #544</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11/4/2014</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: APE – Area of Potential Effects.

CA-BUT-2207H (P-04-002207)

Site BUT-2207H is the partial remains of a historic-era building foundation. Jensen and Associates (1992) suggested that this foundation may have been a barn, and recommended that the foundation was ineligible for the National Register. As with BUT-1281H, they provide no real support for this conclusion.

ONLINE RESEARCH

Online maps and land status files available from the Bureau of Land Management, the US Geological Survey, and California State University, Chico, were perused for information on the project area. The results of that research are presented below in the discussion of resources (under Results, page 23).

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

A letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (Commission) on July 8, 2016, requesting a review of the Sacred Lands file and a list of Native American tribes and individuals who might have cultural ties to the project area. On July 13, 2016, the Commission responded, indicating that they have no knowledge of Native American resources within the Project site and providing a list of five individuals/organizations to contact. Letters were sent to these individuals/organizations on July 26, 2016, requesting information on the project area and soliciting comments on the proposed general plan update. Michael Despain from the Mechoopda Indian Tribe called on August 8, 2016, to discuss the project with Ms. Engbring. He discussed the high sensitivity for archaeological sites near creeks and other waterways and requested that tribal monitors be present during future ground-disturbing activity, including coring. He also referred to the archaeological sensitivity map included within the current general plan (City of Chico 2009). This map of Prehistoric Archaeological Sensitivity was developed by the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria and includes the project APE (City of Chico 2009). While the northwestern portion of the project, west of Bruce Road, is considered to have Medium Sensitivity, the majority of the APE east of Bruce Road is considered to be an area of High Sensitivity. A record of correspondence and communication between Far Western and interested Native American parties, including the pre-existing Memorandum of Understanding, can be found in Appendix B. No other comments were received from interested Native American individuals or tribes (Table 3).

---

1 The California Register was created in 1992, but sites were not typically evaluated under this register until later.
Table 3. Summary of Native American Contact Efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Letter Sent</th>
<th>Phone Call</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Clark-Wilson,</td>
<td>KonKow Valley Band of Maidu</td>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>Voicemail Left, no comment to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis E. Ramirez,</td>
<td>Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria</td>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>Michael DeSpain provided a sensitivity map of Chico and indicated high-sensitivity areas of the APE near waterways. He requested Mechoopda Indian Tribe tribal monitors to be present during future ground-breaking activity including coring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Archuleta,</td>
<td>Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians</td>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>Gary Archuleta is retired. New tribal chair was Benjamin Clark. An email was sent to Mr. Clark on March 21, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Potter,</td>
<td>Redding Rancheria</td>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>Voicemail Left, no comment to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Wright,</td>
<td>Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community</td>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>Mr. Wright is deceased. A voicemail was left for Mr. James Russ, the new president, but was not returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

A letter was sent to the Butte County Historical Society on July 26, 2016, requesting information on the project area and a follow-up telephone message with the same information was left on March 8, 2016. To date, the Historical Society has not responded to the request for information.

BURIED SITE SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT (adapted from Meyer and Rosenthal 2008)

The potential for buried archaeological sites is a practical problem for resource managers who must make a reasonable effort to identify archaeological deposits in a three-dimensional project area, ensuring that potentially important resources are not affected by project activities. Early detection of buried archaeological deposits also avoids the potential for costly delays that may occur when unknown resources are discovered during project construction, triggering late-discovery protocols.

Before buried sites can be avoided, sampled, or otherwise “managed,” they must first be identified. Most buried sites are not found by conventional pedestrian surface surveys, because they typically lack visible or obtrusive features that would indicate their presence to an observer in the field (Bettis 1992:120). Thus, locating sites that may be buried by natural deposition can be one of the most difficult issues faced by archaeologists and cultural resource managers.

To help ensure that project schedules (critical path) and budgets are not inadvertently affected by late archaeological discoveries, a buried site sensitivity study is conducted to determine where buried sites are most likely to be located in the project area. When designed and conducted in an informed fashion, this type of geoarchaeological approach can help satisfy the requirements of Section 106 that “a reasonable and good faith effort to carry out appropriate identification efforts” (800.4(b)(1)) is made for undertakings that receive federal funds or require federal permits.

Review of the geological literature and the results of field studies indicate that the geomorphic landscape in Central California has changed significantly during the span of human occupation. In the Sacramento Valley and lower Coast Range and Sierra-Cascade foothills, major landscape changes during the Holocene have included: (1) partial erosion and truncation of Latest Pleistocene and older surfaces; (2) subsequent burial of Latest Pleistocene and Early Holocene surfaces on fans and floodplains during the Early and Middle Holocene; (3) partial erosion and removal of Early Holocene floodplains; (4) subsequent deposition and periodic stability of floodplains during the Middle and Late Holocene; and (5) deposition
Figure 6. Buried Prehistoric Site Sensitivity in the Project Area.
of alluvium on portions of most lowland floodplains during the Latest Holocene. These landscape changes have clearly affected the ability of archaeologists to identify and sample deposits from the Early and Middle Holocene.

In acknowledging the results of previous research in central California, Meyer and Rosenthal (2004, 2008) recognized that buried archaeological deposits are not distributed randomly throughout the landscape, but occur in specific geo-environmental settings. For example, fans and floodplains consistently contain buried archaeological deposits, indicating some relationship between these landforms and past settlement activities. Those authors sought to develop a general planning tool that would allow for relatively quick assessment of buried site potential at the scale of the landform. While this approach should be relatively accurate in identifying the types of landforms most likely to yield buried archaeological resources, it is not designed to pin-point where, within those landforms, buried sites will be found. That type of assessment is best undertaken on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, in this report, we start with the general landform sensitivity and then examine local conditions more specifically to arrive at project-specific potential for buried resources.

Buried Site Potential in the Project Area

This assessment began with an examination of the mapped distribution of different Quaternary-age landforms (see Figure 6). The project area was included in the California Department of Transportation, District 3 Transportation Enhancement Act geoarchaeological sensitivity study (Meyer and Rosenthal 2008). This study included a review of background literature on the geologic, paleoclimatic, and hydrological records of Butte County, the identification of buried soils, and a detailed buried archaeological site sensitivity study. Over the past eight years, this model has been further updated based on results of subsequent studies in the Sacramento Valley. A synthetic model now includes proximity to water as a key sensitivity factor. The most current model has been referenced in Figure 6, which depicts geoarchaeological sensitivity within the project area.

Application of the Meyer and Rosenthal model identifies four categories of buried site potential in the project area: Lowest, Low, Moderate, High, and Highest. “Lowest” potential for buried sites reflects landforms dating from the Older Pleistocene (Redtough-Redswale Complex, 0–2% slope) and Pre-Quaternary (Doemill-Jokerst Complex, 3–8% slope) soils. These contexts are too old to harbor subsurface archaeological deposits, since they date to before humans arrived in the region. This typifies most of the project parcel, which comprises a remnant Pleistocene-age fan now marked by mima mound/vernal pool topography.

Bisecting this landscape is an area mapped as latest Holocene in age alluvium (WAFAP-Hamslough Complex, 0–2% slope), dating to 2200–1150 BP. This young age, coupled with the presence of drainages, models as High or Highest sensitivity to contain buried surfaces and sites. However, based on observations made in the field, this area contains only a thin veneer of water-worn cobbles and silts that probably represent local reworking of the mima mound topography during an erosional (flood) event from Little Chico Creek. Before construction of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel, such events probably caused floodwaters to fan out across adjacent areas, including the project parcel, creating the series of shallow, ephemeral drainage channels visible across the landscape today. Historic-period mining activity (almost certainly unsuccessful) further modified the landscape, leaving behind small piles of silt and cobbles. In sum, the entire project area has low sensitivity for buried surfaces or archaeological remains.
PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

The majority of the parcel was surveyed on August 2–3, 2016, by archaeologists Michael Darcangelo, Laurel Engbring, Nick Radtkey, and Emily Layton. Sarah Izzi surveyed two small additions to the APE on March 7, 2017. All visible ground surfaces were examined for cultural resources. Although the portions of the project area had already been surveyed, the most recent of these surveys was nearly 25 years ago; more recent studies within the project area concentrated on small linear segments or intersections adjacent to, or just within the corridor. As a result, the crew surveyed the entire APE at 15–20-meter transects. Ground visibility was limited to approximately 10%-20% of the surface across the entire APE due to dense grass and brush cover, with slightly higher visibility noted in the western portion of the APE. A 30-foot-wide firebreak was present along the north, east, and west edges of the APE west of Bruce Road, and along the north, south, and central portion of the APE east of Bruce Road. The central firebreak followed the curve of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel, west of the channel. Within these 30-foot firebreaks, visibility was high, and no evidence of cultural resources was observed. A representative photograph which shows a portion of the Crouch Ditch, the 30-foot firebreak, the dense ground cover, and Skyway Road to the south of the APE is provided in Figure 7. This picture was taken from the edge of the levee west of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel which cuts through the center of the APE east of Bruce Road.

RESULTS

Previously Recorded Sites

CA-BUT-1281H

As noted, BUT-1281H is a “rock wall” or stone fence. Jensen and Associates (1992) originally recorded just one segment of the feature but noted that it extended to the east. The segment was re-recorded by Far Western and designated BUT-1281H Segment A, and the resource extent was expanded to the east of the original site boundary. This feature also intersects with the stone fence that parallels the Butte Creek Diversion Channel, west of the channel. Within these 30-foot firebreaks, visibility was high, and no evidence of cultural resources was observed. A representative photograph which shows a portion of the Crouch Ditch, the 30-foot firebreak, the dense ground cover, and Skyway Road to the south of the APE is provided in Figure 7. This picture was taken from the edge of the levee west of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel which cuts through the center of the APE east of Bruce Road.

As part of the initial recordation, Jensen and Associates (1992) recommended the resource ineligible for the National Register under all criteria. However, those authors provided no evidence to support their recommendation that the feature is ineligible. There is no indication in their report that they conducted any subsurface testing, metal detection, archival research, or oral history investigations. They do include this caveat: “it is hoped, however, that proposed developments are compatible with preservation of the short section of historic wall, which represents and aesthetically pleasing reminder of the nature and extent of early historic ranching operations in the Chico area specifically and northern California generally” (1992:6).

Other researchers provide the following information. Swinlinger and Bayham (1988:3) report that “the stone fence that still stands on Bruce and Humboldt Roads was built [for] Mr. Bruce in the early 1870s.” They cite a “letter on file at the California State University, Chico Archives” as saying that the fences built on the Bruce Ranch were built by a Charles Royls. They also note that “a portion of this stone fence near the intersection of Bruce and Humboldt Roads [outside the current project APE] was set back 20 feet by the City
Figure 7. Surface Conditions during Survey, August 2–3, 2016.
of Chico to widen Bruce Road” in 1988. Swilinger and Bayham conclude that “for both reasons of historic significance and their value as an intangible asset of the landscape, stone fences should be preserved when possible” (1988:5). They recommend avoiding impacts to the wall, possibly by incorporating it into development plans. In a later study, Harrington (2006:15) reports that an in situ part of the “wall” (BUT-1071H) was to be moved and rebuilt “to match the alignment of the previously relocated wall.” She recommends the resource as ineligible due to lack of integrity—though presumably she evaluated only that portion in her study area, which was to the north of, and outside, the current APE.

In sum, it is our conclusion that the stone fences in the project parcels have not been formally evaluated, and that they may represent features of local significance, as called out in the City of Chico’s General Plan. We recommend that they be formally evaluated and/or incorporated into the project design as open space/parkland, with interpretive signage.

CA-BUT-2207H

The second previously recorded resource was BUT-2207H, the partial remains of a historic-era building foundation. Jensen and Associates (1992) suggest that this foundation was for a barn. They concluded that the site was not associated with events which have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of US History (National Register Criterion A), nor was it associated with significant persons (Criterion B). They also found that the foundation did not embody characteristics of a type, period, or method of manufacture (Criterion C). The apparent lack of associated artifacts, according to Jensen and Associates, limited the data potential of the foundation, making it ineligible under Criterion D.

However, as with BUT-1281H, there is no indication that those authors carried out any kind of formal evaluation (metal detector survey, surface scrapes, archival research) to support their recommendations; instead it appears that they based their conclusions on surface observations only. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that a formal determination of eligibility has ever been made for this site. While we agree that there is insufficient integrity for BUT-2207H to be considered eligible under Criteria A, B, or C, we recommend that it has not been properly evaluated under Criterion D. As such, the site remains unevaluated. If impacts to the site cannot be avoided during project implementation, we recommend that it be given a formal evaluation.

Newly Identified Resources

Two additional and previously unrecorded cultural resources were documented: the historic-era Crouch Ditch and a series of mine tailings along a shallow, seasonal drainage.

Crouch Ditch

This ditch is depicted on USGS topographic maps at least as early as 1912 (NETR 2016). The ditch segment within the APE has been bisected by the Butte Creek Diversion Channel, and therefore has been recorded as two segments: Segment A, which is west of the channel, and Segment B, to the east. Segment A also includes the remains of what appears to be a dilapidated wooden footbridge or possibly a small check dam. Approximately 80 feet of the central portion of Segment B has been leveled by heavy equipment.

The Crouch Ditch is described in a recent planning document prepared for the City of Chico as “an historic irrigation canal” that “flows periodically and provides habitat to wild animals” (DC&E 2008:Appendix A). It diverges from Butte Creek at a point roughly 2.5–3.0 miles east of the project area and continues west and south for several miles to where it merges into a series of sloughs, canals, and drains on the east side of the Sacramento River. Modern aerial photographs suggest that the segment east of the Butte Creek Diversion is abandoned.
Feature Characteristics

Only that part of the ditch within the project parcels was recorded for this study, consisting of two segments that total 1,342 feet. The segments are separated by the Butte Creek Diversion Channel. This portion of the ditch is a shallow, earthen feature roughly four feet deep and ranging in width from five to 12 feet at the bottom and 13 to 14 feet at the top. The only associated feature is a collapsed wooden structure interpreted as a small footbridge or check dam, with 8-x-8-inch beams and 10-x-2-inch boards. One of the beams still straddles the ditch; the rest of the feature has fallen into the ditch. Many pieces are burnt and broken. Segment A runs between the Diversion Channel and Skyway Road, where it turns to parallel the road as a drainage ditch. Segment B, east of the Diversion Channel, appears to end just before it reaches Skyway Road.

Historical Background

In their History of Butte County, Wells and Chambers (1882:209) report that “in 1881, there were forty mining and twenty-five irrigating ditches in Butte county [sic]. The mining ditches aggregate 501 miles in length, and the irrigating 200 miles.” Unfortunately, no maps from this period could be located for the project area to determine if the Crouch Ditch was among these. The ditch does not appear on the 1869 or the 1878 GLO plat, or on the 1895 USGS quadrangle. The earliest available map showing the Crouch Ditch is the 1912 USGS Durham 1:31,680 scale topographic quadrangle, which shows the ditch alignment as essentially the same as the modern alignment (Figure 8). A search of several repositories yielded no maps for the period between 1895 and 1912. The best we can say at this point is that the Crouch Ditch was constructed sometime in that 17-year period.

On-line BLM GLO records (land patents) list brothers John and Sylvester Crouch as filing a patent for Section 26 on December 15, 1882. We know, however, that the brothers’ holdings were much more extensive than just Section 26: Mansfield (1918:964–965) tells us that John made arrangements for his nephew Ben, Sylvester’s son, to “buy his homestead of two thousand acres.” Mansfield reports that in 1918 “[Ben’s] holdings consist of the original John Crouch homestead, one of the oldest and best ranches in Butte County” (1918:965). Ben, born in Chico in 1888, obtained the property at the age of 19, at the death of his uncle. This would have been circa 1907. Evidently Ben was quite successful, as sometime around 1918 he “built an elegant and commodious residence on his ranch, one of the finest in the county,” where he lived with his wife and their three children, as well as his father Sylvester (Mansfield 1918:965).

As for the project parcels, land patent records provide no information for Section 31 but multiple entries for Section 32. The earliest of these date to 1877, when a William Weaver patented seven parcels in the southwest 1/4 of Section 32 where the Crouch Ditch now runs. Other patents were filed for the parcels surrounding Weaver’s in 1883, 1886, 1888, and 1889; however, none of the patents were filed under the name Crouch.

According to Jensen (1998:7–8), the Crouch Ditch “was constructed in the 19th Century to channel water from Butte Creek to aid mining operations along this system. Diamond Match may have extended the ditch westerly after about 1906 to service its operation in southwest Chico.” Unfortunately those authors do not identify the source of their information, which makes it difficult to confirm. If the ditch was, indeed, “constructed in the 19th Century,” it would have been sometime after 1895 (since it does not appear on the map of that date) and presumably by John and/or Sylvester Crouch.
Figure 8. 1912 Durham Quad.
Assessment of Eligibility

While the entire Crouch Ditch has not, to our knowledge, been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), the portion in our study area does not appear to qualify for either register at the state or national level. However, the ditch could be eligible at the local and/or regional level for its association with the development of agriculture in Butte County (Criteria A/1), and for its association with the Crouch family, early pioneers in the county (Criteria B/2). It does not include physical elements that might embody distinctive artistic or engineering values (Criteria C/3); nor is the ditch likely to yield important information on local, regional, state, or national history (Criteria D/4), beyond its recordation. As to integrity, those segments of the ditch within the town of Chico have been channelized or otherwise altered, while those to the east, including the project area, appear to retain much of their original character and alignment.

In sum, we recommend the Crouch Ditch as eligible to the California Register under Criteria 1 and 2, at the local level of significance. We further conclude, however, any project impacts to the sections within our project area have been mitigated through the recordation and archival research presented here.

LE-1H—Mine Tailings, Possible Privy, and Associated Artifacts

The second newly recorded historic-era resource, given the temporary designation of LE-1H, is a series of at least 18 discrete features. Most of the features consist of piles of water-worn cobbles situated within a shallow, unnamed seasonal drainage. Three additional rock piles are located along with a series of small silt piles that may represent clean-out sediments from the use of mining rockers. A metal detector survey conducted in February 2017, also identified 25 artifacts, mostly clustered in a small area (Locus 1) and a small pit that might represent an abandoned and in-filled privy (Feature 15).

The identified artifacts are listed in Table 4. Many are diagnostic, dating to sometime between about 1870 and 1910. The presence of a horseshoe nail, a child’s doll fragment, a tablespoon, and several pieces of tableware vessels suggest a family occupation; the cut nails and window glass may indicate that a structure once stood nearby. Because most of the artifacts lay beneath the surface and were found with a metal detector, it is quite likely that more materials are present but are not visible on the surface.

Feature Characteristics

The features include many discrete piles of water-worn cobbles averaging roughly four to five feet in diameter and 18 inches tall; many other piles that lie side-by-side and form a nearly continuous alignment a partially in-filled pit; a concentration of late nineteenth- or early twentieth-century domestic artifacts; and several low silt piles. The cobbles are more-or-less homogenous in size, ranging from about four to 10 inches in diameter, and many have lichen growth. None of the rocks are broken, exhibit plow marks, or show evidence of having been moved by heavy equipment. There is no dirt mixed in with the rocks. Artifacts found directly on the piles included a large, smashed bucket, two “church-key”-opened beverage cans (one with a barely legible label reading “Acme [Beer]”), and two bent sections of galvanized metal. The cans date to sometime between 1935 and 1950, several decades after the artifacts in Locus 1, and probably reflect a later visit to the site.
Table 4. Inventory of Artifacts Identified at LE-1H during Extended Phase I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACT NO.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vessel sherd; salt-glazed exterior, unglazed interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>White Improved Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim and body fragment of thick, white “hotelware” cup or small bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Aqua glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragments of large, heavy paneled bottle, square or rectangular</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>14-42-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>SCA glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thick, heavy base fragment of octagonal drinking glass/tumbler</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>14-45-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>White Improved Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Small body sherd, crazed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Olivine glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small, curved sherd, probably bottle fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>Opaque porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rim sherd of thin, white cup/bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-50-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Cut nail</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cut nail, 16d, unbent</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shiny brown glaze, coiling visible on interior; one with partial handle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>Colorless glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiny flat shards, probably window glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Metal-wrapped wire, possibly rim of key-wind can</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-55-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Carriage bolt, 6 inches long</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>SCA glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Base and body fragment to square/rectangular bottle</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>14-57-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Heavy nut, 1 inch wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10-gauge, bent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>White Improved Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Saucer/plate fragment, crazed</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-00-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>White Improved Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiny rim fragment, thin, curved (cup?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Colorless glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Frosted, curved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Doll</td>
<td>Bisque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Painted “hair” (top of doll’s head)</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>15-12-18 (adjacent to possible privy pit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Thin, bent, possibly a hook/pin or similar item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spoon</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tablespoon, complete bowl, handle missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut nail</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9d, unbent</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>SCA glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Thick, curved fragment</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>15-18-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>White Improved Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tiny sherd with green transferprint design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bucket</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Complete, smashed, large/heavy bucket with lug-type handle</td>
<td>15-32-03 (on Feature 4 tailings pile)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Horseshoe nail</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cut, flattened head</td>
<td>19th/early 20th century</td>
<td>Not mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>“Acme” Beer can, “church-key” opened, ca. 1935–1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not mapped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a Numbers relate to photographs. MNI – Minimum number of individuals; SCA – Sun-colored amethyst.
**Historical Background**

This area is part of the Butte Creek Watershed historic-era gold mining region, which drew local and international immigrants starting in about 1850 (BCWC 1998). Although no gold mines appear to be mapped in the immediate vicinity of the APE, this region was heavily mined between the 1850s and 1950s. Jensen (2010:6) states that “mine tailings and waste rock piles, particularly along both Little Butte and Butte Creeks, are prominent man-made features that attest to the extent of this period of mining, which dates primarily to the latter part of the 19th through the mid-20th Centuries”; however, he does not indicate his source(s) for this information.

A review of historic-era maps, histories, and records search results provided no direct information on who created the tailings features, or when. On-line Land Patent Records maintained by the Bureau of Land Management list a Benjamin Franklin Potter as having filed a Homestead Entry on January 27, 1880, for 160 acres in Section 32, “Lot/Tract 1” and “Lot/Tract 2.” These lots appear to correspond to the NW 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of Section 32, the same location as the recorded tailings (Figure 9). Potter is listed in the 1881 City and County Directory of Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Butte, and Tehama Counties as “Potter, Benj F., farmer” (McKenney 1881:312). The 1900 census lists him as living in Chico with his wife Mary and their daughter Lula. Benjamin and Mary are also listed in the 1910 and 1920 censuses for Chico, although their daughter is no longer listed as living in the household. By 1930, Benjamin is listed as a widower, living with his daughter “Angelina.”

**Assessment of Eligibility**

Because of the likelihood of additional artifacts and the possibility of structural remains, the presence of numerous discrete features reflecting a small placer mining landscape, and its association with a known household, the site may be eligible for the California and/or the National Register; however, it could not be formally evaluated at the survey level. We therefore recommend additional subsurface excavation and archival research to fully assess its eligibility; alternatively, the site can be determined eligible for the purposes of the project, and treated accordingly (see Summary and Recommendations, page 32).

**LE-1P—Prehistoric Isolate**

A single isolated flake of dark gray cryptocrystalline silicate material was also recorded during the pedestrian survey. No additional evidence of prehistoric occupation was observed despite more intensive survey and removal of ground cover in the immediate area of the isolate. Isolates are, by definition, ineligible for listing on the National and California Registers. No further management of this isolate is recommended.

---

2 Most of the 1890 census records were destroyed by fire.
Figure 9. Portion of 1878 Plat Map showing Subdivisions of Section 32.
V - SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Far Western conducted limited archival research, a buried-site sensitivity assessment, Native American and historical society consultations, and a pedestrian survey for the proposed project. Two historic-era resources, BUT-1281H and BUT-2207H, were identified within the APE during the records search, and another two resources and one isolate were identified through pedestrian survey (Table 5). The parcel has low potential for buried cultural resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-BUT-1281H, Segments A-C</td>
<td>Stone fence line (“rock walls”)</td>
<td>Incorporate into open space/parkland, with interpretive signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-BUT-2207H</td>
<td>Building foundation</td>
<td>Avoid impacts or conduct formal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch Ditch</td>
<td>Irrigation ditch, built ca. 1895–1912</td>
<td>Appears eligible to the California Register at the local level of significance; recordation and archival research serve as mitigation of project impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE-1H</td>
<td>Placer mining landscape</td>
<td>Avoid impacts or conduct formal evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site BUT-1281H, initially recorded as a small segment of historic-era “rock wall” (stone fence), proved to be part of a larger feature running the length of the project parcel. It was also recommended ineligible at the time of recordation (Jensen and Associates 1992), but with no supporting data. An earlier study by Swinlinger and Bayham (1988:3) reported that “the stone fence that still stands on Bruce and Humboldt Roads was built [for] Mr. Bruce in the early 1870s” and concluded that “for both reasons of historic significance and their value as an intangible asset of the landscape, stone fences should be preserved when possible” (1988:5). They recommended avoiding impacts to the wall, possibly by incorporating it into development plans. We concur with that recommendation, particularly since the City of Chico’s General Plan identifies “rock walls” as features of local significance.

Site BUT-2207H, a historic-era building foundation initially recorded in February 1992, was recommended at that time as ineligible for the National Register; however, that recommendation appears to have been based on surface observations only, without archival research or subsurface exploration. While the site lacks sufficient integrity to be considered eligible under Criteria A/1, B/2, or C/3, it remains unevaluated with respect to Criterion D. Impacts to this site should be avoided; if avoidance is not feasible, a formal site evaluation is recommended. Under CEQA, the City may decide to accept the 1992 evaluation; however, under Section 106, that evaluation probably will not be accepted by the State Historic Preservation Office.

The two newly recorded resources include segments of the historic Crouch Ditch and site LE-1H, associated with late nineteenth-early twentieth-century placer mining. The ditch appears to be eligible for the California Register under Criteria 1 and 2 at the local level, but not at the state or national level; it does not appear to be eligible for the National Register. Recordation and archival research conducted for this study have mitigated any impacts to sections of the ditch within the project parcels. Site LE-1H contains a relatively dense (and temporally diagnostic) artifact locus, and at least 18 other features. A full evaluation of this site was not possible at the survey level, and so it is recommended that all impacts to the site be avoided; if avoidance is not feasible, a formal evaluation is warranted. Alternatively, the site can be recommended eligible for the purposes of the project, with the written stipulation that data recovery, archival research, public interpretation, and/or other forms of mitigation will take place before the site is impacted.

During consultation with the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria, the Tribe requested that any future ground-disturbing activity near waterways or in areas mapped by the Mechoopda as High Sensitivity areas (City of Chico 2009) be monitored by a tribal consultant. Finally, if the APE is expanded beyond its current limits, additional cultural resources studies may be required.
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APPENDIX A

RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS

CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW
APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Sent</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sent By</th>
<th>Sent to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2016</td>
<td>Sacred Lands File Request</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov">nahc@nahc.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/2016</td>
<td>Sacred Lands File Records Search and NAHC Native American Contact List</td>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laurel@farwestern.com">laurel@farwestern.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>KonKow Valley Band of Maidu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallace Clark-Wilson, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 5850, Oroville, CA 95966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis E. Ramirez, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125 Mission Ranch Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chico, CA, 95926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Archuleta, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1 Alverda Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oroville, CA 95966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Redding Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Potter, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 Redding Rancheria Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redding, CA, 96001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth Wright, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77826 Covelo Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Covelo, CA 95428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2016</td>
<td>Consultation Letter</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Butte County Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 2195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oroville, CA, 95965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2016</td>
<td>Telephone Call between Michael DeSpain and Laurel Engbring; discussion included high-sensitivity of areas of the APE near waterways, and a request from the Mechoopda Indian Tribe for tribal monitors to be present during future ground-breaking activity including coring.</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Michael Despain, Mechoopda Indian Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laurel Engbring at Far Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, left voicemail</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Wallace Clark-Wilson, KonKow Valley Band of Maidu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, received information that Gary Archuleta was retired, and new tribal chair was Benjamin Clark, who was out of town but available by email at <a href="mailto:benjamin.clark@mooretown.org">benjamin.clark@mooretown.org</a>.</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Gary Archuleta, Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Email; attached initial consultation letter sent to Gary Archuleta and requested input from current tribal chair.</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Benjamin Clark, Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, left voicemail</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Jack Potter, Redding Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, received information that Kenneth Wright was deceased, and new tribal chair was James Russ, available at (707) 354-0322.</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Kenneth Wright, Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, left voicemail</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>James Russ, Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/2017</td>
<td>Telephone Call, left voicemail</td>
<td>Far Western</td>
<td>Butte County Historical Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA  95501
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: Stonegate VTSM Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: Butte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USGS Quadrangle
Name: Chico
Township: 22N Range: 2E Section(s): 31 and 32

Contact Person: Laurel Engbring
Street Address: 2727 Del Rio Place, Suite A
City: Davis Zip: 95618
Phone: (530) 756-3941 Extension: 155
Fax: (530) 756-0811
Email: laurel@farwestern.com

Project Description:
The City of Chico proposes a General Plan amendment and rezoning of the Stonegate Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map (VTSM) in southeast Chico. The 284-acre project site includes four vacant parcels, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 002-190-041 and 018-510-007, -008, and -009, that would be rezoned to include open space, public right-of-way, park, single-family residential standard and half-acre lots, multi-family residential, and commercial use.

Project Location Map is attached
July 13, 2016

Laurel Engbring  
Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc.

E Mail: laurel@farwestern.com  
Number of Pages: 2  
RE: Stonegate VTSM, Butte County

Dear Ms. Engbring,

Attached is a list of tribes that have cultural and traditional affiliation to the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above. I suggest you contact all of those listed, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult, as may be required under particular state statutes. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

The NAHC also recommends that project proponents conduct a record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) at the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) to determine if any tribal cultural resources are located within the area(s) affected by the proposed action. The SFL, established under Public Resources Code section 5094, are sites submitted for listing to the NAHC by California Native American tribes. The SFL, established under Public Resources Code section 5094, are sites submitted for listing to the NAHC by California Native American tribes. A record search of the SLF was completed for the APE referenced above with negative results. Please note records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of tribal cultural resources. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of tribal cultural resources.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact via email: frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Frank Lienert  
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List

7/13/2016

KonKow Valley Band of Maidu
Wallace Clark-Wilson, Chairperson
PO Box 5850
Oroville, CA, 95966
Phone: (530) 533 - 1504
res219ng@gmail.com

Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria
Dennis E. Ramirez, Chairperson
125 Mission Ranch Blvd
Chico, CA, 95926
Phone: (530) 899-8922
Fax: (530) 899-8517
dramirez@mechoopda-nsn.gov

Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians
Gary Archuleta, Chairperson
#1 Alverda Drive
Oroville, CA, 95966
Phone: (530) 533-3625
Fax: (530) 533-3680
frontdesk@mooretown.org

Redding Rancheria
Jack Potter, Chairperson
2000 Redding Rancheria Road
Redding, CA, 96001
Phone: (530) 225-8979
Fax: (530) 241-1879

Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community
Kenneth Wright, President
77826 Covelo Road
Covelo, CA, 95428
Phone: (707) 983-6126
Fax: (707) 983-6128
tribalcouncil@rvit.org

KonKow                  Maidu
Mekoopda                Chico Rancheria
Maidu                  Mechoopda
Maidu                  Mooretown Rancheria
Maidu                  Redding Rancheria
Wintu                  Yana
KonKow                  Nomlaki
KonKow                  Plt River
Pomo                   Wallaki
Wintu                  Yuki

*This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.34 of the Public Resources Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Stonegate VTSM project.
July 26, 2016

Wallace Clark-Wilson, Chairperson
KonKow Valley Band of Maidu
PO Box 5850
Oroville, CA, 95966

RE: Proposed Stonegate Subdivision in Chico, Butte County, California.

Dear Chairperson Clark-Wilson:

The City of Chico proposes to amend their General Plan to rezone four vacant parcels (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers [APN] 002-190-041 and 018-510-007, -008, and -009) for the planned Stonegate Vesting Tentative Subdivision located in southeast Chico, Butte County, California. The subdivision will include open space, public right-of-way, a park, single- and multi-family residential homes, and commercial buildings. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is shown on the enclosed maps.

The City of Chico is responsible for implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for this project. Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., has been retained by WRA, Inc. to complete an archaeological resources assessment for the project and to assist with the Section 106 consultation process. We have conducted an archival records search and identified two resources within the APE (historic-period rock wall and building foundation) and four additional resources within the quarter-mile records search extent (historic-era stone fence, rock wall, dilapidated residence with associated silos and a ditch, and a prehistoric bedrock mortar complex). We will be conducting a pedestrian survey of the project area in the next few weeks to identify and record any additional cultural resources that may be present.

The intent of this letter is to inform you about the project and provide the opportunity for you to express any concerns you may have about impacts to traditional values or spiritual places within the project APE. We would appreciate your response by August 10th, 2016. If you need any further information or wish to discuss this project, please contact me at (530) 756-3941.

Sincerely,

Laurel Engbring
Staff Archaeologist
laurel@farwestern.com

Attached: Project Location Map
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE CITY OF CHICO CONSULTATION WITH
THE MECHOOPDA INDIAN TRIBE OF CHICO RANCHERIA

WHEREAS, the City of Chico (the "City") recognizes the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico
Rancheria (the "Tribe") as the first people, whose ancestral lands and area of occupation encompass the
City of Chico, its sphere of influence, and beyond; and

WHEREAS, the Tribe is a sovereign, federally recognized tribe whose members are honored
and respected first peoples of this land; and

WHEREAS, the Tribal Council is the governing body of the Tribe, empowered to make tribal
policy and carry out tribal business; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 18 adopted in 2004 requires the City to consult with the Tribe prior to
the adoption of any amendment to the General Plan, adoption of any specific plan or prior to the
designation of land as open space containing cultural places; and

WHEREAS, the City and the Tribe wish to develop a broader cooperative agreement which
extends beyond that which is specified in SB 18 including consultation on all open space designations;
and

WHEREAS, the City and the Tribe are committed to working with each other on a government
to government basis to develop a cooperative, streamlined process for such consultation; and

WHEREAS, consultation means the meaningful and timely process to notify, discuss, and
consider carefully the views of others, in a manner that is respectful of each other's cultural values and,
where feasible, to seek agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes and agrees to accommodate the Tribe's need to maintain
confidentiality to protect archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and traditional cultural
resources, to the extent allowed for by law, including, but not limited to, exemption from public
disclosure as set forth in SB 18 and California Government Code section 6254(r); and

WHEREAS, the City and the Tribe seek to consult and work cooperatively to protect, preserve,
 enhance, mitigate, and manage archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and traditional
cultural resources, identified within the jurisdiction and sphere of influence of the City, whether on public or private land; and

WHEREAS, the City is committed to enabling the Tribe to access and steward their cultural resources and places by designation and utilizing open and vacant space, and by Tribal acquisition of conservation easements voluntarily conveyed where feasible.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AGREED BY THE CITY AND THE TRIBE AS FOLLOWS:

The City and the Tribe shall work together to establish procedures for consultation which will provide an efficient process for that consultation with both parties committed to open, candid, respectful, timely, and effective communication; and

The Director of the Planning Services Department shall designate a staff member as a Tribal Technical Advisor for Native American consultation to advise the City departments on policy issues and provide appropriate technical information to the Tribe; and

The City and the Tribe shall endeavor to provide the resources necessary for the investigation, evaluation, monitoring, mitigation, and ongoing protection of traditional cultural properties and for the potential disposition of artifacts through the budgetary, development, and capital improvement processes; and

The City and the Tribe shall develop a cultural resources management plan, subject to funding availability, which may include a cultural resource and historic preservation component within the General Plan, and/or update the City's Best Management Practices, or appropriate standard operating procedures, whose purposes are to specify actions to be taken to protect, preserve, enhance, mitigate, and manage, or dispose of, traditional cultural properties and resources identified or impacted within the City.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the signatures of the representatives on the date indicated below that the City and the Tribe formally endorses and accepts this Memorandum of Understanding.

DATE: August 5, 2008

CITY OF CHICO

MECHOOPDA INDIAN TRIBE OF CHICO RANCHERIA

By: David Burkland, City Manager

By: Dennis Ramirez, Tribal Chairman
Approved as to form:

City of Chico

By: Roger S. Wilson, Assistant City Attorney

Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria

By: Christina V. Kazhe, Tribal General Counsel

S:\Resolutions\MOU, Mechoopda.doc
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SITE RECORDS
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