

**CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**  
**Mid-Pacific Region**  
**Division of Environmental Affairs**  
**Cultural Resources Branch**

**MP-153 Tracking Number:** 15-CCAO-149

**Project Name:** Maidu Bike Park Project

**NEPA Document:** Environmental Assessment and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS/MND)

**MP 153 Cultural Resources Reviewer:** Mark Carper

**NEPA Contact:** Bonnie Van Pelt, Natural Resources Specialist

**Determination:** No Adverse Effect

**Date:** January 20, 2016

---

This proposed undertaking by Auburn Recreation District (ARD) is to construct and operate a recreational bike park on land within the existing Maidu Regional Park near Auburn, California. The proposed project is situated on land owned by Reclamation but managed by the ARD. Construction of the proposed project requires Reclamation authorization. Reclamation determined that the issuance of the authorization is an undertaking as defined in 36 CFR § 800.16(y) and a type of activity that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties under 36 CFR § 800.3(a).

The proposed action would result in construction and operation of a recreational bike park on an approximately 9-acre site. Components of the bike park would include a number of tracks and trails as well as an Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant picnic area, restrooms, and an observation area adjacent to the existing Canyon View Community Center parking lot. The vast majority of the tracks and trails would be constructed on imported fill soils to build berms, hills, banks on turns, etc. One proposed bike path, which spans approximately 1-mile, exits the main 9-acre site and follows existing trails and roadways.

In an effort to identify historic properties, the ARD contracted the environmental consulting firm Dudek to conduct a cultural resources inventory. As part of this investigation, Dudek conducted a records search of the project area at the North Central Information Center, reviewed archival information provided by Reclamation, and conducted a pedestrian survey of the proposed project APE. One cultural resource was

**CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**  
**Mid-Pacific Region**  
**Division of Environmental Affairs**  
**Cultural Resources Branch**

identified within the APE: CA-PLA-1759-H, the Shirland Canal. The canal bisects the APE from north to south extending a total of 4.4 miles. Originally an earthen canal built post 1926 as a lateral for the Boardman Canal; the Shirland Canal has been lined with gunnite at an undetermined date. The canal was evaluated for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and was determined ineligible as it failed to meet any requisite criteria for significance.

Pursuant to the regulations at 36 CFR § 800.3(f)(2), Reclamation identified the Shingle Springs Rancheria and the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (UAIC) as Indian tribes who might attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties within the APE. Reclamation sent letters to the tribes on July 17, 2015, inviting their participation in the Section 106 process, and requesting their assistance in the identification of sites of religious and cultural significance or historic properties that may be affected by the proposed undertaking pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(4).

On August 11, 2015 Reclamation received an email from the Mr. Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager for the UAIC, stating that the UAIC had concerns about the project as they had identified a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) and possible historic properties in the APE. Reclamation archaeologist Mr. Mark Carper met with Ms. Melodi McAdams and Mr. Donald Rey of the UAIC at the project location on August 26, 2015 to discuss the Tribe's concerns. During the meeting Ms. McAdams did not identify any possible historic properties as mentioned in Mr. Guerrero's email, but rather expressed concern over the lack of ground visibility reported in the Dudek cultural inventory. To address her concerns, Mr. Carper and the UAIC representatives conducted a reconnaissance level walk over of the entire APE. During this reconnaissance Ms. McAdams identified an area of concern.

Mr. Carper met again with Ms. McAdams and Mr. Rey on October 16, 2015 to document the area of concern and to identify a boundary and an avoidance buffer should the project proceed. The location being the only identified area of concern within the APE. A border around the area of concern was generated and a buffer ranging from 3 to 5 meters was created around that. No buffer was added to the west side of the location as the Shirland Canal and berms abut to the west. Such a buffer would have been superfluous. The UAIC agreed with the size of the proposed buffer. Subsequently, it was determined that one of the proposed bike paths would intersect with part of the location of concern. The ARD was contacted and they redesigned the path to completely avoid the site and the buffer. Further, the ARD added an additional precautionary buffer of approximately 3 meters

**CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**  
**Mid-Pacific Region**  
**Division of Environmental Affairs**  
**Cultural Resources Branch**

beyond what was previously generated. As the location of concern will be completely avoided by the proposed project Reclamation did not formally evaluate it for NRHP inclusion. No further concerns specific to the proposed project were presented by the UAIC.

Reclamation initiated consultation with California the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on December 17, 2015 with a determination of no historic properties affected for the proposed project. SHPO staff contacted Mr. Carper via email on December 31, 2015 informing him that SHPO would not concur with a determination of “no historic properties affected” as they did not agree with the evaluation for the Shirland Canal. Mr. Carper discussed the matter with them on that date, and it was agreed that for the purposes of the project Reclamation would assume the canal eligible for NRHP inclusion with a determination of no adverse effect. SHPO continued the review based upon the altered determination and concurred in a letter dated January 19, 2016.

Reclamation has concluded the NHPA Section 106 process for this undertaking. After reviewing the EA for the proposed project Reclamation finds that this action would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places

This memorandum is intended to convey the completion of the NHPA Section 106 process for this undertaking. Please retain a copy in the administrative record for this action. Should changes be made to this project, additional NHPA Section 106 review, possibly including consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, may be necessary. Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment.