

## **E - ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES**

### **7.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

#### **7.1 Applicable Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, Statutes and Plans**

Cultural resources in California are protected by a variety of federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, regulations, and statutes. In addition, numerous comprehensive plans and programs have been developed that include detailed policies and guidelines for management of cultural resources present in the vicinity of the Project. These laws, ordinances, regulations, statutes, programs, and plans and their application to cultural resources in the Project area are summarized below.

##### **7.1.1 Eldorado National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as Amended**

The Eldorado National Forest (ENF) Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) is discussed in Section E1.1.1. This plan sets forth the following goal for cultural resources: “Locate, preserve and enhance representative historical and archaeological properties that typify the social and economic evolution of forest lands and cultures” (USDA 1988). The ENF LRMP further acknowledges the continued relevance of three existing plans that relate to cultural resources management. These are the Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan, the Mokelumne River Project Cultural Resources Plan, and the South Fork American River (SFAR) Comprehensive Cultural Resources Plan.

##### **7.1.2 Desolation Wilderness Management Guidelines**

The United States Forest Service (USFS) Desolation Wilderness Management Guidelines are described in Section E4.1.2. These guidelines include a management goal to “identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resource sites pursuant to federal laws and in a manner consistent with protection of the wilderness resource.” Among the impacts known to affect cultural resources within the Desolation Wilderness area are recreational camping, trail construction and use, vandalism, cattle grazing, and the annual raising and lowering of lakes. The Management Guidelines include standards and guidelines for heritage resources that include the requirement to conduct surveys prior to site-specific projects, establish a survey strategy for identifying high-elevation sites, mitigate impacts to significant heritage resources, and conduct all interpretation of heritage resources at locations outside of the wilderness.

##### **7.1.3 Framework for Archaeological Research and Management**

The Framework for Archaeological Research and Management on the National Forests of the North-Central Sierra Nevada (FARM) guides the heritage resource management program for the ENF and other USFS lands in the Sierra Nevada. This multi-volume document established planning tools such as heritage resource emphasis zones (HREZ) and heritage resource management areas (HRMA), as well as providing project-specific planning and management

requirements. The FARM is presented in three units: 1) The Framework and its Context; 2) Forest Overviews; and 3) Special Studies and Research Data. The 10 principles guiding the FARM begin with “an understanding and appreciation of the prehistoric past is in the public’s interest.” (Jackson et al. 1994, Unit 1, Vol. A: 1-13).

#### 7.1.4 American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (PL 95-341)

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) established federal policy to protect and preserve the inherent rights of freedom for Native groups to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions. These rights included, but are not limited to, access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites.

#### 7.1.5 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 USC 3001 et seq.)

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) required federal agencies and certain recipients of federal funds to document Native American human remains and cultural items within their collections, notify Native groups of their holdings, and provide an opportunity for repatriation of these materials. This Act also requires planning for dealing with potential future collections of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony.

#### 7.1.6 National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470 et seq.)

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP); authorized the Secretary of the Interior to maintain the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); directed the Secretary to approve state historic preservation programs that provided for a State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); established a National Historic Preservation Fund program; and codified the National Historic Landmarks program.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on properties that may be eligible for or listed on the NRHP, and afford the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment. To determine if an undertaking could affect NRHP-eligible properties, all cultural sites (including archeological, historical, and architectural properties) that could be impacted by the undertaking must be inventoried and evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.

The Section 106 review process (36 CFR 800) is implemented using a five-step procedure:

1. Initiation of the Section 106 process through contact with the appropriate SHPO; establishment of the Area of Potential Effects (APE); identification of other consulting and interested parties; and commencement of public involvement by the responsible federal agency, which is FERC in the case of hydroelectric relicensing or the designated federal representative (as authorized by FERC, may be SMUD).
2. Identification and evaluation of historic properties within the APE.

3. Assessment of the effects of the undertaking on properties that are eligible for the NRHP.
4. Consultation with the SHPO, concerned parties, and other agencies to resolve adverse effects and the development of an agreement document (memorandum of agreement or programmatic agreement) that addresses the treatment of historic properties, if appropriate.
5. Implementation according to the conditions of the agreement document.

7.1.7 Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 USC 431-433)

The Antiquities Act authorized the President of the United States to designate national monuments and provided criminal penalties (fines and/or imprisonment) for the unauthorized excavation, injury, or destruction of prehistoric or historic ruins and objects of antiquity. This Act also authorized the Secretaries of the U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI), Agriculture, and War to issue permits to qualified institutions for the excavation of archeological sites or removal of archeological items if such actions were in the best interests of the United States.

7.1.8 Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 USC 461-467)

The Historic Sites Act established a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States, and led to the implementation of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) by the Secretary of the Interior and the NPS. This Act also created a National Park System Advisory Board, which in part was responsible for making recommendations on the designation of national historic landmarks.

7.1.9 National Trust Act of 1949 (Public Law [PL] 81-408)

The National Trust Act of 1949 established the National Trust for Historic Preservation and empowered the Trust to acquire and hold property for historic preservation purposes.

7.1.10 Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960 (16 USC 469-469c)

The Reservoir Salvage Act required that federal agencies notify the Secretary of the Interior before constructing or issuing a license to construct a dam, and that the Secretary shall survey the area for archaeological resources. This Act specifically provided for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be irreparably lost or destroyed as the result of flooding, the building of access roads, the erection of workmen's communities, the relocation of railroads and highways, and other alterations of the terrain caused by the construction of a dam by any agency of the United States, or by any private person or corporation holding a license issued by any such agency.

7.1.11 Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 USC 469)

Supplementing the Reservoir Salvage Act, the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act provided for the recovery, protection, and preservation of significant scientific, prehistoric, historic, and archaeological data that might be lost or destroyed as a result of construction of dams, reservoirs, and other federally licensed construction projects.

7.1.12 Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 USC 470aa-mm)

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act amended the Antiquities Act, and set a broad policy that archaeological resources are important to the nation and should be protected, and required special permits prior to the excavation or removal of archaeological resources from public or Indian lands. The purpose of this Act was to secure, for the present and future benefit of the American people, the protection of archaeological resources and sites which are on public lands and Indian lands, and to foster increased cooperation and exchange of information between governmental authorities, the professional archaeological community, and private individuals having collections of archaeological resources and data which were obtained before October 31, 1979.

7.1.13 Indian Sacred Sites (Executive Order 13007)

On March 24, 1996, the President of the United States issued an executive order mandating that in managing federal lands, each executive branch agency with statutory or administrative responsibility for the management of federal lands shall, to the extent practicable permitted by law, and not clearly inconsistent with essential public functions 1) accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners and 2) avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites. Where appropriate, agencies are required to maintain the confidentiality of sacred sites.

7.1.14 Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California

In 1997, the California Office of Historic Preservation published a comprehensive planning guide for historic preservation in the state, pursuant to Section 101 of the NHPA (California State Parks 1997). This document was intended to “serve as a guide for decision-making; to help communicate historic preservation policy, goals, and values to all levels of government and local organizations; and to ensure that our historic resources are preserved for many generations to come.” Incorporation of the applicable preservation goals, concerns, and priorities described in the statewide plan will be addressed through the stakeholder involvement process.

7.1.15 El Dorado County General Plan

The El Dorado County (EDC) General Plan is discussed in Section E3.1.11. The Conservation and Open Space element of the EDC General Plan included a goal to “ensure the preservation of the County’s important cultural resources.” Four objectives to meet this goal were developed: 1) protection of the County’s cultural heritage, 2) maintenance of the visual integrity of historic resources, 3) recognition of prehistoric/historic resources, and 4) protection of cemeteries.

The first objective (identification and preservation of cultural resources) includes five policies: 1) creating a Cultural Resources section in the Zoning Ordinance, 2) maintaining the confidential nature of archeological and historical site locational information, 3) conducting cultural resource studies prior to approval of discretionary projects, 4) promoting the registration of historic districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects in the NRHP and inclusion in the California Points of Historic Interest and Inventory of Historic Resources, and 5) forming a Cultural Resources Preservation Commission to aid in the protection and preservation of the County's important cultural resources.

The second objective, dealing with the visual integrity of historic resources, includes six policies. The first establishes Historic Design Control Districts for areas that have special historic significance. The second policy is to develop historic design guidelines for use in Historic Design Control Combining Zone Districts that may be established. The third policy is that new buildings and reconstructions in historic communities shall general conform to prevalent historic (1850 to 1910) architectural styles. The fourth policy is that significant historic buildings shall not be torn down, demolished, destroyed, altered, removed expanded, improved, or otherwise changed in exterior appearance without a design review. The fifth policy relating to maintaining visual integrity is that when the County permits the demolition or alteration of a historic building, such alteration or new construction shall maintain the character of the historic building or replicate its historic features. Finally, the County shall cooperate with the State to identify the viewshed of Coloma State Park and establish specific guidelines for development within the viewshed, and shall continue to support the relocation of the State Route 49 bypass in a manner intended to protect the park's visual and physical integrity.

No specific policies were drafted for the objective of recognizing the value of the County's prehistoric and historic resources to residents, tourists, and the economy of the County. This objective includes the desire to promote public access to and the enjoyment of such resources.

The final objective in the EDC General Plan is the identification, preservation, and protection of cemeteries. One policy, to protect access routes and parking at existing cemeteries, is listed under this objective (El Dorado County 1996).

#### 7.1.16 El Dorado County River Management Plan

Due to concerns about changes in river use patterns and levels since 1988, and the potential impacts to water quality and environmental quality, EDC has authorized the preparation of an updated River Management Plan. The process of updating the 1988 plan began over 5 years ago and an EIR is now before the County Board of Supervisors for selection of a plan alternative. Although not yet formally selected, the alternative presented for approval to the Board of Supervisors includes elements of education, safety, transportation, river activity monitoring, community coordination, facility improvements, use permit enforcement and changes to regulations and ordinances related to river use to reduce environmental effects on the surrounding area. Once the Board of Supervisors has selected a preferred alternative, staff will prepare a revised plan. The County staff plans to complete the plan revision and submit it by September 2001 to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

In September of 2000, the EDC Board of Supervisors issued a revised draft EIR focusing on the management of recreational boating (i.e., whitewater rafting) activities on the SFAR. Four of the nine objectives stated for this project make specific reference to cultural resource issues. Objective 2 notes the desire to provide adequate facilities and services, while protecting the “cultural and human resource values of the river.” Objective 3 is “to preserve and enhance the unique range of experiences and historic character of the river.” Objective 6 states the desire “to preserve and protect environmental and cultural resources.” Finally, Objective 7 addresses the need to enhance educational programs dealing with river safety, as well as “respect for... natural and historical resources.”

The cultural resources section of the EIR describes what is known of the affected environment (including the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic past), including a discussion of water developments on the SFAR that began in the 1850s. The discussion of impacts to cultural resources in the EIR is restricted to the construction of new facilities that could affect cultural resources, and mitigation measures deemed appropriate for the avoidance or reduction of such impacts (EDC 2000).

#### 7.1.17 Sacramento County General Plan

The Sacramento County General Plan is discussed in Section E3.1.12. The General Plan includes a Conservation Element that incorporates goals and objectives relative to cultural resources. The County revised portions of the cultural resources section of the Conservation Element of the General Plan on May 2, 1997 (Section VI). Revisions to the Background Documentation section of the Conservation Element (Section VII) were approved on June 21, 1992.

As stated in Section VI of the Conservation Element of the Sacramento General Plan, the County holds a goal to “promote the inventory, protection, and interpretation of the cultural heritage of Sacramento County, including historical and archaeological settings, sites, buildings, features, artifacts and/or areas of ethnic historical, religious or socio-economical importance.” There are six objectives identified under this goal: 1) archeologic site protection during development, 2) historic structure preservation, 3) destruction of cultural resource sites, 4) cultural resource surveys, 5) artifact study and storage, and 6) public awareness of cultural resources. The intent of each of these objectives, along with associated policies and implementation measures, are described in detail in the General Plan (Conservation Element, pages 101-108).

Section VII of the Conservation Element that deals with the cultural resources background documentation (pages 214-222) addresses the nature of the prehistoric and historic resources of Sacramento County. This section also identifies four issues facing the management of these cultural resources: 1) the lack of systematic methods for handling cultural resources, 2) the lack of consensus and coordination among numerous agencies and interest groups, 3) the lack of adequate protection for significant sites, and 4) the lack of funding. As acknowledged in the conclusion to Section VII, the County states that “the need to protect and preserve these resources so future residents will have the opportunity to learn and appreciate the important contributions of past inhabitants increases the urgency” to address these issues.

The Sacramento County General Plan includes a public facilities element that was also adopted on December 15, 1993 and was amended on August 12, 1998. This plan element addresses, among other topics, the siting of electric generation facilities, policies related to electric distribution, and the electric transmission and subtransmission delivery system. Each of these topics in the General Plan discusses the County's objective to provide necessary public facilities while avoiding adverse impacts on historic and/or archaeological sites and/or districts (Public Facilities Element, pages 37-46). This section of the General Plan is focused on the construction of new electric facilities.

#### 7.1.18 Federal Power Act

The Federal Power Act, in particular sections 4(e), 10(j) and 18 of the act, are described in Section E1.1.4.

## 7.2 **Overview**

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) encompasses lands owned and managed by SMUD, the ENF, and various private parties and can be generally described as the FERC Project Boundary. The ENF maintains precise records of survey coverage of their lands as well as locations of all recorded resources. The North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) maintains records for both public and private lands in the Project area. SMUD consulted with CHRIS and the ENF Cultural Heritage Office in the Supervisor's Office, as well as examined files and talked to cultural resource staff at the Pacific, Georgetown, and Placerville Ranger Districts. These efforts were designed to collect information on known resources present in and adjacent to the APE, the extent of previous cultural resource identification efforts, and the status of site evaluations within the APE. The preliminary results of SMUD findings were discussed with ENF personnel, including the forest historian and the forest historic preservation officer.

### 7.2.1 Archeological Research in Area

Following closely upon the heels of the seminal publication on archeological work in the Central Valley (Lillard et al. 1939), archeological research in the Sierra Nevada over the last 50 years has resulted in the accumulation of a substantial body of knowledge. Investigations begun in the 1950s revolved around the examination of sites throughout the Lake Tahoe vicinity, including the lake shoreline, the Truckee River and Martis Valley, and the high Sierran crest east (*note: research in the 1950s was focused east of the crest*) of the lake (e.g., Arnold 1957; Elsasser 1960; Heizer and Elsasser 1953). This research led to the designation of two chronologically and spatially distinct archaeological complexes. The Martis Complex, first identified at CA-PLA-5, was dominated by basaltic materials and oriented toward hunting and gathering activities. The Martis Complex was believed to date to the period from 2,000 to 4,000 years ago. The more recent Kings Beach Complex, first noted at CA-PLA-9, was associated with bow and arrow technology, as well as a greater use of obsidian and silicate materials. Technological developments oriented toward the extensive use of local fisheries and piñon nuts were also apparent, and an affiliation with the Washoe was surmised (Heizer and Elsasser 1953). Archaeological materials attributed to these two

complexes were widely acknowledged to dominate the prehistoric record of the Sierra Nevada, including the upper portions of the UARP.

More recent work in the higher elevations of the Sierra Nevada has led to important modifications to the earlier sequence of archaeological developments. Excavations and analysis presented in Elston and Davis (1972), Elston et al. (1976), and others (e.g., Keesling and Johnson 1978) revealed the presence of several pre-Martis manifestations termed the Tahoe Reach and Spooner phases, and the division of the Martis and Kings Beach complexes into five more refined phases (Elston et al. 1977). Elston et al. (1994) subsequently revised this typology yet again, identifying four periods in the archaeological record: 1) Pre Archaic or Tahoe Reach phase (prior to 8,000 years BP); 2) Early Archaic or Spooner phase (8,000 to 5,000 BP); 3) Middle Archaic or Martis complex (5,000 to 1,300 BP); and 4) the Late Archaic or Kings Beach phase (1,300 BP to Euroamerican contact).

The Tahoe Reach Phase was originally defined by Elston et al. (1977) and was based in part on an early C<sup>14</sup> date of 8,130 +/-130 BP from the site of CA-PLA-164. Artifacts typologically designated as Parman points from another site, CA-PLA-23, also dated to around this time. Other sites with similarly early dates and typologically distinct lithic artifacts include the Spooner Lake Site (7,100 +/-140 BP). Climate during this period appears to have been characterized by a notable warming trend, similar to later Neoglacial intervals (Moratto 1984).

A group of somewhat later sites possessing temporal, technological and cultural affinities is referred to as the Early Archaic or Spooner Phase. This phase dates to as early as 7,000 BP. Associated projectile point styles include those in the Pinto and Humbolt series. Sites were occupied during the Altithermal climatic period; generally a hot, dry period. The initial definition of this phase hypothesizes that it involved a population movement out of the Great Basin. These movements may have been for exploiting the floral and faunal resources of the Sierran Transition Zone as it shifted to higher elevations during this time (Rondeau 1982).

The Middle Archaic or Martis Phase (or Martis Complex) consists of sites occurring in middle elevation ranges in the Sierra Nevada (approximately 2,000 to 5,500 feet above mean sea level) and appear to differ, at least technologically, from other phases. Martis sites date from around 6000 BP to about 1500 BP and possess features often interpreted as unique to the complex. The complex was originally noted and discussed by Heizer and Elsasser (1953) and was, in large part, based on artifact assemblage composition and the extensive use of basalt for stone tools. Whether or not the extensive use of this material is a manifestation of cultural and technological preferences or simply the result of an intensive use of a locally available resource is a matter of continued debate.

A tripartite division for the Martis, consisting of early, middle and late phases [tentatively proposed by Elston et al. (1977)] was based on the seriation of diagnostic projectile point types, and a single firm radiocarbon date for steamboat points. As a result of further studies and additional radiocarbon dates, it has been suggested that this division of the Martis is untenable. In fact, it might be better divided into two phases, the Early Martis series and the Late Martis series, defined by more securely dated diagnostic point types (Elston et al. 1994).

The Late Archaic or Kings Beach Phase is assigned to sites dating from around 1,500 BP to historic times. In the Truckee area, it is generally considered to be a prehistoric expression of the Washoe (Rondeau 1982). By this time, obsidian and siliceous materials are being more heavily utilized. The intensity of occupation in the higher elevations of the north-central Sierra Nevada appears to have been less than in previous times (Rondeau 1982).

A recent and significant addition to the study of archaeology in the north-central Sierra Nevada is the work of Ataman (1999) entitled *Post Modern Martis: New Archaeological Investigations in Martis Valley*. This project involved the extensive excavations at CA-PLA-5 and CA-PLA-6, documented in 1953 (Heizer and Elsasser 1953). CA-PLA-5 was critical in defining the Martis Complex and is considered the “type” site for this technological manifestation. Another nearby site, CA-PLA-6 was also investigated by Ataman (1999).

In 1996, as a result of natural gas pipeline construction, CA-PLA-5 and CA-PLA-6 were the focus of intensive field and laboratory efforts (Ataman 1999) in order to clarify and expand upon Heizer and Elsasser’s work of the early 1950’s. Analysis of the data recovered from these sites indicates that, over a 7,000-year period, these sites were sporadically inhabited with the use of CA-PLA-5 having been most intensive during early Martis times. Such fluctuations in the utilization of this site (and CA-PLA-6 as well) and hypothesized variation in prehistoric population densities throughout the region may be related to climatic shifts during the 7,000-year temporal span represented by cultural material on the sites. As climate patterns shifted between wet and dry periods, the carrying capacity of the environment may have necessitated shifts in subsistence strategies and land-use patterns. Consequently, such environmental pressures may have lead to chronologically definable variation in the archaeological record of the Martis Valley.

For years, researchers have found vague indications of some occupation of the west slopes of the Sierra Nevada during the early Holocene, circa 6000 to 8000 BC, or earlier, by representatives of what is known as the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition (Bedwell 1973). Elston defined the Tahoe Reach Phase for the Lake Tahoe region based on finds of large lanceolate and broad-stemmed projectile points (Elston et al. 1977), including two “Parman point” bases that were found near Truckee. Peak & Associates, Inc. (1981) found a Silver Lake point at the 5,400 foot elevation in 1980 on the SFAR, and reported a basalt Lake Mojave point from Plumas National Forest. Bedwell (1973) suggested the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition was essentially a lacustrine-based Late Pleistocene and Anathermal occupation, but these finds indicate it was more broadly based in geographic expression. Because these early cultures are not restricted to lacustrine habitats, the associated projectile points have sometimes been called the Western Stemmed Series or the Great Basin Stemmed Series.

The investigation of areas to be impacted by proposed water projects in the Sierra foothills has produced several more localized regional cultural chronologies (Childress and Ritter 1967; Johnson 1967; Rackerby 1965; Ritter 1970a, 1970b; True et al. 1976). Within the immediate Project area, two prehistoric sites were investigated near Gerle Creek in the early 1960s (Wilson and Dyson 1962). This investigation revealed possible house pit depressions and bedrock milling features, and suggested to the researchers use of the area by prehistoric populations during the summer months.

The overview of California archaeology by Moratto (1984) and the ENF Forest Overview (Jackson et al. 1994) provide useful summaries of the above studies relevant to the Project area.

### 7.2.2 Historical Developments in Area

The remote Project area received little attention from early explorers and trappers, although the 1808 Spanish expedition led by Gabriel Moraga did encounter the American River near the present City of Folsom (Beck and Haase 1974). A trapping party led by Jedediah Smith in 1826 undertook the next documented excursion through the area. Smith's attempt to travel east from the Central Valley over the Sierra Nevada led him up the divide between the SFAR and the Cosumnes River, perhaps in close proximity to the later Mormon Emigrant route or the Placerville Road (Supernowicz 1983). Trapping parties led by others in the 1830s and early 1840s primarily were directed through Sierran passes to the north and south of the Project (Beck and Haase 1974).

After the 1848 discovery of gold at Sutter's mill near Coloma, the quest for gold brought large numbers of immigrants into the region, exploring in search of rich mineral deposits. These immigrant miners included Chileans from South America, Kanakas from the South Pacific, Sonorans from northern Mexico, as well as Irish, French, English, Chinese, Italians, and Australians, to name a few. The years from 1848 through 1854 saw a tremendous increase in use of the fragile trails linking California to the east. Between 1851 and 1853 the Johnson Cut-Off Road was established as a shorter alternative to the Carson River Route, passing over Echo Summit and running east-west just south of the Project area. The Johnson Cut-Off Road became part of a more formalized wagon road system in the 1850s and 1860s, carrying the Pony Express mail service in 1860 and more than 10,000 foot and stage travelers in 1864 (Beck and Haase 1974; Hoover et al. 1990; Supernowicz 1983).

The rugged terrain of the Project area limited formal settlement of the region. Early mining camps were strategically located near the most promising gold deposits, with Placerville (originally called Dry Diggings and later Old Hangtown) and Folsom among the earliest camps that became more fully developed in the 1850s and 1860s, in large part due to their location along major transportation corridors. Gold was found near Placerville in July of 1848, and the placer and lode deposits found in the immediate vicinity were quite rich. The 20-acre claim at Coon Hollow yielded \$5,000,000, and the Spanish Hill area yielded \$6,000,000. The lode mining centered in the Placerville area was very profitable from about 1880 to 1915, with another spurt of activity in the 1930s (Clark 1969). The nearby Pacific Mining District, located near the community of Pacific House, is centered on a tertiary channel of placer deposits that were worked by several hydraulic and drift mining operations in the 1850s and 1860s (Clark 1969).

The repetitious fires that ravaged the original wooden buildings in these towns and camps soon led to the more prevalent use of stone structures, some of which still remain from these early days. The Methodist Episcopal Church, built in Placerville in 1851, is the oldest church building standing in El Dorado County, and is commemorated as State Historical Landmark No. 767 (Office of Historic Preservation 1996). Timber was still in high demand during the first decades after the discovery of gold at Coloma, serving as framing for buildings, sluice boxes, wing dams, flumes, and later to

shore hard rock shafts and adits. Yellow pine, fir and cedar were removed from large tracts of the foothills in the Mother Lode in the latter half of the 1800s (Supernowicz 1983).

Serving the booming mining operations of the 1850s through the 1880s provided opportunity to acquire wealth in a variety of support services. Logging, ranching, farming and orchard operations in the valley and lower foothills quickly grew to supply the mines and the miners of El Dorado and Sacramento counties. El Dorado County was home to more than 10,000 work oxen, dairy, and other cattle by 1870. In 1880, almost 23,000 sheep were being grazed in the county, from the eastern margins of the current Desolation Wilderness to the valley floor. The mountain meadows that later became the sites of several of the Project reservoirs were ideal for seasonal grazing in the summer and fall (Supernowicz 1983).

In 1874, a group of ranchers living in the Placerville area formed the commercially oriented California Fruit Grower's Association. One of the instigators of this early industry organization was J.J. Crawford, who operated the Park Canal and Mining Company's water system. Providing a reliable supply of water to the mines, ranches and towns of the foothills could be a highly profitable venture. The first recognized formal water conveyance system in the region was the Coloma Ditch, a three-mile-long ditch built in 1850 at a cost of \$10,000. Extensive systems, owned and operated by large economic organizations, were built throughout the Mother Lode in the 1850s and 1860s. Conversion of these early facilities to support hydroelectric development at the end of the 1800s led to the creation of dams at places such as Echo Lake (Supernowicz 1983).

The forests of the Project area were extensively logged immediately after the discovery of gold in 1848, although more efficient mills and transportation systems were not prevalent until the end of the 1850s. Developments such as the use of double-bitted rather than single-bit axes and the whip saw helped get logs to the ground more quickly, where they were hauled by teams of oxen to the nearest mills. Chutes, flumes, and sluices all helped deliver logs to the mills – where water supplies allowed. The advent of the steam donkey in the 1880s greatly improved the logger's ability to quickly get trees to the mill, with the development of railroad logging systems in the late 1800s representing the next great leap in lumbering technology. In 1892, the American Land and Lumber Company, later to become the Michigan-California Lumber Company, began use of a narrow gauge railroad system to bring logs from the forest to the mill at Pino Grande ([www.georgetowndivide.com](http://www.georgetowndivide.com)). Remnants of the narrow gauge track and the logging cable systems used along the SFAR canyon are still evident in the Project area. Other early logging operations, such as the California Door Company and the El Dorado Lumber Company also bought timbered lands and constructed railroad logging systems in this era in EDC, operating some smaller mills at places such as Fresh Pond (Supernowicz 1983).

In 1910, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) established the ENF in its efforts to consolidate and manage forested lands within the nation. The ENF, consisting of 841,211 acres, was formed from parts of the earlier Tahoe and Stanislaus National Forests. Issues such as mediating the conflicts between loggers and ranchers, and between sheep and cattle operations, as well as controlling wild fires, quickly dominated the administrative calendar. Development of recreational activities and a more broad-based land use policy was undertaken primarily after 1920 (Supernowicz 1983).

### 7.2.3 Hydroelectric System History

A history of the Project is provided in Section IV of this document. (Resources in the project area that are less than 50 years old cannot qualify for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places unless they possess “exceptional” significance (36 CFR 60.4[g]). No resources of this nature are known to exist in the UARP.)

### 7.2.4 Indian Tribes in Area

The Project area is generally considered the homeland of the Nisenan and Washoe ethnographic groups, who maintain strong interests in traditional practices and the heritage values of their ancestral homeland. Indian trust assets (ITAs) are legal interests in assets held in trust by the federal government for Indian tribes or individual Indians. Assets can be real property, physical assets, or intangible property rights. A characteristic of an ITA is that it cannot be sold, leased, or otherwise alienated without the US Government’s approval. Examples of ITAs are lands, including reservations and public domain allotments; minerals; water rights; hunting and fishing rights; other natural resources; money or claims. ITAs do not include things in which a tribe or individuals have no legal interest. For example, off-reservation sacred lands or archeological sites in which a tribe has no legal ownership interests are not ITAs. The APE does not contain any ITAs.

### 7.2.5 Ethnohistory

The accuracy of the ethnographic literature compiled in the first decades of the 1900s is constrained by several significant variables. Beginning with incursions by Spanish missionaries and military explorers along California’s western margin, native coastal populations were disrupted, disturbed, or displaced. These actions interfered with trade and social interactions between inland populations and their neighbors to the west. By the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, impacts associated with Euroamerican trappers, miners and settlers were felt directly by native occupants of the project area. The ravages of disease and military actions decimated the native people, further weakening cultural identity. Informants interviewed by early scholars were often uncertain of the original distribution of the various tribal groupings, and may not have had direct knowledge of pre-contact lifestyles.

The Project area lies primarily within an area ascribed to the Nisenan (sometimes called the Southern Maidu), with the upper elevations in the APE also within the sphere of influence of the Washoe (d’Azevedo 1986; Wilson et al. 1978). The Nisenan language, along with those of the Northeastern Maidu and the Konkow, form the Maidu family of the Penutian linguistic stock. These languages, while sharing significant similarities, are not mutually intelligible (Shipley 1978). Kroeber (1925) recognized three Nisenan dialects: Northern Hill Nisenan, Southern Hill Nisenan, and Valley Nisenan. Shipley (1978) defines seven such dialects, including Valley Nisenan, Oregon House, Auburn, Clipper Gap, Nevada City, Colfax, and Placerville. Additional primary sources of information on the Nisenan include publications by Faye (1923), Gifford (1927), Littlejohn (1928), Kroeber (1929, 1932), and Beals (1933). A more thorough overview of the cultural context of the ENF is presented in the Unit II, Volume A of the FARM (Jackson et al. 1994).

The Nisenan territory included the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American rivers and the lower drainages of the Feather River. The Nisenan ranged from the Sierra crest to nearly sea level at the Sacramento River. The Hill Nisenan occupied the majority of the APE prehistorically (Wilson et al. 1978). Hill Nisenan villages within the foothills were located on ridges, knolls, or larger terraced areas near water (Kroeber 1925; Wilson et al. 1978). Kroeber (1925) and Wilson et al. (1978) do not depict any Nisenan village locations above the approximate elevation of Placerville, although the imprecise nature of these data must be acknowledged (Kroeber 1925). Permanent occupation of the higher elevations in the Sierra Nevada was generally impractical due to heavy winter snows. Houses were conical in shape and covered with bark, skins or brush. Most villages included bedrock mortar sites. The Nisenan territory was crossed with trails allowing for easy access to, and trade with, other areas.

The Nisenan used a large tool kit, including flaked stone, bow and arrow, scrapers, groundstone and wooden tools. Cordage, netting and basketry were also devised. These tools helped the Nisenan take advantage of a wide range of the floral and faunal resources of their territory. Acorns, deer, fish, roots, birds, and berries were but a few of the most important foodstuffs used by the Nisenan, who followed a varying, year-round collecting and gathering strategy. These seasonal harvests included both personal and communal activities, with the most intensive activities connected to acorn gathering in the fall (Wilson et al. 1978).

The Washoe occupied an area extending approximately 4,000 square miles from the crest of the Sierra Nevada to the western edge of the Great Basin, with Lake Tahoe clearly within their core area. The Washoe extended beyond their core area in the pursuit of various resources, including excursions down the American River and other major westward-draining rivers (d'Azevedo 1986). The Washoe were the only native occupants in the Great Basin that were not members of the Numic language family. The Washoe instead are affiliated with the Hokan linguistic stock, a somewhat imprecise grouping of languages found in California and the Southwest (Jacobsen 1986). While ancient origins and affiliations are unclear from the linguistic evidence, the long-term persistence of the Washoe within their core area is generally supported, and they may have diverged from California Hokan groups anywhere from 5,500 years to 10,000 years ago (Supernowicz 1983). The interested reader is referred to the following partial list of publications for further information concerning the Washoe: Powers (1876); Curtis (1930); Barrett (1917); and Stewart (1941, 1944).

Washoe village settlements, none of which were recorded near the Project APE, were generally situated at elevations at or below 5,500 feet, and on the floors of large valleys where food and water were readily accessible (d'Azevedo 1986; Kroeber 1925). The Washoe followed an annual subsistence round of fishing, hunting deer, rabbit and pronghorn, and gathering nuts, berries and seeds in the appropriate seasons. Temporary occupational camps associated with these procurement activities were highly flexible in their structure and location. For example, archaeological evidence suggests that the area now covered by Union Valley Reservoir may have been used seasonally by both the Nisenan and the Washoe. The Union Valley Reservoir area offered a large number of interspersed wet and dry meadows. Numerous seeps and springs made the area attractive to prehistoric peoples and supported fairly high site densities (Deal 1997).

### 7.3 Cultural Resources in the Project Area

The following text and tables are provided as a summary of known information on the historical and archeological sites in each of the seven Project development areas. A brief statement as to the degree to which each area has been examined by professional archeologists is included to provide information on the completeness of the existing information.

<b>Table E7.3-1. Archaeological sites within the Loon Lake Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources.</b>		
<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>
05-03-55-005	Dam, boulders	Not determined
05-03-55-081	Task site, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-143	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-144	Bedrock milling station (BRM), lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-348	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-473	Wickander cabin	Not determined
05-03-55-521	Dam	Not determined
05-03-55-522	Concrete dam	Not determined
05-03-55-540	Standing cabin, BRM, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-545	Road	Not determined
05-03-55-580	Ranger Station	Not determined
05-03-55-619	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-620	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-621	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-622	Groundstone, milling surface	Not determined
05-03-55-623	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-624	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-625	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-626	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-627	Dense lithic scatter	Not determined

#### 7.3.1 Loon Lake Development

Twenty archaeological sites have been recorded within the Loon Lake Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources. With completion of the recent surveys (Gross 2000), the entire APE within this development has been surveyed by professional archaeologists with two exceptions: areas below high water and the two overhead transmission lines. Only sporadic surveys have been conducted under the transmission line routes for various ENF-related projects that happened to overlap with these Project facilities. In addition, thick forest duff and brush hampered the visibility of the mineral soil in several areas around the Loon Lake Reservoir, leaving nearly one-third of the project area subject to no more than a cursory reconnaissance.

Recording of the majority of the sites in the Loon Lake Development was undertaken by staff from the ENF, with original site records or site record updates conducted in the period between 1990 and 1997. Nine newly discovered sites were recorded in 1999 (Gross 2000). None of these resources have been evaluated for their eligibility for inclusion in NRHP.

7.3.2 Robbs Peak Development

Excluding areas along the Gerle Creek Canal that are too steep to safely survey, about 80 of the areas around the water features (dams, reservoirs, canal, and forebay) associated with the Robbs Peak Development have been inventoried by professional archaeologists. Conversely, only about one-half of the transmission line from the Robbs Peak switchyard to the Union Valley switchyard has been surveyed—primarily as a coincidental overlap with ENF timber harvest units.

Twenty-five prehistoric and historic resources have been documented within this area, with the oldest records dating to those prepared by Wilson and Dyson in 1962 (sites 05-03-55-060 and -061) and 1975 (05-03-55-025) (Table E7.3-2). Staff from the ENF compiled the remainder of the site records or updates in the period between 1988 and 1997. Six of these resources are considered not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of historic places based on site evaluations conducted by the ENF. The remaining sites have not been evaluated.

<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>
05-03-55-024 (CA-ELD-0355)	Prehistoric camp, BRM, flakes	Not determined
05-03-55-025 (CA-ELD-0356)	Prehistoric cam, BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-060	Occupation, house pits	Not determined
05-03-55-061	BRMs, flaked stone	Not determined
05-03-55-074	Prehistoric occupation, historic materials	Not determined
05-03-55-077	BRM, flakes	Not determined
05-03-55-111	BRMs	Not determined
05-03-55-111B	Unknown	Not determined
05-03-55-113 (CA-ELD-0672)	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-146	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-147	BRMs, sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-159	Sparse lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-160	BRMs, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-161	BRM, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-176	BRM, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-183	South fork ditch	Ineligible
05-03-55-286	BRM, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-287	BRMs	Not determined
05-03-55-288	BRMs, flakes and groundstone artifacts	Not determined
05-03-55-289	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-367	BRM, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-391	BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-427	Flaked stone scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-550	Orelli homestead	Not determined
25C0093	Bridge	Not determined

### 7.3.3 Jones Fork Development

About 80 percent of the Ice House Reservoir area appears to have been previously surveyed by professional archaeologists, with the majority of the unsurveyed land on the southern margin of the reservoir, or below the high water mark. More than one-half of the overhead electric transmission line from the Jones Fork switchyard to the Union Valley switchyard has been surveyed in conjunction with ENF timber sale activities. Only five archaeological properties have been recorded within the Jones Fork Development area, including three prehistoric site types and two historic-era resources (Table E7.3-3). Archeologists from the ENF recorded all sites in this area in the 1990s. None of these resources has been evaluated against the National Register of Historic Places eligibility criteria.

<b>Table E7.3-3. Archaeological sites within the Jones Fork Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources.</b>		
<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>
05-03-55-140 (CA-ELD-0815)	Lithic scatter and groundstone	Not determined
05-03-55-378	Flakes, groundstone, and BRMs	Not determined
05-03-55-426	BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-532	Gobbi homestead	Not determined
05-03-55-601	Structure	Not determined

### 7.3.4 Union Valley Development

Professional archaeologists have previously examined a substantial percentage of the perimeter of the Union Valley Reservoir, although little work has been conducted below the high water mark. Archaeological surveys that overlap the transmission lines from Union Valley to Jaybird and Camino are virtually non-existent, in part due to the precipitous terrain in much of this area. Forty-two archaeological sites, primarily prehistoric lithic scatters and bedrock milling stations, have been documented within the Union Valley Development area (Table E7.3-4). With the exception of site 05-03-55-009, which does not have a recording date on the site form, all of these resources were recorded after 1988. Two sites (THS2 and TS3) were recorded by a private consultant; the remainder of the sites were recorded or have been updated by staff from the ENF. Seven of these resources are considered ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places based on evaluations conducted by the ENF; the remaining sites have not been evaluated against the National Register eligibility criteria.

### 7.3.5 Jaybird Development

An archaeological inventory has been completed along portions of the 15.9-mile-long transmission line that extends from the Jaybird Powerhouse to the White Rock Powerhouse. The terrain around Junction Reservoir precludes safe pedestrian surveys, with the exception of perhaps 40 acres of terrain on the northern end of the reservoir. A significant portion of the transmission line crosses perilously steep ground, although substantial segments of this alignment cross relatively flat terrain. Six prehistoric and historic archaeological sites have been documented in the Jaybird Development,

all in conjunction with ENF management activities (Table E7.3-5). None of these sites have been evaluated for potential inclusion in the NRHP.

<b>Table E7.3-4. Archaeological sites within the Union Valley Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources.</b>		
<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>
05-03-55-009	Unknown	Not determined
05-03-55-038 (CA-ELD-0366)	BRMs, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-039 (CA-ELD-0367)	BRMs	Not determined
05-03-55-040 (CA-ELD-0368)	Prehistoric camp, BRM	Ineligible
05-03-55-041 (CA-ELD-0369)	Prehistoric camp, BRM	Ineligible
05-03-55-042 (CA-ELD-0370)	Prehistoric camp, BRM, flakes	Not determined
05-03-55-044 (CA-ELD-0372)	Prehistoric camp, BRM, flakes	Not determined
05-03-55-045 (CA-ELD-0373)	Prehistoric camp, BRM, flakes	Not determined
05-03-55-087	BRMs, lithics, midden	Not determined
05-03-55-088	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-089	Dairy, Palmer house	Not determined
05-03-55-090	Lithic scatter, occupation site	Not determined
05-03-55-091	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-097	Potts cabin	Not determined
05-03-55-099	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-100	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-117 (CA-ELD-0810)	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-119 (CA-ELD-0740)	BRMs	Ineligible
05-03-55-128 (CA-ELD-0663)	BRMs, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-153	Groundstone, flakes, midden, occupation site	Ineligible
05-03-55-154	Historic ranch, ditch	Not determined
05-03-55-158 (CA-ELD-0662)	BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-194	BRM, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-195	Single BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-202	BRM	Not determined
05-03-55-313	BRMs, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-319	BRMs, lithic scatter	Ineligible
05-03-55-371	BRMs, groundstone, historic artifacts	Not determined
05-03-55-372	Foundation and trash scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-413	Flaked stone, historic debris	Not determined
05-03-55-415	BRMs, flake scatter, midden, historic materials	Not determined
05-03-55-416	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-421	BRMs, flake scatter, midden, historic materials	Not determined
05-03-55-422	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-423	BRM, single flake	Not determined
05-03-55-424	BRM, flake scatter, portable millingstone	Not determined
05-03-55-433	Lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-55-547	Rafetto homestead	Not determined
05-03-55-549	Bassi dairy ranch	Not determined
05-03-55-576	Wagner's house	Not determined
CA-ELD-THS2	Unknown	Not determined
CA-ELD-TS3	Unknown	Not determined

**Table E7.3-5. Archaeological sites within the Jaybird Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources.**

Site Number	Site Type	NRHP Status
05-03-53-060	Mining, dump, lithic scatter, milling stations	Not determined
05-03-53-061	Cabin	Not determined
05-03-53-080	Logging camp, lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-53-158	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-53-159	Groundstone and flake scatter	Not determined
05-03-53-213	Cabin, historic occupation	Not determined

**Table E7.3-6. Archaeological sites within the Camino Development area, including both prehistoric and historic resources.**

Site Number	Site Type	NRHP Status
None	El Dorado Powerhouse	Not determined
CA-ELD-0133	BRM	Not determined
05-03-53-025	Village site, flakes, groundstone, BRM's	Not determined
05-03-53-062	Lithic scatter, groundstone	Not determined
05-03-53-146	Sparse lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-53-241	Groundstone and lithic scatter	Not determined
05-03-53-242	Lithic scatter, groundstone	Not determined
05-03-53-323	Groundstone and projectile point	Not determined
05-03-55-133	Unknown	Not determined
05-03-55-561	Cabin and mine	Not determined

### 7.3.6 Camino Development

No controlled inventory of lands within the Camino Development has been documented, partially due to the predominance of precipitous slopes around the Camino and Brush Creek reservoirs. The overhead electric transmission lines from the Camino switchyard to the White Rock switchyard and to the Lake substation have not been subject to controlled archaeological surveys. Ten prehistoric and historic archaeological sites have been noted within the Camino Development area, including several cabin sites and prehistoric lithic scatters (Table E7.3-6). The El Dorado Powerhouse was noted in a report prepared by PAR Environmental Services, Inc. in 1995. Two site records (CA-ELD-133 and 05-03-55-133) do not include recordation dates. The remainder of these sites was all recorded in the 1990s by archaeological staff from the ENF. None of these resources have been evaluated against the National Register of Historic Places eligibility criteria.

### 7.3.7 Slab Creek/White Rock Development

No evidence of previously conducted professional archaeological surveys within the Slab Creek/White Rock Development has been discovered at this time. The perilously steep terrain around the Slab Creek Reservoir is likely to have limited previous human activities, although approximately 15 acres of relatively flat terrain on the edge of this facility are suitable for pedestrian survey. Similarly, surveys that overlap the two 230 kV overhead transmission lines and one 12 kV distribution tap line associated with this development are infrequent, at best.

Fourteen archaeological sites have been documented within the Slab Creek/White Rock Development, including railroad logging-related resources, a mine, a canal, a dump, and three prehistoric sites (Table E7.3-7). The three sites with temporary numbers were documented by a private party and do not include recordation dates. The five sites with USFS designations (e.g., 05-03-56-206) were recorded by ENF staff between 1981 and 1995, with one updated by KEA in 1999 (Gross 2000). Sites CA-ELD-45 and -54 were recorded by F. Riddell in 1956, with no record of updated forms available at the Information Center. PAR Environmental Services recorded CA-SAC-425 in 1990, with the remaining two sites recorded in 1988 (IF-88-17) and 1990 (Super 90) by private parties. None of these sites have been evaluated for potential inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>NRHP Status</b>
CA-ELD-191 (temp. #)	Possible house pits	Not determined
CA-ELD-190 (temp. #)	Midden deposit and BRM outcrop	Not determined
CA-ELD-189 (temp. #)	Midden deposit	Not determined
05-03-56-206	Mine, dump	Not determined
05-03-56-212	Railroad logging grade	Not determined
05-03-56-213 (CA-ELD-0516/H)	Railroad logging grade	Not determined
05-03-56-215	Canal	Not determined
05-03-56-216	Dump	Not determined
CA-ELD-454	Unknown	Not determined
CA-ELD-45	BRM site	Not determined
CA-ELD-54	Village site with mortaring areas	Not determined
CA-SAC-425	Lithic stone scatter	Not determined
IF-88-17	Check dams, shaft	Not determined
Super 90	Chinese mining	Not determined

#### **7.4 Literature Cited**

Arnold, A. B. 1957. Archaeological investigations on federal lands in Martis Valley, California. Manuscript on file. Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento, CA.

Ataman, K. 1999. Post modern *Martis*: New archaeological investigations in Martis Valley. Cultural report submitted to the USACE and the California Department of Transportation. Prepared by Summit EnviroSolutions, Reno, NV. Nevada and Pacific Legacy, Inc. Cameron Park, CA.

Barrett, S. A. 1917. The Washoe Indians. *Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee* 2(1):1-52. Milwaukee, WI.

Beals, R. L. 1933. Ethnology of the Nisenan. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 31(6):335-414. Berkeley, CA.

Beck, W. A., and D. Haase. 1974. Historical atlas of California. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK.

- Bedwell, S. F. 1973. Fort Rock Basin: Prehistory and environment. University of Oregon Books, Eugene, OR.
- California State Parks. 1997. Forging a future with a past: Comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan for California. The Resources Agency, Sacramento, CA.
- Childress, J. G., and Eric W. Ritter. 1967. An archaeological survey of the proposed Auburn and Sugar Pine Reservoirs in El Dorado and Placer Counties. Report to the NPS, San Francisco, CA.
- Clark, W. B. 1969. Gold districts of California. California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 193. Sacramento, CA.
- Curtis, E. S. 1907-1930. The North American Indian. Norwood, MA.
- D'Azevedo, W. L. 1986. Washoe. In Great Basin: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11. Edited by Warren L. D'Azevedo. W. C. Sturtevant, General Editor. 466-498. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Deal, K. 1997. Archaeological investigations at Call of the moth light, Eldorado National Forest Site 05-03-55-319, El Dorado County, Pacific Ranger District, ENF, CA.
- EDC. (El Dorado County). 1996. El Dorado County General Plan. <http://el-dorado.ca.us/planning/genplan/conserv.html>.
- EDC. 2000. El Dorado County river management plan update revised draft environmental impact report. [http://el-dorado.ca.us/general/services/parks/rivermanage/revised\\_draft\\_env\\_impact\\_rpt.html](http://el-dorado.ca.us/general/services/parks/rivermanage/revised_draft_env_impact_rpt.html).
- Elsasser, A. B. 1960. The archaeology of the Sierra Nevada in California and Nevada. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 51:1-93. Berkeley, CA.
- Elston, R. G. S. Stornetta, D.P. Douglass, and P. Mires. 1994. Beyond the blue roof: Archaeological survey on the Mount Rose Fan and Northern Steamboat Hills. Prepared by Intermountain Research, Silver City, NV.
- Elston, R. G., and J. O. Davis. 1972. An archaeological investigation of the Steamboat Springs locality, Washoe County, Nevada. *Nevada Archaeological Survey Reporter* 6(1):9-14. Reno, NV.
- Elston, R. G., J. O. Davis, A. Levanthal, and C. Covington. 1977. The archeology of the Tahoe Reach of the Truckee River. A report to the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency. Manuscript on file. University of Nevada Northern Division of the Nevada Archaeological Survey, Reno, NV.
- Elston, R. G., J. O. Davis, and G. Townsend. 1976. An intensive archaeological investigation of the Hawkins Land Exchange Site (FS 05-17-57-33), 3-Nev-184. Report on file. Tahoe National Forest, Nevada City, CA.
- Faye, Paul-Louis. 1923. Notes on the Southern Maidu. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20(3):35-53. Berkeley, CA.
- Gifford, E. W. 1927. Southern Maidu religious Ceremonies. *American Anthropologist* 29(3):214-257.

- Gross, C. S. 2000. Cultural resources inventory, Upper American River Project. Prepared by KEA Environmental, Inc. Submitted to SMUD, Sacramento, CA.
- Heizer, R. F., and A. B. Elsasser. 1953. Some archaeological sites and cultures of the Central Sierra Nevada. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 21:1-42. Berkeley, CA.
- Hoover, M. B., H. E. Rensch, E. G. Rensch, and W. N. Abeloe (revised by D. E. Kyle). 1990. Historic spots in California. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Jackson, R. J., T. L. Jackson, C. Niksicek, K. Roper, and D. Simons. 1994. Framework for archaeological research and management on the national forests of the North-Central Sierra Nevada. Prepared by BioSystems Analysis, Inc., Sacramento, CA. Submitted to USDA Forest Service, ENF, Placerville, CA.
- Jacobsen, W. H., Jr. 1986. Washoe Language. In *Great Basin: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11. Edited by Warren L. D'Azevedo. W. C. Sturtevant, General Editor. 107-112. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Johnson, J. J. 1967. The archeology of the Camanche Reservoir locality, California. *Sacramento Anthropological Society Papers* 6. Sacramento, CA.
- Keesling, H. S., and J. J. Johnson. 1978. Preliminary test excavations Conducted at Nev-199, Truckee, California. California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, DC.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1929. The Valley Nisenan. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 24(4):253-290. Berkeley, CA.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1932. The Patwin and Their Neighbors. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 29(4):253-423. Berkeley, CA.
- Lillard, J. B., R. F. Heizer, and F. Fenenga. 1939. An introduction to the archaeology of Central California. Sacramento Junior College, Department of Anthropology Bulletin 2. Sacramento, CA.
- Littlejohn, H. W. 1928. Nisenan geography. Manuscript on file. Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Moratto, M. J. 1984. California archaeology. Academic Press, San Francisco, CA.
- Office of Historic Preservation. 1996. California historical landmarks. California State Parks, Sacramento, CA.
- Peak & Associates, Inc. 1981. SOFAR upper mountain project cultural resources study, phase II: test excavations. Manuscript on file. County of El Dorado Irrigation District, Placerville, CA.
- Powers, S. 1876. Life and culture of the Washo and Paiutes. National Anthropological Archives, Manuscript No. 808. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

- Rackerby, F. 1965. The archaeology of the Middle Fork American River Project, Placer County, California. Report to the NPS, San Francisco, CA.
- Ritter, E. W. 1970a. Northern Sierra Foothill archaeology. In *Papers on California and Great Basin prehistory*. Edited by E. W. Ritter, P. D. Schulz, and R. Kautz. 171-184. University of California, Center for Archaeological Research Publications 2. Davis, CA.
- Ritter, E. W. 1970b. The archaeology of 4-Pla-101, the Spring Garden Ravine Site. In *Archaeological investigations in the Auburn Reservoir area, phase II-III:270-538*. Edited by E. W. Ritter. Report to the NPS, San Francisco, CA.
- Rondeau, M. 1982. The archaeology of the Truckee Site, Nevada County, California. Manuscript on file. North Central Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, California State University, Sacramento, CA.
- Shipley, W. F. 1978. Native languages of California. In *California: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8. Edited by Robert F. Heizer. W. C. Sturtevant, General Editor. 78-90. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Stewart, O. C. 1941. Culture Element Distributions, XIV: Northern Paiute. *University of California Anthropological Records* 4(3):361-446. Berkeley, CA.
- Stewart, O. C. 1944. Washo-Northern Paiute peyotism: A study in acculturation. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 40(3). Berkeley, CA.
- Supernowicz, D. E. 1983. Historical overview of the Eldorado National Forest. MA Thesis in History. California State University, Sacramento, CA.
- True, D. L., H. Crew, and T. Drake. 1976. Archaeological surveys, Auburn-Folsom, Foresthill Divide. Manuscript on file. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis, CA.
- USDA (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service). 1988. Eldorado National Forest. Land and resource management plan. USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, San Francisco, CA.
- Wilson, N.L., and Dyson, J.R. 1962. Archeological survey in the Gerle Creek diversion dam area, El Dorado County, California. Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, CA.
- Wilson, N. L., and A. H. Towne. 1978. Nisenan. In *California: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8. Edited by Robert F. Heizer. W. C. Sturtevant, General Editor. 387-397. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.