

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

This section considers and evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on cultural and paleontological resources. Cultural resources include historic buildings and structures, historic districts, historic sites, prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, and other prehistoric and historic objects and artifacts. Paleontological resources include vertebrate, invertebrate, or plant fossils. Archaeological and historical investigations for the proposed Vineyards at Anderson project site were conducted between May and November 2005 and included: a record search at the Northeast Information Center at California State University, Chico; archival research (e.g., Shasta County Assessor's Office); a sacred lands search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission; consultation with the Native American community and other interested parties (e.g., historical associations); and two pedestrian surface surveys of the project area (May 2005 and September 2005). (See **Appendix 4.10-1**.) This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) also utilizes technical information and analyses from previous studies which are supported by the State CEQA Guidelines (see Sections 15148 [Citation] and 15150 [Incorporation by Reference]).

### CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

The following definitions are common terms used to discuss the regulatory requirements and treatment of cultural resources:

*Cultural resource* is a term used to describe several different types of properties: prehistoric and historical archaeological sites; architectural properties such as buildings, bridges, and infrastructure; and resources of importance to Native Americans.

*Historic properties* is a term defined by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property.

*Historical resource* is a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) term that includes buildings, sites, structures, objects, or districts, each of which may have historical, prehistoric, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance, and is eligible for listing or is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

*Paleontological resource* is defined as including fossilized remains of vertebrate and invertebrate organisms, fossil tracks and trackways, and plant fossils. A unique paleontological site would include a known area of fossil bearing rock strata.

### 4.10.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### PREHISTORY

Most of the previous archaeological investigations in the general project area were conducted in response to proposals for reservoir developments and highway construction projects. Some of the earliest archaeological investigations conducted in the project area included work at: Shasta, Whiskeytown, and Trinity reservoirs (Treganza 1958, 1959; Treganza and Heicksen 1960); Black Butte Reservoir (Mohr and Fredrickson 1949); Red Bank Creek (Treganza 1954); the Tehama-Colusa Canal (Treganza et al. 1965); the proposed Paskenta-Newville Reservoir (Chartkoff and Childress 1966); Black Butte Reservoir (Treganza and Heicksen 1969); and the proposed Dutch Gulch Reservoir (Leonard 1969). In the 1970s, archaeological survey and excavation work continued in the area with investigations along Thomes Creek (Edwards 1970) and surveys for Tehama and Dutch Gulch Reservoirs (Jensen 1978). Investigations related to

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

reservoir construction continued into the 1980s at Thomes-Newville Reservoir (Bard et al. 1983) and Black Butte, Dutch Gulch, and Tehama Reservoirs (Dondero and Johnson 1988; Johnson and Theodoratus 1984a, 1984b; Johnson et al. 1984; Johnson 1990; Johnson and Dondero 1990). Other archaeological investigations in the project area include work at Whiskeytown (Baker 1984), near Squaw Creek (Clewett and Sundahl 1983), in the Redding area (Sundahl 1982), and in the upper Sacramento River Canyon (Raven et al. 1984; Basgall and Hildebrandt 1989; Sundahl 1982).

Archaeological research in the project area has facilitated the development of various chronological schemes to place assemblages of artifacts in specific temporal and spatial contexts. Edwards (1970) developed a three-phase cultural chronology for the Northern Sacramento Valley. The chronology begins with early occupations dominated by the use of millingstones. The subsequent phases include the Tehama Phase, A.D. 0 to 1000, and the Shasta Complex. Sundahl (1982) conducted additional archaeological investigations in the area and presented a synthesis of northern California prehistory that identifies five generalized cultural patterns spanning 8,000 years. Sundahl's (1982) five patterns include: the Borax Lake Pattern; the Squaw Creek Pattern; the Whiskeytown Pattern; the Tehama Pattern; and the Augustine Pattern of the Redding Aspect. Basgall and Hildebrandt (1989) propose another cultural chronology for the northern Sacramento River Canyon. Their chronology stretches back farther in time than Sundahl's, and is divided into a three-phase chronology that includes the Pollard Flat Phase (2700-5300 B.P.), Vollmers Phase (1700-4500 B.P.), and Mosquito Creek Phase (1900 B.P. to contact).

In summary, archaeological research in the region is improving our understanding of the prehistory of the northern Sacramento River Valley, but questions regarding cultural chronologies and patterns of prehistoric settlement and subsistence persist. Current archaeological research in the region is addressing these issues.

### ETHNOGRAPHY

Prior to the arrival of Euroamericans in the region, California was inhabited by groups of Native Americans speaking more than 100 different languages and occupying a variety of ecological settings. Kroeber (1925) subdivided California into four subculture areas, Northwestern, Northeastern, Southern, and Central. The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan area is in the Central area in Wintu territory. Traditional territory of the Wintu encompasses parts of what are now Shasta, Trinity, Tehama, and Siskiyou Counties (LaPena 1978: 324). The Wintu language is part of the Wintuan linguistic group that includes the Wintu, Nomlaki and Patwin languages, all of which belong to the larger Penutian linguistic family.

The family was the basic social unit of the Wintu, with the village being the political and economic unit (LaPena 1978: 326). Village leadership was maintained by a hereditary chieftainship. Typical villages numbered from 20 to 150 people and consisted of four to several dozen semi-subterranean, conical shaped, bark covered houses (LaPena 1978:325). Larger villages were usually located along major rivers and inhabited during winter months, while temporary hunting and gathering camps were established in the foothills and mountains during warm seasons and in concert with resource availability. Wintu relied on a subsistence pattern emphasizing gathering, hunting, and fishing. Wintu exploited a variety of resources within their territory including deer, Chinook salmon, acorns, elk, bear, rabbit and other small mammals, various birds, buckeyes, pine nuts, manzanita berries, and a variety of other plants.

The expeditions of Jedediah Smith and Peter Ogden across the northern Sacramento Valley in 1826 and 1827, respectively, recount the earliest encounters between Wintu and Euroamericans

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

(LaPena 1978:324). Succeeding expeditions of Euroamerican explorers and fur trappers brought foreign diseases that took a huge toll on the Native Americans of northern California, particularly those of the Central Valley and its major river systems. Malaria and smallpox came into the region in the 1830s, decimating entire villages and lowering the population in the area by as much as 50 to 75 percent (Cook 1978).

In 1846 Mexico granted the 26,000-acre Rancho Buenaventura to Pierson B. Reading, and Wintu found themselves in competition with settlers who were rapidly moving into the area (Beck and Haase 1974). The end of the Mexican-American War in 1848 marked the beginning of the American period (ca. 1848-Present) in California history, but the onset of this period did nothing to change the economic condition of the Native American populations. Indeed, the plight of Native American populations worsened with the onset of the Gold Rush in the late 1840s. Subsequent to the Gold Rush, the culture of Native Americans in California was dramatically affected by the influx of Euroamericans.

### HISTORIC PERIOD

The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan area and the City of Anderson are located within and adjacent to the 26,000-acre Rancho Buenaventura Land Grant that Major Pierson B. Reading acquired from Mexico in 1846 (Petersen 1965). Major Reading slowly began to attract settlers to his land grant in the northern Sacramento Valley. In 1848, however, Reading discovered gold in Clear Creek, and his discovery caused an influx of gold-seekers to the area (Petersen 1965). A community named Horsetown quickly grew up around Reading's discovery site, which was also called Reading's Bar or Clear Creek diggings.

As miners poured into the area around Horsetown the surface gold sources were quickly exhausted. Consequently, by the 1850s and 1860s placer mining was supplanted by hydraulic mining in the area. During this period, Petersen (1965) reports that as many as 11 hydraulic cannons were in use in the banks and hillsides surrounding Horsetown. Nathan A. Townsend, a Shasta County pioneer and early miner, built a diversion structure and ditch in the vicinity of Saeltzer Dam in the 1850s to develop his mining claims near Briggsville (Bunse and Wee 1999). Briggsville, however, was overshadowed by Horsetown and was abandoned during the 1860s. The decline and eventual cessation of mining in the area forced landowners and other residents to turn to other industries in order to survive. Agriculture, primarily cattle ranching, was the alternative of choice in the Redding area (Petersen 1965).

The founding of the city of Redding in the summer of 1872 highlights the general growth and development of the area between the 1870s and 1880s. The city was named in honor of Benjamin B. Redding, a land agent for the Central Pacific Railroad Company, rather than Major Reading (Clark 1970). Redding was located at the end of the railroad line until 1883, when the railroad was extended further up the Sacramento River canyon (Hoover et al. 1990). Redding was incorporated in 1887 as the first municipality in Shasta County, and subsequently became the county seat in 1888.

The origins of the City of Anderson are related to Elias Anderson, who is one of Shasta County's first settlers. He purchased the American Ranch in 1856 and the ranch served as a stopping place for teamsters and travelers using the Oregon to California trail (Hoover et al. 1990). The area encompassed by the American Ranch and the buildings/structure associated with the rest stop eventually developed into the City of Anderson.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

### CULTURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY

Cultural resources investigations for the project identified two prehistoric sites, four historic sites, and one prehistoric/historic site within project boundaries (Table 4.10-1). There are no known prehistoric or historic sites within the project area that are State Historic Landmarks or California Points of Historical Interest.

**TABLE 4.10-1  
CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN BOUNDARIES OF THE VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON**

SITE IDENTIFICATION	SITE TYPE
Vineyards #2	Isolated Prehistoric Artifact
Vineyards #3	Isolated Prehistoric Artifact
Vineyards #9	Historic
Vineyards #10	Historic
Vineyards #11	Historic
Vineyards #13	Historic
CA-SHA-1188/H	Prehistoric/Historic

### PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE INVENTORY

Paleontology is defined as a science dealing with the life of past geological periods as known from fossil remains. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations that have produced fossil material. Such locations and specimens are important nonrenewable resources. CEQA offers protection for these sensitive resources and requires that they be addressed during the EIR process.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database identified 6,721 recorded paleontological resources in Shasta County. Approximately 90% of these are mammalian and reptilian vertebrates located at several major paleontological sites in the County. The database search, however, did not identify any paleontological resources or sites within or near the project area. Additionally, pedestrian surface survey of the area within project boundaries did not identify any paleontological resources.

### REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

#### FEDERAL

##### National Historic Preservation Act

Federal regulations for cultural resources are governed primarily by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, and as amended. Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and, if appropriate, afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation an opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The council's implementing regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" can be found in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites, which are determined to be eligible for listing or listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The criteria for determining NRHP eligibility are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Recent amendments to the NHPA (1986 and 1992)

and subsequent revisions to the implementation regulations have strengthened the provisions for Native American consultation and participation in the Section 106 review process. While federal agencies must follow federal regulations, most projects by private developers and landowners do not require this level of compliance. Federal regulations come into play in the private sector if the proposed project requires a federal permit (e.g., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act Permit) or if it uses federal money.

STATE

### **California Environmental Quality Act**

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both "historical resources" and "unique archaeological resources." Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on "unique archaeological resources."

"Historical resource" is a term with a defined statutory meaning (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [a], [b]). The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be "historical resources" for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Pub. Resources Code, Section 5024.1 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4850). Unless a resource listed in a survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource to be potentially eligible for the CRHR.

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process (Public Resources Code 5024.1 [g]), lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the CRHR criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts to historical resources (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [a][3]). Following CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.5 (a) and (b) an historical resource is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- a) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- b) Meets any of the following criteria:
  - 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
  - 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

- 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Archaeological resources may also qualify as “historical resources” and Public Resources Code 5024 requires consultation with the Office of Historic Preservation when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

For historic structures, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(3), indicates that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995) shall mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant. Potential eligibility also rests upon the integrity of the resource. Integrity is defined as the retention of the resource’s physical identity that existed during its period of significance. Integrity is determined through considering the setting, design, workmanship, materials, location, feeling and association of the resource.

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact “unique archaeological resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that “‘unique archaeological resource’ means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.”

Treatment options under Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a “unique archaeological resource”).

Advice on procedures to identify cultural resources, evaluate their importance and estimate potential effects is given in several agency publications such as the series produced by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The technical advice series produced by OPR strongly recommends that Native American concerns and the concerns of other interested persons and corporate entities, including but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associations and societies, be solicited as part of the process of cultural resources inventory. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains.

Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety code specifies protocol when human remains are discovered. The code states:

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (e), requires that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the appropriate Native Americans, if any, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

In addition to the mitigation provisions pertaining to accidental discovery of human remains, the State CEQA Guidelines also require that a lead agency make provisions for the accidental discovery of historical or archaeological resources, generally. Pursuant to Section 15064.5, subdivision (f), these provisions should include "an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation should be available. Work could continue on other parts of the building site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place."

As of March 1, 2005, Senate Bill 18 (Gov. Code, Sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction. Although a general plan amendment is not required to support the proposed project, the City of Anderson initiated Native American consultation in March 2006 because the adoption of a Specific Plan is being proposed.

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by state statute (Public Resources Code Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5, Archeological, Paleontological, and Historical Sites and Appendix G). No state or local agencies have specific jurisdiction over paleontological resources. No state or local agency requires a paleontological collecting permit to allow for the recovery of fossil remains discovered as a result of construction-related earth moving on state or private land in a project site.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### LOCAL

#### City of Anderson General Plan

The City of Anderson General Plan (City of Anderson, 2007) contains various policies and implementation measures regarding preservation and protection of historic and cultural resources. General Plan policies relevant to historic and cultural resources within the Specific Plan area are summarized in **Table 4.10-2**. This table also provides an evaluation of the proposed project in relation to its consistency with the pertinent General Plan goals and policies as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). The final authority for interpretation of these policy statements and determination of the project's consistency rests with the City of Anderson City Council.

**TABLE 4.10-2  
SPECIFIC PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH CITY OF ANDERSON GENERAL PLAN POLICIES  
CULTURAL RESOURCES**

City of Anderson General Plan Policies	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Preserve areas that have identifiable and important archaeological or paleontological significance. (CRP-1)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations for the project identified five archaeological sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
Assess development proposals for potential impacts to significant archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Require a study conducted by a professional archaeologist for projects located near creeks or identified archaeological sites to determine if significant archaeological resources are potentially present and if the project will significantly impact the resources. If significant impacts are identified, either require the project to be modified to avoid the impacts, or require measures to mitigate the impacts. Mitigation may involve archeological investigation or recovery in consultation with both the professional archaeologist and Tribal representatives. (CRI-1)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations were conducted for the proposed project. These investigations identified five archaeological sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
Consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine religious, historical or cultural significance of site and notification of appropriate tribal group or descendants as identified by NAHC in accordance with the guidelines presented in Senate Bill (SB) 18. (CRP-2)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations for the proposed project included a sacred lands search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and consultation with the Native American community. In addition, Senate Bill (SB) 18 consultation was conducted with Tribal groups identified by the NAHC. The project is consistent with this policy.
Consult with local Indian tribes to monitor all development projects during grading and excavation. If a cultural resource is identified or uncovered, construction will be redirected or	Yes	Cultural resources investigations included consultation with local Native American groups identified by the NAHC. Native American representatives will monitor ground disturbing

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

City of Anderson General Plan Policies	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
stopped until the archaeologist monitor has evaluated the significance of the find and identified the appropriate mitigation measures. (CRI-2)		activity associated with the project. The project is consistent with this policy.
If human remains are encountered, work in the immediate vicinity of the remains will be halted until the Shasta County coroner, who must be contacted within 24 hours, has evaluated the remains. If the coroner determines that the burial is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted to determine the most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD should be involved with the disposition of the remains following scientific analysis. (CRI-3)	Yes	According to Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code, If human remains are discovered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and the County Coroner must be notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed. Cultural resources mitigation measures include this section of code. The project is consistent with this policy.
Protect and preserve historic resources within the City of Anderson. (HP-1)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations for the project identified five archaeological sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
Encourage owners of eligible historic properties to apply for State and Federal registration of these sites and to participate in tax incentive programs for historic restoration. (HI-1)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Identify funding mechanisms, including funding from the City to the extent possible, to support programs to preserve, restore, and enhance unique historic sites. (HI-2)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Assess development proposals for potential impacts to significant historic resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. (HI-3)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations for the project identified five archaeological sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
Work with property owners to preserve historic features within the community. (HI-5)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Promote the compatibility of new development located adjacent to existing structures of historic significance with the architecture and site development of the historic structure. (HP-2)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Respect the character of the building and its setting during the remodeling and renovation of facades of historic buildings. (HP-3)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

City of Anderson General Plan Policies	Consistency with General Plan	Analysis
Encourage the use of the State Historic Building Code for historic buildings and other structures that contribute to the City's historic character. Use flexibility when applying zoning regulations to historic sites and buildings. (HP-4)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Recognize the value of Anderson's historic resources as an economic development tool. (HP-5)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.
Ensure that the integrity of historic structures and the parcels on which they are located are preserved through the implementation of applicable design, building and fire codes. (HP-6)	N/A	There are no eligible buildings/structure within project boundaries. The policy is not applicable to the proposed project.

### The Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan

The proposed Vineyards at Anderson Specific Plan contain various goals and policies regarding preservation and protection of cultural resources. Specific Plan policies relevant to cultural resources within Phase 2 of the proposed project area in the context of CEQA are summarized in **Table 4.10-3**. This table also provides an evaluation of Phase 2 relative to pertinent Specific Plan policies as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d). The final authority for interpretation of these policy statements and determination of the project's consistency rests with the City of Anderson City Council.

**TABLE 4.10-3  
PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) CONSISTENCY WITH VINEYARDS AT ANDERSON SPECIFIC PLAN POLICIES  
CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
Implementation of the project shall include ongoing consultation with the Native American community, in accordance with the guidelines presented in Senate Bill (SB) 18. (Policy 7.3.1)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations for the proposed project included a sacred lands search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and consultation with the Native American community. In addition, Senate Bill (SB) 18 consultation was conducted with Tribal groups identified by the NAHC. The project is consistent with this policy.
Goals for the identification and protection of cultural resources within boundaries of the Vineyards Specific Plan shall follow guidance in the: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at 21083.2 and 21084.5; CEQA Guidelines at 15064.5. (Policy 7.3.2)	Yes	Cultural resources investigations were conducted for the proposed project. These investigations identified five archaeological sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
Archival research and possibly minimal subsurface testing will be used to finalize the preliminary eligibility determinations for any potential resources	Yes	Cultural resources investigations were conducted for the proposed project. These investigations identified five archaeological

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Specific Plan Policies	Consistency with Specific Plan	Analysis
sites in the Plan Area. If necessary, mitigation measures such as avoidance or data recovery will be used to protect cultural resources or recover the data potential of the sites and facilitate implementation of the proposed project. (Policy 7.3.3)		sites and two locations of isolated artifacts within project boundaries. The proposed project will protect these sites as identified in the mitigation measures for cultural resources. The project is consistent with this policy.
If a cultural resource is identified or uncovered, construction will be redirected or stopped until the archaeologist monitor has evaluated the significance of the find and identified the appropriate mitigation measures. (Policy 7.3.4)	Yes,	This policy is included in the cultural resources mitigation measures. The project is consistent with this policy.
If human remains are encountered, work in the immediate vicinity of the remains will be halted until the Shasta County coroner, who must be contacted within 24 hours, has evaluated the remains. If the Coroner determines that the burial is Native American in origin, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted to determine the most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD should be involved with the disposition of the remains following scientific analysis. (Policy 7.3.5)	Yes	According to Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code, If human remains are discovered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and the County Coroner must be notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed. Cultural resources mitigation measures include this section of code. The project is consistent with this policy.

### 4.10.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Following Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and Section 15064.5 and Appendix G of the 2007 State CEQA Guidelines, cultural resource impacts are considered to be significant if implementation of the project considered would result in any of the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, respectively;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines "substantial adverse change" as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired.

#### METHODOLOGY

Archaeological and historical investigations for the proposed Vineyards at Anderson project site were conducted between May and November 2005 and included: a record search at the Northeast Information Center at California State University, Chico; archival research (e.g., Shasta

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

County Assessor's Office); a sacred lands search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission; consultation with the Native American community and other interested parties (e.g., historical associations); and two pedestrian surface surveys of the project area (May 2005 and September 2005).

The records search identified one previously recorded prehistoric/historic site, CA-SHA-1188/H, and the pedestrian surface surveys identified two prehistoric isolates and four historic sites in the project APE. The sacred lands search did not identify any sensitive Native American cultural resources either within or near the project. In addition, consultation and a field visit to the project area, including site CA-SHA-1188/H, in February 2007 did not identify any Native American concerns with implementation of the project.

The pedestrian surface surveys of the project area identified four historic sites, a prehistoric/historic site, and two isolated artifacts (**Table 4.10-4**). The four historic sites and the isolated artifacts do not appear eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR. The prehistoric/historic site, CA-SHA-1188/H, appears to meet eligibility Criterion d for inclusion in the NRHP and Criterion 4 for inclusion in the CRHR. Site CA-SHA-1118/H, however, is located in an area designated as open space and would not likely be affected by project activities.

Paleontological resources investigations included a search of the Museum of Paleontology at the University of California, Berkeley database. These investigations did not identify any paleontological resources or geological units that would likely contain paleontological resources on the project site.

**TABLE 4.10-4  
CULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Resource Number	Resource Type	Eligible or Ineligible for Inclusion in the NRHP/CRHR
Vineyards #2	Basalt core/Isolated Artifact	Ineligible
Vineyards #3	Basalt core/Isolated Artifact	Ineligible
Vineyards #9	Collapsed remnants of buildings and structures, including a trash scatter, water wells, and a reservoir.	Ineligible
Vineyards #10	Historic concrete bridge	Ineligible
Vineyards #11	Historic trash scatter	Ineligible
Vineyards #13	Concrete bridge	Ineligible
CA-SHA-1188/H	Sparse lithic scatter and concentration of historic refuse	Potentially Eligible

### PROGRAM LEVEL (PROJECT BUILDOUT) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Identified Prehistoric and Historic Resources

**Impact 4.10.1** Implementation of the project could impact the following archaeological sites: Vineyards #2, #3, #9, #10, #11, #13, and CA-SHA-1188/H. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

Archaeological and historical investigations for the proposed project identified archaeological sites Vineyards #9, #10, #11, #13, and CA-SHA-1188/H, and two isolated artifacts, Vineyards #2 and #3, within project boundaries. Vineyards #2, #3, #9, #10, #11, and #13 do not meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the NRHP and the CRHR or for consideration as unique archaeological resources and therefore do not require mitigation.

Site CA-SHA-1188/H appears to meet eligibility Criterion d for inclusion in the NRHP and Criterion 4 for inclusion in the CRHR. Ground disturbing project-related activities may impact site CA-SHA-1188/H. Therefore, this impact is considered **potentially significant**.

**MM 4.10.1a** Site CA-SHA-1188/H is not located in a project area identified for development. The site shall be identified as a culturally sensitive area on project plans (e.g., grading plans) and shall be avoided during project implementation and preserved in place. If current project designs change and site CA-SHA-1188/H cannot be avoided during project implementation and preserved in place, subsurface excavations shall be conducted at the site to recover its data potential. Subsurface excavations, if necessary, shall be conducted by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric archaeology and in consultation with the Native American community.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented prior to approval of improvement plans and the commencement of any site grading activities, whichever occurs first.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

**MM 4.10.1b** Ground disturbing project activity (e.g., grading) and/or any subsurface archaeological excavations will be monitored by members of the Native American community as appropriate and as agreed to by the City of Anderson in consultation with the Native American community.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented prior to approval of improvement plans and the commencement of any site grading activities, whichever occurs first.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10.1a and 4.10.1b will preserve site CA-SHA-1188/H in place or, if necessary, recover its data potential. Therefore, MM 4.10.1 would reduce any impacts to site CA-SHA-1188/H to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

### Unknown Prehistoric and Historic Resources and Human Remains

**Impact 4.10.2** Implementation of the proposed project could potentially destroy or damage undiscovered prehistoric and historical cultural resources and human remains on the project site. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

Archaeological and historical investigations for the project are adequate to identify typical prehistoric and historic resources that would likely occur in the area. Regardless, there is a possibility of unanticipated and accidental discoveries of prehistoric and historic resources and

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

human remains during ground disturbing project related activities. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.10.2a** If, during the course of construction, cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Based on the significance of the discovery, the professional archaeologist shall present options to the City of Anderson and project applicant for protecting the resources.

The City and the project applicant shall consider the recommendations presented by the professional archaeologist for any unanticipated discoveries. The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consult and agree upon implementation of a protection measure or measures that the City of Anderson and project applicant deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement the necessary measures for the protection of cultural resources as agreed to by all parties.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented during construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

**MM 4.10.2b** The Native American community will be notified of any unanticipated and accidental discoveries of prehistoric or historic Native American cultural resources and will monitor activities associated with determining the significance of any discoveries as agreed to by the City of Anderson in consultation with the Native American community.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented during construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

**MM 4.10.2c** If human remains are discovered, all work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be notified, and the County Coroner must be notified, according to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented during construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

Mitigation Measures 4.10.2a, 4.10.2b, and 4.10.2c provide a protocol for addressing unanticipated discoveries of prehistoric and historic cultural resources as well as human remains. Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to undiscovered cultural resources and human remains to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

### Paleontological Resources

**Impact 4.10.3** Implementation of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology collections database for the proposed project and the surrounding area did not identify any evidence of paleontological resources. Pedestrian surface surveys of the area within the project boundaries did not identify any paleontological resources. In addition, the geography and geology of the area suggest that it is not sensitive for paleontological resources. Regardless, there is a potential to uncover previously unknown paleontological resources during project implementation. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

### Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.10.3** Should any potentially unique paleontological resources (fossils) be encountered during development activities, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City of Anderson Planning Department shall be immediately notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. Based on the significance of the discovery, the qualified paleontologist shall present options to the City of Anderson and project applicant for protecting the resources. Appropriate action may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources.

The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consider the recommendations of the qualified paleontologist for any unanticipated discoveries. The City of Anderson and the project applicant shall consult and agree upon implementation of a protection measure or measures that the City of Anderson deems feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement the necessary measures for the protection of paleontological resources as agreed to by all parties.

*Timing/Implementation:* As a condition of project approval, and implemented during construction activities.

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Anderson Planning Department.

MM 4.10.3 provides a protocol for addressing unanticipated discoveries of paleontological resources. Therefore, implementation of MM 4.10.3 would reduce impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

### PROJECT LEVEL (PHASE 2) IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Identified Prehistoric and Historic Resources

**Impact 4.10.4** Archaeological and historical investigations for the proposed project did not identify any significant cultural resources within the Phase 2 project area. Therefore, it is anticipated that implementation of Phase 2 would not impact previously identified prehistoric or historic resources. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

None required.

#### Unknown Prehistoric and Historic Resources and Human Remains

**Impact 4.10.5** Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could potentially destroy or damage undiscovered prehistoric and historical cultural resources and human remains on the project site. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

As described under Impact 4.10.2, archaeological and historical investigations for the project, which includes Phase 2, are adequate to identify prehistoric and historic resources that would likely occur in the area. Regardless, there is a possibility of unanticipated and accidental discoveries of prehistoric and historic resources and human remains during ground disturbing project related activities. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of **MM 4.10.2a**, **MM 4.10.2b**, and **MM 4.10.2c** would reduce impacts to undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources and human remains to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

#### Paleontological Resources

**Impact 4.10.6** Implementation of Phase 2 of the proposed project could result in the potential damage or destruction of undiscovered paleontological resources. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

As described under Impact 4.10.3, paleontological resources investigations for the project, including Phase 2, did not identify any paleontological resources in the project area. Regardless, there is a potential to uncover previously unknown paleontological resources during project implementation. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

#### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of **MM 4.10.3** would reduce impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

### 4.10.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative setting for prehistoric and historic resources includes existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development within the City of Anderson, Shasta County and the surrounding region (see **Table 4.0-1**). Archaeological and historical investigations for the proposed project identified five sites and two isolated artifacts within project boundaries, and there is the possibility for the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during ground disturbing project activity. Consequently, there is a possibility that these projects could result in a net loss of prehistoric and/or historic resources. Similarly, approved and proposed development within the region could impact paleontological resources. Paleontological investigations did not identify any paleontological resources within project boundaries, but there is the possibility for the inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources during ground disturbing project activity. Consequently, there is a possibility that these projects could result in a net loss of paleontological resources.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

##### Prehistoric and Historic Resources and Human Remains

**Impact 4.10.7** Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and foreseeable development in the City of Anderson and Shasta County could result in cumulative impacts to prehistoric and historic resources and human remains in the region. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

##### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of **MM 4.10.1a**, **MM 4.10.1b**, **MM 4.10.2a**, **MM 4.10.2b** and **MM 4.10.2c** would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to prehistoric and historic resources and human remains to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

##### Paleontological Resources

**Impact 4.10.8** Implementation of the proposed project, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development in the City of Anderson and Shasta County, could result in cumulative impacts to paleontological resources in the region. This impact is considered **potentially significant**.

##### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of **MM 4.10.3** would reduce the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts to paleontological resources to a level that is considered **less than significant**.

## 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

### REFERENCES

- Andrews, Alexander R. 1964. Horsetown, *The Covered Wagon*. Pg. 3-11
- Articles of Incorporation of Redding Land, Ditch and Cattle Company. 1887. Signed October 11, filed with Secretary of State October 12, 1887. California State Archives.
- Baker, Suzanne. 1984. Archaeological Investigations in the Tower House District, Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Shasta County, California. Archaeological Consultants, Oakland, California. Submitted to the National Park Service, Western Region, San Francisco, California, under Contract No. CX 8000-3-0028.
- Bard, J. C., C. I. Busby, and L. S. Kobori. 1983. A Cultural Resource Overview and Inventory of the Proposed Thomes-Newville Reservoir, Glenn and Tehama Counties, California. California Department of Water Resources, Northern District. Sacramento.
- Basgall, Mark E. and William R. Hildebrandt. 1989. Prehistory of the Sacramento River Canyon, Shasta County, California. *Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publication Number 9*.
- Beck, Warren and Ynez D. Haase. 1974. Historical Atlas of California. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.
- Bunse, Meta and Stephen Wee. 1999. Inventory and Evaluation of Saeltzer Dam, Clear Creek, Shasta County, California. JRP Historical Consulting Services. Davis, California.
- Chartkoff, Joseph L., and Jeffrey Childress. 1966. An Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Paskenta-Newville Reservoir in Glenn and Tehama Counties, Northern California. U. S. National Park Service, Western Region, San Francisco.
- Clark, William B. 1970. Gold Districts of California. California Division of Mines and Geology, Bulletin 193 (1992 edition). Sacramento.
- Clewett, S. E. and Elaine Sundahl. 1983. Archaeological Excavations at Squaw Creek, Shasta County, California. Report on file, Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Redding, California.
- Cook, S. 1978. Historical Demography. In California, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 485-495. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Strutvevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Dondero, Steven B., and Jerald J. Johnson. 1988. Dutch Gulch Lake: Excavations at Six Prehistoric Sites. Draft report submitted to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. Contract #DACW05-81-C-0094. Sacramento, CA.
- Edwards, Robert L. 1970. The Prehistory of the Pui 'mak Wintun, Thomes Creek, Tehama County, California, Including a Suggested Chronological Model of the Northern Sacramento Valley Region Prehistory. Masters Thesis on file, Department of Anthropology, California State University, San Francisco.
- Hoover, M. B., H. E. Rench, E. G. Rensch, and W. N. Abeloe. 1990. Historic Spots in California. Fourth Edition revised by D. E. Kyle. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

#### 4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

- Jensen, Peter M. 1978. Archaeological Reconnaissance at the Authorized Tehama and Dutch Gulch Reservoirs on Cottonwood Creek. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, Sacramento.
- Johnson, J. J. 1990. Excavations at Archeological Site CA-THE-10 Cemetery 2: Black Butte Lake, Glenn and Tehama Counties, California. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, Sacramento.
- Johnson, Jerald J., and Steven B. Dondero. 1990. Excavations at Archeological Site CA-THE-10 Cemetery 1: Black Butte Lake, Glenn and Tehama Counties, California. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, Sacramento.
- Johnson, Jerald J., and Dorothea J. Theodoratus. 1984a. Cottonwood Creek Project, Shasta and Tehama Counties, California: Tehama Lake Intensive Resources Survey. United States Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, CA.
- Johnson, Jerald J., and Dorothea J. Theodoratus. 1984b. Cottonwood Creek Project, Shasta and Tehama Counties: Dutch Gulch Lake Intensive Cultural Resources Survey. United States Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, CA.
- Johnson, Jerald J., Dorothea J. Theodoratus, Clinton M. Blount, and Steven B. Dondero. 1984. Black Butte Lake Intensive Cultural Resources Survey, Glenn and Tehama Counties, California. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, CA.
- Kroeber, Alfred. 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.
- LaPena, Fran. 1978. Wintu. In California, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 485-495. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Strutvant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Leighton's Livestock Register. 1902. Shasta County Historical Society.
- Leonard, N. Nelson, III. 1969. Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Proposed Dutch Gulch Reservoir in Shasta and Tehama Counties, California. On file National Park Service, Western Region, San Francisco.
- Mohr, Albert, and David A. Fredrickson. 1949. Appraisal of the Archaeological Resources of Black Butte Reservoir, Glenn and Tehama Counties, California. Pacific Coast Division of River Basin Surveys. Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Petersen, Edward. 1965. In the Shadow of the Mountain. S.I.: Petersen.
- Raven, C. M., S. Goldberg, M. J. Moratto , and K. M. Banks. 1984. Archaeological Investigations in the Sacramento River Canyon. Vol. 1, Report of Testing at Seven Aboriginal Sites. California Department of Transportation, Sacramento.
- Sundahl, Elaine. 1982. The Shasta Complex in the Redding Area, California. Unpublished Masters Thesis, on file, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Chico.
- Tincher, Phil. 972. "Dudley Saeltzer, Reddings 'First' Citizen," The Covered Wagon. Pg. 39-42
- Treganza, Adan E. 1954. Salvage Archaeology in Nimbus and Redbank Reservoir Areas, California. University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 26:1-39. Berkeley.

#### **4.10 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

---

Treganza, Adan E., and Martin H. Heicksen. 1960. Salvage Archaeology in the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area and Wintu Pumping Plant, Shasta County, California. *San Francisco State College Occasional Papers in Anthropology* 1:1-49. San Francisco.

Treganza, Adan E., and Martin H. Heicksen. 1969. The Archaeology of the Black Butte Reservoir Region, Glenn and Tehama Counties. San Francisco State College Occasional Papers in Anthropology 2:1-54. San Francisco.

Treganza, Adan E. 1958. Salvage Archaeology of the Trinity Reservoir Area, Northern California. University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 26:1-39. Berkeley.

Treganza, Adan E. 1959. Salvage Archaeology of the Trinity Reservoir Area, Northern California: Field Season 1958. University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 46:1-32. Berkeley.

Treganza, Adan E., Robert L. Edwards, and Thomas F. King. 1965. Archaeological Survey and Excavations Along the Tehama-Colusa Canal, Central California. On file, National Park Service, Western Division, San Francisco.