

Appendix H Cultural Resources

Cultural resources may be defined as any building, structure, object, or location of past human activity, occupation, or use that may be identified through documentary evidence, oral history, inventory survey, or subsurface investigation. They may include archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties or tribal cultural resources, or structures within the built environment. This chapter discusses the affected environment of cultural resources in the Reach 4B, Eastside Bypass, and Mariposa Bypass Channel and Structural Improvements Project (Reach 4B/ESB Project) area and the potential environmental impacts of the Reach 4B/ESB Project alternatives. This chapter also provides an analysis of potential cumulative effects to cultural resources.

A Programmatic Agreement (PA) is being developed for the San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and consulting parties, including Native American tribes, for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The PA will provide a framework for conducting the Section 106 process, including mitigation and review protocols, for the Reach 4B/ESB Project and for the SJRRP as a whole.

H.1 Regional Setting

The area of analysis or Area of Potential Effects (APE) for cultural resources includes all areas of potential disturbance associated with each of the Reach 4B/ESB Project action alternatives, and it was defined as the area between the largest levee or setback alignments for Reach 4B1 and the Middle Eastside Bypass. For Reach 4B1, Levee Alignment D comprises the widest alignment (10,150 acres) and includes a portion of the San Luis National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) as well as several privately-owned land parcels. The Project level APE also includes the proposed levee setback along the Middle Eastside Bypass, which encompasses private lands as well as portions of the Merced NWR. Potential disturbance along Reach 4B2, the Mariposa Bypass, and the Lower Eastside Bypass are less well defined and are considered on a programmatic level, though these areas also are included in the study area.

This section describes existing conditions for cultural resources within the Reach 4B/ESB Project area. Information regarding existing conditions was collected through an examination of current literature, archival and record search information, and cultural resource inventory survey data for the Reach 4B/ESB Project that was presented in a recent technical report (Schneider et al. 2017). Supporting information regarding Native American ethnographic resources (Davis-King 2009), built environment resources, and cultural resource sensitivity (Byrd et al. 2009) compiled for the SJRRP also was integrated.

1 ***The Prehistoric Period***

2 The Project area is in the Central Valley Region of California, bounded by the Siskiyou
3 Mountains to the north, the Tehachapi Mountains to the south, the Coast Ranges to the
4 west, and the Sierra Nevada and Cascade ranges to the east. The prehistoric
5 archaeological record within the Central Valley Region encompasses the full range of
6 hunter-gatherer adaptation. Rosenthal, White, and Sutton (2007) noted that prehistoric
7 peoples within the Central Valley Region developed a sophisticated material culture,
8 became the center of an extensive trade system incorporating distant and neighboring
9 regions, and reached population densities equaled only by agricultural societies in the
10 American Southwest and Southeast.

11 No single cultural historical framework has been established that accommodates the
12 entire prehistoric record of the Central Valley Region, though detailed cultural
13 chronologies have been derived for certain sub-regions. In discussing the cultural history
14 of the Central Valley Region and the Study Area, it is appropriate to use the broad period
15 and stage classification system developed by Fredrickson (1973, 1974) and refined by
16 Rosenthal, White, and Sutton (2007:150) while referencing more localized cultural
17 historical sequences put forth by Olsen and Payen (1969) and Moratto (1984). Broad
18 periods identified for the Central Valley Region include the Paleo-Indian (11,550-8,550
19 BC), Lower Archaic (8,550-5,550 BC), Middle Archaic (5,550-550 BC), Upper Archaic
20 (550 BC-1100 AD), and Emergent (1000 AD-Historic) periods. A more localized
21 sequence relevant to the Study Area is defined largely by distinctive artifact types and
22 mortuary practices, and includes the Positas (ca. 3300-2600 BC), Pacheco (2,600 BC-AD
23 300), Gonzaga (AD 300-1000), and Panoche (AD 1500-1850) complexes.

24 Evidence for human occupation of the Central Valley during the Paleo-Indian (11,550-
25 8,550 BC) and Lower Archaic (8,550-5,550 BC) Periods is sparse. Materials from this
26 period are typically encountered as isolated, chipped stone tools. No materials dating to
27 the Paleo-Indian or Lower Archaic periods have been recovered from the Study Area,
28 though it is likely that erosional and depositional episodes dating to the Late Pleistocene
29 (ca. 9,050 BC) and the Middle Holocene (ca. 5,550 BC) have obscured many early
30 archaeological deposits.

31 The Middle Archaic Period (5,550-550 BC) witnessed substantial climatic changes in the
32 form of warmer, dryer conditions and the formation of new wetland habitats and
33 stabilized alluvial fans and floodplains (Atwater et al. 1990; Rosenthal et al. 2007;
34 Rosenthal and McGuire 2004). Archaeological sites dating to the Middle Archaic have
35 yielded evidence for increased residential stability, logistical organization, riverine
36 adaptation, and far ranging regional exchange networks (Rosenthal et al. 2007:153-155).
37 The earliest evidence for human occupation of the Study Area dates to the Middle
38 Archaic Period, specifically the Positas Complex (3,300-2,600 BC), and is distinguished
39 by small shaped mortars, short cylindrical pestles, milling stones, perforated flat cobbles,
40 and spire-topped *Olivella* beads (Moratto 1984:191; Olsen and Payen 1969). The Pacheco
41 Complex (2,600 BC-AD 300) is marked by two distinctive phases: Pacheco B, which
42 pre-dated 1,600 BC, and Pacheco A, which post-dated 1,600 BC. Pacheco B was marked
43 by foliate bifaces, rectangular *Haliotis* ornaments, and thick *Olivella* beads. Pacheco A
44 was distinguished by a proliferation of *Olivella* bead types; perforated canine teeth; bone

1 awls, whistles, and saws; stemmed and side-notched projectile points; and abundant
2 milling stones, mortars, and pestles.

3 The Upper Archaic (550 BC-AD 1100) witnessed the onset of cooler, wetter but more
4 stable climatic conditions within the Central Valley. Those conditions resulted in
5 renewed fan and floodplain deposition that formed many of the surface soils observable
6 today. The Upper Archaic Period is better represented and understood than earlier
7 periods. It was marked by cultural, technological, and economic diversity and the rise of
8 large, mounded villages in the lower Sacramento Valley (Rosenthal et al. 2007:156). The
9 localized Upper Archaic Period sequence termed the Gonzaga Complex (AD 300-1000)
10 is characterized by extended and flexed burials; bowl mortars and shaped pestles; squared
11 and tapered-stem projectile points; bone awls and grass saws; distinctive *Haliotis*
12 ornaments; and thin rectangular, split-punched, and oval *Olivella* beads.

13 By the Emergent Period (AD 1100-Historic), Native Americans living within the Central
14 Valley had developed the cultural traditions that would be noted at the time of European
15 contact. These traditions included technological advances such as the bow and arrow and
16 the fish weir. Native trade networks also appear to have changed during the Emergent
17 Period, as shell beads assumed the role of currency throughout much of the region.
18 Population densities, which had been growing steadily in the Central Valley Region since
19 the Middle Archaic, continued to increase. Within the Study Area, the Emergent Period
20 was expressed through the Panoche Complex (AD 1500-1850), which was separated
21 from the Gonzaga Complex by a 500-year break. It has been distinguished by the remains
22 of large, circular structures; flexed burials as well as primary and secondary cremations;
23 milling stones; varied mortar and pestle types; bone awls, saws, whistles, and tubes; side-
24 notched projectile points; clamshell disk beads; *Haliotis* disk beads; and *Olivella* lipped,
25 side-ground, and rough disk beads (Moratto 1984:193).

26 ***The Ethnographic Record***

27 The Study Area falls within the traditional territory of the Northern Valley Yokuts
28 (Kroeber 1925; Wallace 1978). The Yokuts were hunter-gatherers who divided
29 themselves into tribelets organized by kin and shared dialects, resulting in a mosaic of
30 smaller territories and discrete settlements (Kroeber 1925:474). The Yokuts' Penutian
31 language was spoken by some 40 groups using distinctive but closely related dialects.
32 Those groups inhabited three main geographic locales in Central California—the
33 Southern Valley (Tulare Lake), the Northern Valley (San Joaquin Valley), and adjacent
34 foothills (Sierra Nevada) (Kroeber 1925; Wallace 1978). Yokuts' populations numbered
35 approximately 41,000 at the time of European contact and primarily clustered at a narrow
36 strip of land bordering the San Joaquin River and its tributaries as well as lands east of
37 the river along the Sierra Nevada foothills. Fewer Yokuts are thought to have inhabited
38 the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, where villages were typically located along
39 watercourses such as Los Banos and Panoche creeks (Wallace 1978:463).

40 Mission birth, baptismal, and death records have been used to extrapolate information
41 about Central California tribelets, including Yokuts speakers (Milliken 1995, 2008).
42 Milliken (2008:Figure 2) noted several Northern Valley Yokuts tribelets within the Study
43 Area vicinity, including the *Janalame* (*Notoals*), *Quithrathre*, and *Silalamne*, who

1 occupied the valley floor south and east of the confluence of the Merced and San Joaquin
2 rivers (Milliken 2008:5). Typically, Yokuts tribelets consisted of a principal village with
3 a residing chief surrounded by several satellite settlements (Kroeber 1955). Tribelet
4 boundaries were most often defined by physiographic features such as sloughs and rivers.
5 Lightfoot and Parrish (2009:80) posited that tribelet territories would have been
6 sufficiently large and diverse to provide a range of biotic and environmental resources,
7 yet accessible from just a few village locations. Relatively little has been revealed about
8 Northern Valley Yokuts material culture through the ethnographic record, though
9 archaeological contexts have yielded a diverse array of stone tools and implements.
10 Mortars and pestles, handstones and milling slabs, and bedrock mortar outcrops were
11 used for processing acorn nuts, seeds, berries, and small game for consumption or
12 storage. Chipped stone arrow points, knives, and scraping implements made from
13 imported obsidian and locally available chert, jasper, and chalcedony were used to hunt
14 or process game animals (Wallace 1978:465). Bone tools, particularly awls, were
15 prevalent and were widely used in basketry production.

16 During the Mission Period (ca. 1776-1830s), large numbers of Northern Valley Yokuts
17 were relocated to Spanish missions in the San Francisco Bay Area (Milliken 2008:9).
18 Large numbers of clamshell disk beads, likely associated with Yokuts groups from the
19 Central Valley, have been found in later mission-period deposits at Mission Santa Clara
20 (Allen et al. 2010:171). In addition to participating in missions, Northern Valley Yokuts
21 also actively resisted them, at times fleeing to the tule marshes (the “*Tulares*”; see
22 Teggart 1913) and at other times participating in raids that resulted in the theft or
23 destruction of mission property (Cook 1960, 1962; Milliken 1995, 2008; Phillips 1993).
24 Impacts to the Yokuts from introduced diseases, damage to Native ecosystems, and
25 displacement through missionization was compounded in subsequent years by Mexican
26 and American settlement (Wallace 1978).

27 ***The Historic Period***

28 **The Spanish Period (1542-1821)**

29 The historic period in California began in earnest in the mid- to late 18th century when the
30 Spanish expanded northward from Mexico into Alta California (Erlandson and Bartoy
31 1995). The interior of Alta California, specifically the northern portion of the San Joaquin
32 Valley, remained largely unexplored until 1806 when an expedition led by Gabriel
33 Moraga ventured from San Juan Bautista to the San Joaquin River and north to the
34 Mokelumne River. Moraga, accompanied by Father Pedro Munoz, traversed what would
35 later become known as Pacheco Pass. The expedition was notable because it established
36 Pacheco Pass as an important historic period transportation route between Mission San
37 Juan Bautista and the Central Valley. In 1808 and 1811, further expeditions of the San
38 Joaquin River and modern San Joaquin County were conducted (Byrd et al. 2009:16;
39 Hoover et al. 1990:198). Through these expeditions, the Spanish established an interior
40 north-south road called El Camino Viejo. The early 19th century route ran from the Los
41 Angeles coast north along the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley to Patterson Pass
42 (near Tracy) and then west to San Antonio (current East Oakland) (Hoover et al.
43 1990:85).

1 Mexican Period (1821-1848)

2 In 1822, Mexico gained its independence from Spain, and Alta California became part of
3 the Mexican frontier. As the Mexican government consolidated their control of Alta
4 California, several American and Hudson's Bay Company trappers and explorers came
5 west over the Sierras into the interior Central Valley. Among the most notable of these
6 was John C. Fremont; in 1844, he and his party passed close to the Reach 4B/ESB Project
7 area when they travelled south from the Merced River and east of the San Joaquin River
8 (Byrd et al. 2009:16). During the 1840s, Mexican governors granted several land grants
9 along the San Joaquin River in Merced and Stanislaus counties, including *El Pescador*,
10 *Rancho del Puerto*, *Orestimba Rancho*, and *Sanjon de Santa Rita* as well as Thompson's
11 *Rancho*, *Rancheria del Rio Estanislao*, *San Luis Gonzaga*, and *Panocha de San Juan y*
12 *Los Carrisalitos* (Beck and Haase 1974). In the 1840s, relations between Mexico and the
13 US became strained as the US expanded westward. These political stresses erupted into
14 the Mexican-American War, which lasted from 1846 to 1848. At the close of the war,
15 Alta California became a part of the US with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe
16 Hidalgo.

17 American Period (1849-Present)

18 In 1848, gold was discovered on the American River, setting off the California Gold
19 Rush. With the rapid influx of settlers into California, land grants awarded by the Spanish
20 or Mexican authorities were increasingly disputed. The American government passed the
21 Land Act of 1851, which placed the burden of proof-of-ownership on the grantees. As a
22 result, the few Native Americans who had received land grants lost their titles, as did
23 many Hispanic land grantees. By congressional action, grant claims were heard by a
24 board of Land Commissioners and then appealed in federal courts. By 1885, 97% of the
25 claims had been decided. Francisco Soberanes filed a land grant claim in 1853 for
26 *Rancho Sanjon de Santa Rita*, and the grant was confirmed in 1862 (Outcalt
27 1925:Chapter XII; Willey 1886:23). Early American Period settlement of the San Joaquin
28 Valley tended to occur along streams and rivers. Among the earliest such settlements
29 were Dover and Hills Ferry. Dover was established in 1844, five miles north of the
30 confluence of the San Joaquin and Merced rivers (Hoover et al. 1990:203). It was
31 abandoned in 1860 when the community of Hills Ferry was established at the confluence
32 of the Merced River and the San Joaquin River. As the gold mining industry in California
33 declined in the 1850s, the agricultural and ranching industries expanded to become
34 central to the state's economy. Farming in the American Period was characterized by
35 cattle and sheep ranching, grain farming, and irrigation agriculture. Cattle and sheep
36 ranching were dominant until the 1880s. With the completion of the transcontinental
37 railway in 1869, farmers in the Central Valley began to export their crops, including
38 many different types of fruits, nuts, and vegetables, to the rest of the nation. The demand
39 for water for gold mining and agriculture led to the development of numerous water
40 conveyance systems in the Central Valley. In the San Joaquin Valley, large private
41 landholders drove the movement to irrigate their land, which led to the formation of
42 private water companies. Irrigation in Madera, Merced, Fresno and Stanislaus counties
43 came from the Merced, San Joaquin, and Tuolumne rivers and facilitated the construction
44 of the San Joaquin and Kings River Canal from Mendota. This canal comprised the
45 largest single irrigation system in the state during the 1880s (Beck and Haase 1974:76).
46 Private water companies still exist; however, these early, privately financed systems were

1 dwarfed by early 20th century systems created by municipalities and by the federal
2 government (Beck and Haase 1974). Details regarding the history and development of
3 irrigation and flood control systems, ranching and agriculture, transportation, and wildlife
4 refuges within the Study Area are detailed in the technical report (Schneider et al. 2017)
5 prepared in support of this EIS.

6 *Ranches and Agriculture*

7 During the late 1850s through the 1870s, cattle ranching increased and consolidated
8 along the San Joaquin River. That period also witnessed the rise of grain agriculture
9 within the San Joaquin River lowlands, as federal land patents became increasingly
10 available. By the late 19th century, the largest cattle ranching concern in Merced County
11 was owned by Henry Miller and Charles Lux. Miller and Lux acquired the *Rancho*
12 *Sanjon de Santa Rita* grant (Outcalt 1925: Chapter XII). They also acquired a large
13 portion of the *Orestimba Rancho* grant, which was located along the eastern side of the
14 San Joaquin River, as well as land to the northwest that they leased from Juan Perez
15 Pacheco (Byrd et al. 2009:22). Miller and Lux established their headquarters at Santa
16 Rita, south of the Reach 4B/ESB Project APE, and developed farming and ranching
17 operations. Several smaller ranches also operated within the Reach 4B/ESB Project area.
18 One of these was Turner Ranch, which appeared on US Geological Survey topographic
19 maps as early as 1918 (USGS 1918, 1948, and 1961a). Farming tracts were present
20 within the Reach 4B/ESB Project area as well, including two located at the edge of the
21 Merced NWR that were patented in the 19th century, one of which lay within the Reach
22 4B/ESB Project APE.

23 *Irrigation /Flood Control Systems*

24 As ranching and agriculture developed along the San Joaquin River, irrigation and levee
25 systems became important for managing water resources and controlling flooding. Large
26 tracts of tule swamp were drained to create ranching and agricultural lands. The earliest
27 irrigation system developed within the Reach 4B/ESB Project area was established by
28 Miller and Lux on the *Rancho Sanjon de Santa Rita*. There they began the San Joaquin
29 and Kings River Canal and Irrigation Company, which constructed the Main Canal in
30 1871 and the Outside Canal, which paralleled the Main Canal to the west, in the 1890s.
31 The Main Canal ran from near Mendota north to Los Banos (Iglar 2001:76). Miller and
32 Lux also built the Dos Palos and Temple Slough canals in ca. 1882 by improving existing
33 natural sloughs along the San Joaquin River (Byrd et al. 2009:25). A network of smaller,
34 generally hand-built canals and ditches grew from these main canals for irrigation and
35 drainage of swamplands. On the east side of the San Joaquin River, one of the earliest
36 irrigation canals was the East Side or Stevinson Canal, which was completed in 1887
37 (Outcalt 1925:246-247). In 1911, the US Army Corps of Engineers adopted the Jackson
38 Plan and created the California State Reclamation Board to focus study on large-scale
39 flood control for the Sacramento River watershed. In 1913, the San Joaquin River was
40 added to the plan. By 1955, the Lower San Joaquin Levee District was established and a
41 flood control plan was proposed. The plan, which encompassed the Eastside Bypass and
42 Mariposa Bypass, was adopted in 1958, and all elements were completed by 1966 (Byrd
43 et al. 2009:30).

44 *Duck Clubs and Wildlife Refuges*

1 The Miller and Lux Company sold off portions of its property during the 1920s and
 2 1930s, and parcels within the Reach 4B/ESB Project vicinity were purchased mainly by
 3 cattle companies and by duck hunting clubs. Although the Miller and Lux Company
 4 initially kept the riparian water rights to their parcels, it ultimately sold the water rights to
 5 Reclamation in 1939. Subsequently, the duck clubs and cattle ranchers organized as the
 6 Grass Lands Association to negotiate for water from Reclamation. During the 1940s, as
 7 the Grasslands Water District, they pressured Reclamation and the US Fish and Wildlife
 8 Service to study the importance of waterfowl grassland habitat. The resulting study led to
 9 the establishment of the Merced NWR in 1951. In 1966, continued efforts to protect
 10 waterfowl habitat led to the creation of the San Luis NWR (Byrd et al. 2009:37). The two
 11 refuges were combined as the San Luis National Wildlife Refuge Complex, and now
 12 include the Grasslands Wildlife Management Area (US Fish and Wildlife Service 2008).

13 *Transportation Features: Roads and Airstrip*

14 Byrd, Wee, and Costello (2009) reported that three transportation-related features lay
 15 within the Reach 4B/ESB Project APE, including two roads and one airstrip. One road
 16 appeared on two historic period topographic maps (USGS 1918, 1919); it ran
 17 approximately north-south from the Eastside Canal/Stevinson Canal to Turner Ranch.
 18 The second was featured on the 1874 “Official Map of Merced County” (Merced County
 19 1874) and extended from the west side of the San Joaquin River. Also within the Reach
 20 4B/ESB Project APE was a historic period airstrip. It appeared on topographic maps
 21 sometime after 1948 and before 1961 (USGS 1948, 1961a). No background information
 22 was available to document when or why the airstrip was established, though it may have
 23 been associated with agriculture (e.g., crop dusting, transport).

24 **H.2 References**

- 25 Allen, Rebecca, R. Scott Baxter, Linda Hylkema, Clinton Blount and Stella D'Oro. 2010.
 26 *Uncovering and Interpreting History and Archaeology at Mission Santa Clara*.
 27 Report to Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California.
- 28 Beck, W. A., and Haase, Y. D. 1974. *Historical Atlas of California*. Norman: University
 29 of Oklahoma Press.
- 30 Byrd, B. F., Wee, S., and Costello, J. 2009. Cultural Resources Sensitivity Study and
 31 Research Design for the San Joaquin River Restoration Program, Fresno, Madera,
 32 Merced, and Stanislaus Counties, California. Far Western Anthropological
 33 Research Group, Inc., Davis, California. Report prepared for MWH
 34 Environmental Permitting, Sacramento, California on behalf of the US Bureau of
 35 Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Sacramento, California.
- 36 Cook, Sherburne F. 1960. Colonial Expeditions to the Interior of California: Central
 37 Valley, 1800-1820. *Anthropological Records*. 16(6):239-292. Berkeley:
 38 University of California, Berkeley.

- 1 ————. 1962. Expeditions to the Interior of California: Central Valley, 1820-1840.
2 *Anthropological Records*. 20(5):151-214. Berkeley: University of California,
3 Berkeley.
- 4 Davis-King, S. 2009. Native American Ethnographic Information in Support of the
5 Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report for the San Joaquin River
6 Restoration Program, Fresno, Madera, and Merced Counties, California. Davis-
7 King & Associates. Volume 1 & 2. Submitted to Far Western Anthropological
8 Research Group, Inc. for the US Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region,
9 Sacramento, California.
- 10 Erlandson, J. M. and Bartoy, K. 1995. Cabrillo, the Chumash, and Old World Diseases.
11 *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*. 17(2):153-173.
- 12 Fredrickson, D. 1973. Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California. Ph.D.
13 Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.
- 14 ————. 1974. Cultural Diversity in Early Central California: A View from the North
15 Coast Ranges. *Journal of California Anthropology*. 1: 41-54.
- 16 Hoover, M., Rensch, H., Rensch, E., Abeloe, W., and Kyle, D. 1990. *Historic Spots in*
17 *California*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- 18 Kroeber, A. L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American
19 Ethnology Bulletin. 78. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- 20 ————. 1955. The Nature of Land-Holding Group. *Ethnohistory*. 2(4): 303-314.
21 Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.
- 22 Lightfoot, K. G., and O. Parrish. 2009. *California Indians and Their Environment*.
23 California Natural History Guides, no 96. Berkeley: University of California
24 Press.
- 25 Milliken, R. 1995. *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the*
26 *San Francisco Bay Area, 1769-1810*. Menlo Park, California: Ballena Press.
- 27 ————. 2008. *Native Americans at Mission San Jose*. Banning, California: Malki-
28 Ballena Press.
- 29 Moratto, M. 1984. *California Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press.
- 30 Olsen, W., and Payen, L. A. 1969. Archaeology of the Grayson Site, Merced County,
31 California. Sacramento: *California Department of Parks and Recreation*,
32 *Archaeological Reports* 12.
- 33 Outcalt, J. 1925. *History of Merced County, California*. Historic Record Company, Los
34 Angeles. Online version transcribed by K. Sedler. California Genealogy Website.

- 1 Accessed on: August 1, 2012. Available:
2 <http://www.cagenweb.com/merced/Merced.Outcalt.pdf>.
- 3 Phillips, G. H. 1993. *Indians and Intruders in Central California, 1769-1849*. Berkeley:
4 University of California Press.
- 5 Rosenthal, J. S. and McGuire, K. R. 2004. Middle Holocene Adaptations in the Central
6 Sierra Foothills: Data Recovery Excavations at the Black Creek Site, CA-CAL-
7 789. Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Davis. On file at the Central
8 California Information Center, California State University, Stanislaus, Turlock,
9 California.
- 10 Rosenthal, J. S., White, G. G., and Sutton, M. 2007. The Central Valley: A View from
11 the Catbird's Seat. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture and*
12 *Complexity*, edited by T. L. Jones and K. A. Klar. 147-163. New York: Altamira
13 Press.
- 14 Schneider, T., S. Lane, and J. Holson. 2017. Cultural Resources Survey and Inventory for
15 the San Joaquin River Restoration Program Reach 4B1, Eastside Bypass Reach 2,
16 and Eastside Bypass Reach 3 Merced County, California. Prepared by Pacific
17 Legacy, Inc. for the US Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region.
- 18 Wallace, W. J. 1978. *Northern Valley Yokuts*. In *California*, edited by R. F. Heizer.
19 Handbook of North American Indians. 8:462-470. Washington, D.C.:
20 Smithsonian Institution.
- 21 Willey, H. I. 1886. Grants of Land in California Made by Spanish or Mexican Authorities
22 Table. In, *Report of the Surveyor General of the State of California, from August*
23 *1, 1884 to August 1, 1886*. State Printing Office, Sacramento. California State
24 Lands Commission. Accessed on: August 1, 2012. Available:
25 [http://www.slc.ca.gov/Misc_Pages/Historical/Surveyors_General/reports/Willey_](http://www.slc.ca.gov/Misc_Pages/Historical/Surveyors_General/reports/Willey_1884_1886.pdf)
26 [1884_1886.pdf](http://www.slc.ca.gov/Misc_Pages/Historical/Surveyors_General/reports/Willey_1884_1886.pdf).