

## 2.5 Cultural Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES— Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

#### ***Prehistoric Context***

Researchers have outlined four basic patterns for the region defined by a configuration of basic archaeological traits representing a basic adaptation generally shared by a number of separate cultures over an appreciable period of time within an appreciable space for the region. These include the Post Period (before 8,000 before the Christian Era (BC), Borax Lake Pattern (8,000 BC to 2,500 BC), Mendocino Pattern (2,500 BC to 500 after the Christian Era (AD)) and the Gunther Pattern (500 AD to 1,800 AD) (PacifiCorp, 2007).

The earliest systematic archaeological investigations performed at a site in the area were conducted in 1964 near Point Saint George. The investigations surmised that two distinct occupations occurred at the site, an earlier occupation referred to as the Point Saint George I that had radiocarbon dates dating back to approximately 310 BC, which coincides with the end of the Mendocino Pattern, and a later occupation, Point Saint George II, which dated from approximately 1,300 to 1,800 AD. This latter occupation is a representation of the Gunther Pattern. Recent archaeological excavations near the confluence of the South and Middle Forks of the Smith River have failed to extend the archaeological occupation sequence of the immediate region beyond 500 BC. These excavations were intended to research questions related to the origins of the intensive Salmon-Acorn economy of the northern river valleys. Early results from these investigations suggest that this economy may predate 500 BC, and may lead to a new understanding of the transition to a sedentary fishing based economy (PacifiCorp, 2007).

#### ***Ethnographic Context***

The Proposed Project study area is entirely within the ethnographic territory of the Tolowa, one of five northern California groups representing the southernmost expression of the Athapaskan-speaking Northwest Coast Culture area. Several researchers have written about the culture of these people (Drucker 1937; Du Bois 1932; Gould 1966, 1978; Hildebrandt 2007; Kroeber 1925;

Powers 1976; Thornton 1984; Waterman 1925). The following paragraphs are based those research papers.

Historically, the Tolowa occupied a territory of approximately 640 square miles in present-day California and Oregon including the northern two-thirds of Del Norte County in California, and extended north to the Winchuck River in Oregon. Many villages were small, composed of only one extended family; and larger villages had a headman. Some ownership of land and resource exploitation areas was practiced and applied to village territories, salmon-fishing areas, and acorn groves. Permanent villages were located along the Smith River and tributaries, Lake Earl, Point Saint George, and Crescent City. The Tolowa resided primarily in the permanent villages, and only left in the late summer for the sandy beaches to harvest smelt.

The Tolowa were hunters and gatherers who practiced an annual subsistence round based on a series of seasonal moves designed to ensure their arrival at specific areas during the peak period of productivity for certain resources. Food was plentiful, with major protein sources including seal lion, whale, deer, anadromous fish, resident fish, small mammals, birds, turtles, and invertebrates such as mussels, grasshoppers, and crickets. Men hunted by tracking, driving, and smoking out; and they fished with hook and line, spear, and harpoon. Women concentrated on procuring plant foods, especially acorns.

Tolowa technology used a wide variety of materials including stone, bone, wood, shell, and plants obtained both locally and in trade with other groups. The Tolowa constructed elaborate semi-subterranean family houses using two pitched plank roofs with a square interior pit. A single pitch plank roofed sweathouse was also located in each village which housed bachelor men. Elaborate dugout canoes were also constructed by the Tolowa, capable of sea voyages and carrying up to 24 rowers.

### ***Historical Context***

The first euro-Americans to enter the vicinity of the Smith River were early Spanish explorers who arrived by ship in the early 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, followed by the Hudson's Bay trappers and traders who traveled through the area beginning circa 1826 through the mid-1840s. In 1828 Jedediah Smith traded with Native Americans at Lake Earl (about four miles to the southwest from the Proposed Project site); then various wagon roads developed through the area bringing miners and homesteaders (Del Norte County, 2003). The first roads in the Proposed Project vicinity were the Kelsey Trail from Crescent City to Yreka in 1855, and the Crescent City & Yreka Plank & Turnpike Company's road between Crescent City and Waldo, Oregon. The first well established transportation link to Smith River was a narrow-gauge railroad lining Smith River to Crescent City in 1890 (Del Norte County, 2003).

The County was originally inhabited by two Native American tribes; the Yurok tribe on the Klamath River, and the Tolowa tribe on the Smith River. Gold was first found at Myrtle Creek in 1853 and quickly attracted many settlers to the area (DNCVB, 2007). Copper mining also begin in 1960. The largest town in the County, Camp Crescent City, was founded in 1856 during the

Red Cap War which resulted in the removal of the Yuroks and seven other tribes to the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation (PacifiCorp, 2007).

During the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, logging grew as the economic mainstay of the County, along with dairy ranching and agriculture. Sufficient roads and bridges into the rugged mountain border country were vital to the growth of the local economy, yet pleas for funding were ignored by California State government. Because of discontent, various attempts were made beginning in 1852 by several northern California and southern Oregon counties who were trying to secede from their respective states to form a new state called Jefferson. The most recent attempt was in 1941, but the outbreak of World War II interrupted those efforts (Rock, 1985).

Crescent City became a destination for ships from San Francisco in search of products related to the lumber, agriculture, and fishing industries once the gold rush began to die down (DNCVB, 2007). The first lumber mill was established in Crescent City in 1853 and oxen were used for transportation. In the 1870's the railroad replaced the oxen to move logs, and in the 1920's the Caterpillar tractor replaced the railroad. Hobbs, Wall and Company was the main logging company in the local area from 1872 to 1939 (DNCVB, 2007). In 1968, the Redwood National Park was established to protect the remaining old growth coast redwoods, and now includes 112,598 acres of land (Hillclimb Media, 2007). The park became a World Heritage Site in 1980 and an International Biosphere Reserve in 1983 (Hillclimb Media, 2007).

The Smith River is the largest river system in California that is not dammed (Wikimedia, 2007). It runs freely for 20 miles from the Siskiyou into the Pacific Ocean (Wikimedia, 2007). The community of Smith River was established in 1853 as the first farming community of the County and is now known as the Easter Lily Capital of the World (Del Norte County, 2003; DNCVB, 2007). Important economic activities in Smith River included dairy, fish canneries, and the gravel industry. Both the town and the river are named after the Californian explorer Jedediah Smith who traveled through the area in 1828 (Bright, 1998).

## **Regulatory Context**

### ***Federal***

Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) does not apply to the Proposed Project, as there is no federal agency involved, nor is there federal funding or a federal permit required.

### ***State***

#### **California Environmental Quality Act**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that public or private projects financed or approved by public agencies must assess the effects of the project on historical resources. CEQA also applies to effects on archaeological sites, which may be included among "historical resources" as defined by Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (a), or, in the alternative, may be subject to the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, which

governs review of “unique archaeological resources.” Historical resources may generally include buildings, sites, structures, objects or districts, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific significance.

Under CEQA, “historical resources” include the following:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, §5024.1.)
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resources as significant, unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, §5024.1) if it:
  - (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
  - (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
  - (C) 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
  - (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, is not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or is not identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

Archaeological resources that are not “historical resources” according to the above definitions may be “unique archaeological resources” as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, which also generally provides that “non-unique archaeological resources” do not receive any

protection under CEQA.<sup>1</sup> If an archaeological resource is neither a “unique archaeological” nor an “historical resource,” the effects of a project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the environmental review document, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

In summary, CEQA requires that if a project results in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, or would cause significant effects on a unique archaeological resource, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered.

### **Local**

The community of Smith River is not an incorporated city government and its land use is regulated by the *Del Norte County General Plan*.

### **Del Norte County General Plan**

The General Plan contains sixteen policies relating to paleontological and cultural resources (Del Norte County, 2003). Policies 5.H.1 through 5.H.16 require cultural resource surveys for environmental assessment in accordance with CEQA for development projects. Projects must identify and protect archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites from damage. The County encourages private individuals and citizens to preserve cultural resources and increase public knowledge of cultural heritage. The General Plan requires the solicitation of the views of the local Native American community whenever development may disturb a Native American historical or cultural site. The County keeps archaeological site locations confidential to prevent vandalism. The Del Norte Historical Advisory Committee identifies cultural resources and register them as landmarks.

## **Methods and Findings**

### **Native American Consultation**

Contact by Condor Country Consulting to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was made by fax on October 4, 2007. The NAHC responded via facsimile on October 15, 2007, stating that there was no specific site information in the sacred lands file for the Proposed Project area. Environmental Science Associates (ESA) also initiated contact with the closest Native American community, the Smith River Rancheria on September 12, 2007. ESA spoke directly with Ms. Suntayea Steinruch, the Smith River Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Officer. Ms. Steinruch reported no concerns associated with the Proposed Project. Condor Country Consulting followed up with Ms. Suntayea Steinruch via letter and telephone on

<sup>1</sup> As used in this section, "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: (1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; (2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type or (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

October 2, 2007. In addition to the letter sent to Ms. Steinruck, Condor Country Consulting also sent information request letters to the following individuals on October 17, 2007:

- Chairperson Dale Miller, Elk Valley Rancheria of Smith River Tolowa
- Tribal Administrator Glen Gary, Elk Valley Rancheria of Smith River Tolowa
- Mr. John Green, Elk Valley Rancheria of Smith River Tolowa
- Ms. Shannon Tushingam, THPO, Elk Valley Rancheria of Smith River Tolowa
- Chairperson Kara Brundin-Miller, Smith River Rancheria of California
- Tribal Administrator Russ Crabtree, Smith River Rancheria of California
- Melochundum Band of Tolowa Indians

No response has been received from Ms. Suntayea Steinruck or other Native American contacts as of the publication date of this IS/MND.

### ***CHRIS Records Review***

An archaeological literature search was conducted on May 3, 2007, at the North Coast Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) in Klamath, California, by Environmental Planning Group (PacifiCorp, 2007). Results of this literature search resulted in no known archaeological resources or cultural resource surveys within the Proposed Project site, and only one recorded archaeological resource, CA-DNO-047, within a one-mile radius of the site. One previous archaeological survey had been conducted immediately adjacent to the Proposed Project sites along U.S. Highway 101, and another nine surveys had been conducted within the 1-mile record search radius between 1982 and 1998 (PacifiCorp, 2007).

### ***Pedestrian Survey***

A pedestrian archaeological survey of the Proposed Project study area was conducted on May 2, 2007, by an Environmental Planning Group archaeologist (PacifiCorp, 2007). The pedestrian survey was conducted by using transects spaced no greater than three meters (10 feet) apart. The survey covered existing access roads used for the existing substation, as well as the areas proposed for new access roads, staging areas, and other work sites designated as part of the Proposed Project. A 100-foot buffer around the Proposed Project site was also included in the archeological pedestrian survey.

As reported by Environmental Planning Group, at the time of the survey, much of the study area was covered with ankle- to midcalf-high grasses, blackberry bushes, and recently excavated divots containing redwood seedlings. The remaining area had limited soil visibility given the constraints of remnant roadway asphalt, inundated drainages, and thick understory. No attempt was reported to improve the surface visibility in these locations (PacifiCorp, 2007). Despite the constraints, the archaeological survey is considered to have been thorough enough to have located any surface archaeological sites that may be present within the study area.

The ground was examined for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, baked clay items, fire-affected rock), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a

cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., postholes, foundations) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Ground disturbances such as ground divots for redwood seedlings were visually inspected. During the surveys, a handheld global positioning system (GPS) unit was available for recording locational data, and photographs of the study area, any potential features, and items of interest were taken with a digital camera.

### **Findings**

Remnants of a gravel works operation, with associated remnant roads, equipment parking areas, and probable modular office/home lay down area were identified. The outlines of the former structures associated with the gravel works are identifiable on the 1966 USGS topographic map, but are not identifiable on the ground. Environmental Planning Group noted wire nails, lumber fragments, and asbestos roofing shingle fragments, but did not note the definitive location of any former structures within the study area. No “historical resources” or “unique archaeological resources” have been identified within the Proposed Project study area.

### **Cultural Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts on cultural resources could result from ground-disturbing activities and/or damage, destruction, or alteration of historic structures. Ground-disturbing activities include Proposed Project-related excavation, grading, trenching, or other sub-surface disturbance that could damage or destroy buried archaeological resources including prehistoric and historic remains or human burials. Mechanisms that would cause damage, destruction, or alteration of historic structures includes Proposed Project-related demolition, damage, or alteration of historic structures or their immediate surroundings that could impair the significance of an historic resource or adversely alter those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance.

**a) Change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5: *Less than significant.***

The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of any known historical resource. No historical resources have been identified within the Proposed Project study area. Impacts would be less than significant.

**b) Change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5: *Less than significant with mitigation.***

No “unique archaeological resources” have been identified within the Proposed Project study area, but the nonexistence of subsurface cultural resources cannot be adequately demonstrated, and unidentified, buried archaeological remains could be present within the footprint of the Proposed Project site. Buried archaeological remains such as prehistoric midden deposits, flaked and ground stone artifacts, bone, shell, historic artifacts and features, or other cultural resources could be damaged during grading, trenching, and other construction related activities.

**Impact 2.5-1: If construction activities associated with the Proposed Project encounter currently unknown cultural resources, either prehistoric or historic, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or CEQA Section 21083.2(g), this could cause substantial adverse changes to the significance of the resource. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-1.**

**Mitigation Measure 2.5-1:** In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and PacifiCorp and/or the CPUC shall consult with a qualified archaeologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of PacifiCorp and/or the CPUC and the qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation, with the ultimate determination to be made by the CPUC. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, as necessary, and a report prepared by a Specialist according to current professional standards.

In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the CPUC shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, Proposed Project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the Proposed Project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is carried out.

If the CPUC, in consultation with the qualified archaeologist, determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project, the CPUC shall require PacifiCorp to:

- Re-design the Proposed Project to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- Implement an archeological data recovery program (ADRP) unless the qualified archaeologist determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive use than research significance, and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. If the circumstances warrant an ADRP, such a program shall be conducted. The project archaeologist and the CPUC shall meet and consult to determine the scope of the ADRP. The archaeologist shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed ADRP would preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP shall identify the scientific/historical research questions that are applicable to the expected resource, the data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not

be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

---

c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature: *Less than significant with mitigation.***

Paleontologic resources are the fossilized evidence of past life found in the geologic record. Despite the tremendous volume of sedimentary rock deposits preserved worldwide, and the enormous number of organisms that have lived through time, preservation of plant or animal remains as fossils is an extremely rare occurrence. Because of the infrequency of fossil preservation, fossils (particularly vertebrate fossils) are considered to be nonrenewable resources. Because of their rarity, and the scientific information they can provide, fossils are highly significant records of ancient life.

The likelihood of encountering a significant paleontological discovery during Proposed Project construction activities is considered very unlikely; but significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and proposed excavation activities could have a deleterious effect on such resources. In the event a paleontologic resource is encountered, Mitigation Measure 2.5-2 would be required.

**Impact 2.5-2: The Proposed Project could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources at the proposed pole site or the substation locations. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-2.**

**Mitigation Measure 2.5-2:** In the event of an unanticipated paleontological discovery during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist per up to date Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The discovery shall be documented as needed, the potential resource evaluated, and the significance of the find shall be assessed under the criteria set forth in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the CPUC determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the Proposed Project on the qualities that make the resource important, and such plan shall be implemented. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

---

**d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries  
*Less than significant with mitigation.***

There is no indication that any area in the vicinity of the Proposed Project site has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during Proposed Project construction. However, in the event of the discovery of any human remains during proposed construction activities, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, Mitigation Measure 2.5-3 would be required.

**Impact 2.5-3: Proposed Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. This would be a less than significant impact with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-3.**

**Mitigation Measure 2.5-3:** In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered during Proposed Project construction or demolition activities, PacifiCorp shall immediately halt all work, contact the Del Norte County Coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols pursuant to Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, PacifiCorp shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and all excavation and site preparation activities shall cease until appropriate arrangements are made. The Native American Heritage Commission shall assign a Most Likely Descendant, who shall have the right to access the find and provide a recommendation for treatment of the remains to the property owner, PacifiCorp, and the CPUC.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

---

## References – Cultural Resources

- Bright, William. 1998. 1500 California Place Names, Their Origin and Meaning. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles. 1998.
- Del Norte County Visitors Bureau (DNCVB). 2007. Del Norte County - The Real Northern California. Electronic document accessed October 4, 2007 online at: <http://www.exploredelnorte.com>
- Del Norte County. 2003. Del Norte County General Plan. Prepared with the assistance of Mintier & Associates, Jones & Stokes Associates, and Steve Lowers, P.E. page I-11
- Drucker, Phillip. 1937. The Tolowa and their Southwest Oregon Kin. University of California Press Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 36(4):221-300, Berkeley, CA.
- DuBois, Cora A. 1932. Tolowa Notes. American Anthropologist 34(2):248-262.

- Gould, Richard A. 1966. Archaeology of the Point St. George Site and Tolowa Prehistory. University of California Publications in Anthropology, Vol. 4. Berkeley.
- Gould, Richard A. 1978. Tolowa. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8, California. Robert F. Heizer, Ed., pp. 128-136. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Hildebrandt, William. 2007. Northwest California: Ancient Lifeways among Forested Mountains, Flowing Rivers, and Rocky Ocean Shores. Pages 83-97 In California Prehistory. Terry Jones and Kathryn Klar, Editors. Alta Mira Press, New York.
- Hillclimb Media. 2007. Redwood National Park. Electronic document accessed October 4, 2007. Online at <http://www.redwood.national-park.com/>
- Kroeber, A.L. 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, DC.
- PacifiCorp. 2007. Proponent's Environmental Assessment, Appendix B, A Cultural Resource Survey for the Proposed Morrison Creek Substation, Del Norte County, California. Prepared Environmental Planning Group for PacifiCorp to submit to the California Public Utilities Commission.
- Powers, Stephen. 1976. Tribes of California. Introduction and Annotations by Robert F. Heizer. University of California Press, Berkeley. (Reprinted from Contributions to North American Ethnology, Volume III, Department of Interior, U.S. Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rockt Mountain Region, J.W. Powell in Charge. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1877.)
- Rock, James T. 1985. The State of Jefferson: A Dream that Died, Or Did It? Siskiyou County Historical Society, Yreka.
- Thornton, Russell. 1984. "Social Organization And The Demographic Survival Of The Tolowa." Ethnohistory 31(3):187-196.
- Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 2007. Smith River (California). Electronic document accessed October 4, 2007. Online at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smith\\_River\\_California](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smith_River_California).
- Waterman, Thomas T. 1925. The Village Sites in Tolowa and Neighboring Areas in Northwestern California. American Anthropologist 27(4):528-543.