

## 4.5 Cultural Resources

The assessment of project impacts on cultural resources under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5) is a two-step process: (1) determine whether the project site contains cultural resources (defined as prehistoric archaeological, historic archaeological, or historic architectural resources). If the site is found to contain a cultural resource, then (2) determine whether the project would cause a substantial adverse change to the resource. The setting discussion describes the existing properties overlying and in the vicinity of the Yreka-Weed project alignments and assesses whether the properties are cultural resources<sup>1</sup> for the purposes of CEQA. The impact discussion reviews the criteria for significant impacts on cultural resources and assesses the impact of the project on cultural resources.

### 4.5.1 Setting

#### Environmental Setting

Shasta Valley is situated between the Klamath Mountains to the west and the Cascade Range to the east, and the project corridor lies along the western margin of Shasta Valley at the base of the Klamath Mountain foothills. A number of drainages flow from the mountains and foothills into Shasta Valley, the largest of which are Shasta River, Willow Creek, and Parks Creek. Elevation along the Proposed Project and Weed Segment ranges from approximately 750 to 1,000 feet above mean sea level.

The climate is characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, wet winters typical of Mediterranean climates; however, because the latitude of Siskiyou County (41° N to 42° N) lies at the northern extreme of the Mediterranean climate zone, and because the area is situated within a mountainous region, winters are typically colder. Shasta Valley, however, lies within the rain shadow of the Klamath Mountains, and thus receives less than 20 inches of precipitation per year. Current temperatures average 11° C (52° F), generally ranging between averages of 1° to 22° C (34° to 72° F). When California was initially occupied, the climate was more moist and cooler than today's Mediterranean climate (Major, 1988).

Current land uses along the segment include primarily farming and ranching, with some developed areas. Historically, Shasta Valley was characterized by vegetation communities that included grasslands in upland areas, freshwater marshland in low-lying areas, and riparian scrub or forests along drainages. Neighboring foothills and mountains included chaparral, oak woodlands, and coniferous forest. With this mosaic of ecological communities, Shasta Valley would have provided a very productive environment for its prehistoric occupants, one well-suited to a hunting and gathering economy with a variety of water birds, small and large mammals, fish, reptiles and amphibians, and edible plant species. Arrington (2006) provides a list of the vegetation communities along the project corridor and the plants and animals within each com-

---

<sup>1</sup> For the ease of discussion, the term "cultural resources" refers to both historical resources (either architectural or archaeological) or unique archaeological resources.

munity that likely would have been harvested by the area's prehistoric occupants; and additional information can be found in Section 2.4 Biological Resources.

## **Cultural Resource Setting**

### ***Prehistoric Context***

The SWCA report (Arrington 2006) summarizes the prehistory of northern California in the Paleoindian Period (ca. 8000 to 5500 B.C.), the era of the Borax Lake Pattern (5000 B.C. to A.D. 500), and the most recent era of the Shasta Aspect of the Augustine Pattern (A.D. 500 to 1769). Specific to the study area, the following summary of archaeological investigations in Shasta Valley is taken from Hamusek et al. (1997) and summarizes the work of Wallace and Taylor (1952), Clewett (1968), Ritter (1989), Nilsson (1985, 1987, 1988), Johnston and Nilsson (1983), and Nilsson et al. (1989). The following setting information applies to the Shasta territory as a whole and would reflect the setting characteristics for the Proposed Project and the Weed segment, as well as the alternative alignments (or the study area).

The earliest systematic archaeological investigations performed within ethnographic Shasta territory were conducted in 1950 by Wallace and Taylor who excavated a small rockshelter along the eastern edge of the valley. Based on the presence of small triangular barbed projectile points, they suggest a period of occupation as late as A.D. 1700 to 1800. Obsidian was the dominant lithic material used for stone tool manufacturing at the site, although cryptocrystalline silicates (ccs) and basalt were also present. Site function was attributed to seasonal hunting by Achumawi, Modoc or eastern Shasta peoples (Wallace and Taylor, 1952).

Excavations at CA-SIS-327, the Chaney Site, were undertaken by S. E. Clewett and California State University, Chico in 1965. Located in southern Shasta Valley along the banks of the Shasta River, this site was a small pithouse village with a cultural assemblage which included projectile points and groundstone implements indicative of a late prehistoric occupation (Clewett, 1968). Hamusek et al. (1997) looked at this artifact assemblage again, and they suggest that while projectile points typically assigned to the late prehistoric period dominate the assemblage, there are hints of earlier occupational sequences (e.g., Clikapudi Series projectile points) occurring at the site.

In 1984, excavations were conducted at CA-SIS-266, Sheep Rock Shelter (Ritter, 1989). Unlike the cultural deposit encountered by Wallace and Taylor at CA-SIS-13, Sheep Rock Shelter yielded few archaeological remains, despite the presence of a midden deposit. One corner-notched projectile point, two metate fragments, a mountain sheep bone awl and lithic debitage dominated by obsidian were recovered. Ritter's analysis of the cultural and ecofactual material suggests that the site was utilized as a lithic reduction workshop in which the maintenance and final shaping of tools was occurring along with local foraging for seeds and other plant foods and hunting. Radiocarbon dates and obsidian hydration rim readings obtained on cultural material indicate that the site was occupied between 600 B.C. to A.D. 700 (Ritter, 1989).

In the mid to late 1980s, eight prehistoric sites were excavated in the northern portion of Shasta Valley near Ager for the proposed realignment of the Montague-Ager Road (Johnston and Nilsson 1983; Nilsson 1985, 1987, 1988; and Nilsson et al. 1989). Nilsson (1991) states that four of these sites (three sparse surface lithic scatters and a housepit village) where minimal testing was conducted, yielded little in the way of archaeological data; but the archaeological investigations conducted at the remaining sites (CA-SIS-900, CA-SIS-154, CA-SIS-331, CA-SIS-332) and a re-examination of the data from the previously excavated rockshelters (CA-SIS-13 and CA-SIS-266) provided a significant body of data that allowed Nilsson to develop the following provisional chronological sequence for Shasta Valley (Nilsson 1991).

The earliest distinct cultural manifestations in Shasta Valley that can be solidly documented are defined by Nilsson (1991) as the Ager Phase which dates from 500 B.C. to A.D. 500. The artifact assemblage associated with this phase is characterized by Elko Corner-Notched, medium-sized side-notched and stemmed leaf-shaped projectile points manufactured nearly exclusively of Grasshopper Flat obsidians, as well as unifacial and bifacial manos, unifacial metates, end scrapers, and side-scrapers. Lithic technology during this period of time appears to focus on the reduction of imported, pre-formed obsidian bifaces; however, core reduction of local ccs and basalt materials was also commonly encountered. Faunal remains indicate that dietary patterns focused primarily on large and small terrestrial mammal species; and settlement pattern information appears to suggest that in addition to occupying river banks at the transition zone between the valley bottom and the upland region, the adjacent upland areas were utilized at least on a sporadic basis.

The Meek Phase then follows the Ager Phase, which Nilsson (1991) dates to the period from A.D. 500 to historic contact. Projectile point types in this phase are dominated by Gunther Barbed series specimens, as well as a limited number of Desert Side-Notched series and other small corner-notched specimens; and the groundstone assemblage is similar to that of the preceding complex except for the appearance of flat-ended and cylindrical pestles and, more rarely, hopper mortars. Also commonly found in site assemblages from this period are various bone tools and ornaments, shell beads, twined basketry, ceramic figurines, and pottery fragments identified as Siskiyou Utility Ware.

Lithic technology patterns typical of Meek Phase assemblages revolve around a reduction strategy which was multi-faceted and material specific and include core, biface, and bipolar techniques; and also of note is the apparent increase in the number of obsidian sources utilized during this phase. Whereas assemblages associated with the Ager Phase are dominated by a near exclusive use of obsidian from Grasshopper Flat, site assemblages associated with the Meek Phase reveal the presence of four additional Medicine Lake Highland glasses, as well as material from the Cougar Butte, Callahan, Glass Mountain, and Railroad Grade sources.

Subsistence data from Meek Phase site assemblages suggest a continued focus on terrestrial mammal species, but evidence for the exploitation of riverine resources begins to appear during this time period. Based on these data, coupled with the lack of fish bone and freshwater mollusk from Ager Phase site assemblages, Nilsson (1991) hypothesizes that shifts in subsistence patterns

may have occurred during the Meek Phase as riverine resources began to be exploited and the reliance on land animals was lessened in favor of a broader-based economy.

### ***Ethnographic Context***

The project corridor lies entirely within the ethnographic territory of the Shasta Indians, one of four northern California Hokan-speaking groups collectively termed Shastan peoples. Several references discuss the culture of these people (Dixon, 1907; Holt, 1946; Kroeber, 1925; Silver, 1978), and the following is from these sources. Historically, the Shasta occupied territories in present-day California and Oregon including almost all of Siskiyou County in California and Jackson and Klamath counties in Oregon. The four main divisions of Shastan peoples roughly correspond to topographic features: Shasta Valley, Scott Valley, approximately sixty miles of the Klamath River basin, and the Rogue River Valley.

The fundamental social unit of the Shasta was the family. 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, hunting and fishing areas, tobacco plots, and oak trees. Permanent winter villages were located along the major rivers and tributaries; and during the other seasons, the Shasta lived in temporary brush huts or bark houses as they moved to various resource locations.

The Shasta 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 deer, bear, small mammals, birds, anadromous fish, resident fish, 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 gathered seeds, bulbs, roots, insects, and grubs, and they also trapped fish in baskets. Both men and women collected acorns and pine nuts. In addition, the Shasta practiced limited plant husbandry by burning areas to stimulate plant growth and encourage better seed harvests.

Shasta technology used a wide variety of materials including stone, bone, wood, shell, and plants obtained both locally and in trade with other groups. The Shasta relied heavily on obsidian for tools, but a variety of cherts and basalts were also used. The Shasta traded with their southern and western neighbors, the Wintu and the Hupa; but trade with the Klamath and Modoc to the east was not common.

With the influx of miners into Siskiyou County in the 1850s, the traditional Shasta way of life was completely disrupted. In 1851, a treaty made with the three California divisions of the Shasta provided for a reservation in Scott Valley, but it was never ratified (Heizer, 1972). These groups went to the aid of the Oregon Shasta in the Rogue River Wars of 1851–1856; and the survivors were then taken to reservations in Oregon.

## **Historical Context**

Hudson's Bay trappers and traders traveled through the area beginning circa 1826 through the mid-1840s; then various wagon roads developed through the area bringing miners and homesteaders. The California-Oregon Trail, first traveled by a settler headed for Oregon in 1834, skirted the western base of Mt. Shasta; then in 1849, a party of wagons heading south from Oregon came over the Siskiyou Mountains to Shasta Valley, but “fearing the Native Americans and being concerned about the remoteness of the area,” the party returned to Oregon (Marschner, 2001). Not until 1854 did a wagon team reach Siskiyou County from the Sacramento Valley.

The main route through the study area was the Yreka Trail which was heavily used in the 1850s and 1860s bringing emigrants primarily in search of gold. The route of this trail has been thoroughly researched and mapped by Richard Silva and Keith Arnold (1999), both Yreka residents and members of the Oregon-California Trails Association.

During the first quarter of the twentieth century, logging grew as the economic mainstay of the county, along with 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 their 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 their efforts (Rock, 1985).

In the mid-1940s, Highway 97, better known as the Al-Can Highway, which runs from Weed to Alaska, was completed; and the alignment for Interstate 5 through Yreka was finalized in the mid-1960s by the State of California. In recent decades, Siskiyou County has remained a quiet, sparsely populated area. Changing government regulations have led to the decline of logging in the area, which has been replaced in part by tourism and outdoor recreation. Siskiyou County is California's fifth-largest county in geographical size, yet its population is only 45,000 (Mount Shasta Region Travel Center [MSRTC], 2006).

### **Yreka**

Yreka was originally named Thompson's Dry Diggings in 1851 after Abraham Thompson who discovered gold here, and “two thousand miners arrived when the news got out.” Within a year's time, the town's name changed five times from Thompson's Dry Diggings to Shasta Butte City to Shasta Plains to Ieka to Wyreka, and finally Yreka in 1852 (Luecke, 1982). The latter name for the town is from a bastardization of the Shasta Indian word for Mount Shasta which was *Wy-e-kah* (Silva and Arnold, 1999).

Joaquin Miller described Yreka during 1853–1854 as a bustling place with “...a tide of people up and down and across other streets, as strong as if in New York” (MSRTC, 2006). The first newspaper, the *Mountain Herald*, was printed in June 1853, and the post office was established in August of the same year. Yreka was incorporated in 1854.

By 1885, the mining boom was nearly over, but the town had a population of 1,400 and boasted a courthouse, churches, hotels, a school, an express and telegraph office, and numerous other businesses (Luecke, 1982), and settlers were well established in Shasta Valley, primarily as ranchers and farmers. The growth of Yreka and the surrounding area prompted the construction in 1889 of a shortline railroad to connect Yreka with the Southern Pacific's west coast line. Hundreds to thousands of Chinese laborers were used to construct the shortline, and they established two large commercial, cultural, and social centers, known as Chinatowns (MSRTC, 2006).

### **Weed**

The history of Weed is closely tied to the development of the logging industry in the region and its founder Abner Weed. The following is excerpted from Linville (2000):

The town inherited its unusual name from its founder, Abner Weed, who saw a vast potential for the area's lush timber and abundant water supplies. Because of its unique location at the base of Mt. Shasta, Weed experiences almost a constant breeze that ascends over Black Butte summit in a northward thrust. As they descend, the air currents swirl around the hills with a tremendous force, often causing a swirling patch of clouds to appear over the peak of Mt. Shasta. Weed noticed this and saw that he could harness the wind to his lumber operation to help in the drying of the green lumber. He purchased a 280-acre site in the path of the wind from the Siskiyou Lumber and Mercantile in 1897, and thus came the birth of the town.

Mr. Weed developed an extensive railroad logging operation, and the California & Oregon Railroad was extended into the area to accommodate the factory business. Weed Lumber Company furnished employment and housing and provided mercantile goods and social services to its workers. In 1902, this "company town" included the cookhouse and bunkhouse, a post office, two mills, a box factory and boarding house, a store, and several homes. The company was taken over by Long Bell Lumber Company circa 1906, and they operated the mill until 1956 when it was purchased by International Paper Company. The town of Weed was incorporated in 1959.

### **Transmission line and Substations**

Russell Loeffler, Project Manager with PacifiCorp, provided the following information by emails (6/28/06 and 7/21/06). The Yreka-Weed transmission line was originally built in the 1920s. A review of the Facility Point Inspection report for this line shows that most of the poles were replaced in 1994, and others were replaced between 1992 and 2001. There are a few poles that do not have dates, and Loeffler states that it "is possible, but not likely, that they could be from the original line construction."

The original drawings for the Weed Substation indicate that it was built in 1963. The manufacture date on the transformer is 1959, on the original breaker is 1963, and on the second breaker is 1969. The first capacitor banks were probably installed in the 1970s and the second set of capacitor banks were installed in 1985.

## Regulatory Context

### ***Federal***

Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) does not apply for this 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<sup>2</sup>, which also generally provides that “non-unique archaeological resources” do not receive any protection under CEQA. If an archaeological resource is neither a “unique archaeological” nor an “historical resource,” the effects of the 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 EIR, 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 General Plans for both Siskiyou County and the City of Weed are outdated, written in 1973 and 1987, respectively. These documents provide only broad recommendations for the protection of cultural resources.

### **Siskiyou County General Plan**

The Conservation Element of the Siskiyou County General Plan is dated 1973. The Archaeology section of the Conservation Element states that Siskiyou County “has a wealth of archaeological history within its borders” and the County shall “preserve, protect, and develop the county’s Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic as well as Geologic sites.” The County will (1) strictly enforce State laws which prohibit unauthorized excavation on all lands under its jurisdiction; and (2) encourage scientific excavation, with all projects directed to the Siskiyou County Museum or Historical Society for guidance to assure that the proper procedures are followed which will insure the validity and authenticity of any and all finds.

---

<sup>2</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, (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

### **City of Weed General Plan**

The City of Weed General Plan prepared in 1987 states that the City “shall protect its historical, cultural, and archaeological heritage. All development shall be reviewed for impacts on historical, cultural, and archaeological resources and mitigation measures proposed if impacts are found” (pg 65).

An amendment to the Land Use Element adopted in 2003 states that the City proposes to designate Main Street as an historic route through downtown from North Weed Boulevard to Alamo Avenue; and the historic route will then continue along Alamo Avenue to Highway 97 (pg. 29). The proposed historic route is outside of this project corridor.

## **Methods**

### ***Archival Methods***

S.W.C.A. Environmental Consultants of Sacramento (SWCA) prepared the cultural resources section of the Preliminary Environmental Analysis (PEA) for this project. Prior to fieldwork, SWCA consulted the following sources in September 2005 to obtain information concerning previously identified sites or other historic properties located within or adjacent to the study area: Northeast Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Chico (NE/CHRIS); the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC); and the local Native American community. Additional consultation was conducted in June 2006 by Trudy Vaughan, Principal of Coyote & Fox Enterprises (CFE), and subcontractor with ESA to prepare the Cultural Resources section of this document. Also, Russell Loeffler, Project Manager with PacifiCorp in Portland, was contacted by Vaughan for historical information on the transmission line and the Weed Substation. This information is provided in the Historical Context.

### **Records Search**

The letter response to SWCA’s request for a review of archaeological records at NE/CHRIS is dated September 15, 2005. Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, districts, and objects, standing historic structures, buildings, districts, objects, locations of important historic events, and sites of traditional cultural properties. Prehistoric resources include sites, features, and artifacts associated with indigenous Californians, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historic resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region, and to be an “historic” resource, it must be more than 50 years old.

The review at NE/CHRIS covered maps and records for cultural resource surveys and archaeological sites along each project corridor (the Proposed Project and Weed Segment as well as the alternative alignments) and within a 1/4-mile radius (or the study area); and the following documents were also reviewed: *National Register of Historic Places - Listed Properties and Determined Eligible Properties* (1990 and supplements through 8/05 by National Park Service), the *California Register of Historic Resources* (2002), *California Points of Historical Interest* (1992), *California Historical Landmarks* (1996), and the NE/CHRIS Historic Property Data File for Siskiyou County.

Records indicate that 16 cultural resources surveys have been previously conducted within the Study Area, but only five of these are within the project corridors (Hopkins, 1979; Jensen, 1994; Manning, 1982; Peak & Associates, 1988; Vaughan, 1999). The Peak & Associates survey covered approximately four miles in the Grenada area, and the Jensen and Manning surveys covered portions of the Weed segment. The other two surveys each covered less than 1/4 mile along the transmission line.

As a result of the previous surveys in the area of review, 3 previously-recorded archaeological sites were identified within the 1/4-mile radius of the study area:

- (1) CA-SIS-152 is identified as a small prehistoric seasonal campsite adjacent to the east side of the project corridor south of Montague.
- (2) CA-SIS-345/H has both a prehistoric component and an historic component; and it is located east of Pole 19/45 along the Weed segment between the transmission line and Hoy Road on both sides of Beaughton Creek. This site was originally recorded in 1974 as part of an archaeological survey along Highway 97 (Bass, 1974). It was re-examined in 1975 by Johnson (Johnson, 1975) and described as “a thin lithic scatter of obsidian and basalt detritus with associated light gray colored midden of untested depth.” At that time, Johnson recommended the site for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, but did not discuss specific criteria for eligibility.

The site was again re-examined in 1994 and the site forms updated (Jensen, 1994). He described the prehistoric component similarly to Johnson, and he also noted an historic component. The latter includes “several lumber piles (possibly collapsed structures), a metal-lined cistern, fence posts and fencing wire, miscellaneous metallic objects, window pane glass fragments, bottle glass fragments, and various other household trash.” Jensen states that “the site exhibits those qualities and attributes which both Bass and Johnson ascribed to it in the mid-1970s. Since the site has not been materially affected since its original recording, it remains potentially significant for information values under CEQA criteria” (Jensen, 1994).

- (3) CA-SIS-3391H is the trinomial which documents the Weed Lumber Company Railroad system; and two segments of this railroad are located northeast of Weed and east of the end of the project corridor.

CA-SIS-3391H is outside the Proposed Project and Weed Segment corridor by 1,500 feet or more and was not revisited for this project. CA-SIS-152 and CA-SIS-345/H are discussed in the Findings below.

In addition to the above sites, an historic bridge and ditches were noted at Parks Creek (Hopkins, 1979); and records also indicate that numerous segments of rock walls/fences composed of dry-laid fieldstone have been documented in the previous archaeological survey reports for this area. A few of these are shown to cross the transmission line corridor.

NE/CHRIS considered the potential for encountering prehistoric or ethnohistoric resources within the project corridor to be high and the potential for historic resources to be moderate to high.

### **Native American Consultation**

Contact was made by letter on September 7, 2005 to NAHC, and their reply dated September 20 states that their records do not show the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate study area. NAHC also provided a list of 15 Native American groups and individuals to contact for information, and a letter dated September 21 was sent to the following individuals: Chairman, Pit River Tribe; Sharon Elmore, Cultural Information Officer, Pit River Tribe; and 13 individuals serving as Council Representatives of Cultural Resource Representatives of various bands within the Pit River Tribe: Ajumawi, Atwamsini, Ilmawi, and Madesi. No responses were received, and copies of the transmittal letters are included in the SWCA report (Arrington, 2006: Appendix B).

NAHC provided the wrong list to SWCA, since the project corridor is within Shasta ethnographic territory, and not within Pit River territory. On June 20, 2006, letters were sent to the following groups and individuals asking if they had concerns: President, Siskiyou County Historical Society; Chairman, Shasta Nation; Mary Carpelan, Cultural Liaison, Shasta Nation; and Mr. and Mrs. Roy Hall. The 30-day time limit in which a response was requested has elapsed, and the only response received is from NAHC. David Singleton, Program Analyst for this agency, responded on July 17, 2006, stating that their Sacred Lands File did not indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate study area. NAHC also provided a list of Native American contacts for Siskiyou County which includes additional persons besides those already contacted. No additional letters were sent, however, as the previous contacts are considered by Vaughan, based on previous experience with the Shasta Nation, to be the appropriate individuals for this study area.

### **Field Methods**

The pedestrian survey of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment as well as the alternatives, was conducted on September 9 and 10, 2005 by SWCA Archaeologist Cindy Arrington, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Also, CFE Principal Trudy Vaughan, who also meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, visited the study area on May 18 and July 2, 2006.

The pedestrian survey was conducted by traversing one side of the corridor and then returning via the opposite side covering 50 feet on either side of the current pole line in transects spaced no greater than 15 meters apart. Also surveyed was the proposed new 1.6 mile line in a 100-foot corridor, again in 15 meter transects. Encompassed in the survey were existing access roads used for the existing transmission line and substations, as well as the proposed new access roads, staging areas, and other work sites designated as part of the project.

As reported by SWCA (Arrington 2006), at the time of the survey, approximately 85 percent of the study area was covered with ankle- to mid-calf-high grasses. Much of the right-of-way for the transmission alignment crosses active pastureland; and ground cover along this linear corridor is composed of hilly annual grassland pastures (45%), scrub/sage chaparral (20%), developed/rural (10%), irrigated agricultural land (10%), water resources/wet meadows/drainages (10%), mixed conifer forest (3%), and hardwood riparian (2%). Soil visibility varied greatly in each setting. For the grassland pastures and irrigated agricultural land, soil visibility averaged 25%. Animal paths

and crop rows held the best visibility and were scrutinized for soil changes and surface debris. The scrub/sage chaparral setting varied in density on the surface, and where access was possible, 20% of the surface was scraped with a handheld trowel. The conifer forest had only 5-7% soil visibility on the surface; but, again, a handheld trowel was used to clear the duff and examine the surface providing 60-70% visibility. The remaining settings (developed/rural, water resources, and riparian) had soil visibility of <5%, but given the constraints of roadway asphalt, inundated drainages, and thick understory, no attempt was made to improve the surface visibility in these locations.

Despite the limited soil visibility described above, the archaeological survey is considered by Vaughan to have been thorough enough to have located any 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 cattle paths and ground dimpling 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. Also, the surrounding neighborhood was reviewed by car to check on the general topography.

Vaughan's revisit to the area on July 23, 2006 was to more accurately identify the location of the two previously-recorded sites in, or in close proximity to, the project corridor.

### ***Findings***

As part of the archaeological survey, the following information from NE/CHRIS was field verified: (1) a check was made in those areas where segments of rock walls had been previously noted within or adjacent to the project corridor, and (2) an effort was made to relocate the previously-recorded sites nearest to the proposed project corridor (CA-SIS-152 and CA-SIS-345/H) and determine if they might be impacted by the project.

- None of the segments of rock walls shown on the NE/CHRIS records search maps were found within the transmission line corridor, nor were any segments noted in close proximity to the corridor that might be impacted by this project. No rock wall segments were mapped or recorded as part of this project.
- CA-SIS-152 could not be relocated. As noted above, this site was recorded in 1952 and the information provided on the site form is quite limited; but an intensive survey was conducted within the project corridor in the vicinity of this site, and no cultural material was noted.
- CA-SIS-345/H was relocated as shown on the 1974 and 1994 site forms and determined to be more than 200 feet east of Pole 19/45 and therefore outside the project impact area.

However, this site was re-investigated by SWCA (2007) and was determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources (see below).

The existing transmission line was originally built more than 50 years ago and is, therefore, a potential historic resource. Based on the information provided above in the Historical Background, however, there are no historic elements remaining for these structures since they have been upgraded over the years. Field inspection was made of these structures by Vaughan on May 18, 2006, and based on this visit and the background information; these structures were not recorded as historic sites.

As a result of the archaeological survey conducted for this project, one new site was identified as being within the Proposed Project corridor, along and adjacent to the transmission line between Poles 16/45 and 17/45. This historic debris scatter was temporarily identified as PE #1, and it has been assigned the trinomial CA-SIS-4170H by NE/CHRIS. This site was documented on the appropriate State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms which are included as an appendix to the SWCA report (Arrington, 2006). Other than this site, no prehistoric sites were identified and no isolated prehistoric or historic artifact or feature locations were noted.

#### **CA-SIS-4170H**

This site is a broadly dispersed historic debris scatter which consists of three concentrations identified as Loci A, B, and C. The site is situated approximately 340 feet west of Hoy Road, and it lies along and adjacent to the transmission line between Poles 16/45 and 17/45. The site measures approximately 600 feet north–south by 350 feet east–west, and it appears to have accumulated over several decades.

Loci A and C include historic material starting possibly in the 1920s, while Locus B is almost all modern (i.e., <50 years old). Metal items include 100+ assorted sanitary seam cans of various shapes and sizes, a 4" tall "Cashmere Bouquet" talcum powder can, Golden Lion Oil Company can, brake fluid cone-top cans, aluminum pull top soda cans, galvanized metal fragments, 12-gauge shotgun shells, car seat springs, and double bed springs. Glass items include clear glass milk bottles, clear glass jars of assorted sizes with screw-top metal lids, a 4" tall brown glass bottle with screw top, and a green glass tumbler. There are also a few assorted ceramic fragments including a white earthenware plate with green edging and a maker's mark JACKSON CHINA, which dates 1895–1917. Other dates derived from the range of artifacts sampled include Hazel Atlas glass manufactured between 1920 and 1969; the "churchkey" opening for cans made in 1935; hinged pocket tobacco cans patented in 1907; glass from Owens Illinois Glass manufactured between 1929 and 1956; glass from Armstrong Cork Company, Glass Division, manufactured between 1938 and 1969, and aluminum pull-top soda cans manufactured circa 1962 (Arrington, 2006).

CA-SIS-4170H is not considered eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources; therefore, it does not qualify as an historical resource under CEQA; it also does not appear to qualify as a unique archaeological resource. This is a common site type, and Vaughan

(Coyote & Fox Enterprises, 2004, 2005) has recorded and evaluated more than 50 of these sites, many of which are better examples that possess a greater degree of scientific interest and potential. It appears the refuse scatter has been used by numerous individuals over time and it does not appear to be linked to a particular settlement or individual. There is no evidence to suggest that the site is associated with an important historical event, even on the local scale (criterion A), or that it is associated with any important historical individual (criterion B). The site is an historic refuse scatter and it would therefore fail to exhibit distinctive characteristics or possess artistic values (criterion C). Because the site appears to have little connection to a particular event or person of significance in state or local history, it is unlikely to yield important historical information (criterion D). Further, the site does not appear to be directly associated with a scientifically recognized important historic event or person. The likelihood of a significant subsurface deposit, if there is any such deposit at all, is very low; and the site documentation provided on the DPR forms is believed to have retrieved the significant information potential for this site.

#### **CA-SIS-345H**

As mentioned above, SWCA (2007) revisited this site to evaluate the site and determine if the boundaries of the site are within the Proposed Project boundaries. This site is comprised of prehistoric and historic components. It is primarily a prehistoric midden, with three loci (2 dense lithic scatters and 1 concentration of historic material). In addition, thinly scattered historic-era artifacts and scant modern debris are interspersed throughout the entire surface of the site. Site survey and auger test units (AUs) were conducted to clarify or update site boundaries previously recorded. The prehistoric midden is bisected by Beaughton Creek and Hoy Road, and contains surface scatters of more than 50 basalt flakes and 6 obsidian flakes, with an estimated maximum depth of 20–30 cm. The historic component includes over 30 wooden structural remains, a wooden fence, hundreds of window glass fragments, over 50 bottle glass fragments, an iron lined cistern, various iron implements, 13 white ceramic fragments, and a bullet casing.

On the basis of these findings, SWCA (2007) determined that CA-SIS-345H qualifies as an historical resource for its potential to yield important information about California prehistory (criterion D).

#### **PE#2**

One historic-era archaeological site was identified by SWCA (2007) adjacent to the Weed substation (northeast of the substation). The site consists of historical refuse, such as tin cans, glass bottles, metal debris, and ceramics from the early to mid-1900s. It appears that the site functioned as a privy or refuse deposit and did not exhibit any features or signs of habitation. While this site was not formally evaluated for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, it is considered an historical resource for the purposes of this EIR.

### **4.5.2 Significance Criteria**

Based on criteria in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would be considered to have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

### 4.5.3 Cultural Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### Analysis Approach

Impacts on cultural resources could result from ground-disturbing activities and/or damage, destruction, or alteration of historic structures. Ground-disturbing activities include 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 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.

#### Impact Mechanisms

Impacts on cultural resources could result from the following project-related activities or project design elements:

**Ground-disturbing activities.** Project-related excavation, grading, trenching, or other sub-surface disturbance could damage or destroy buried archaeological resources including prehistoric and historic remains or human burials.

**Damage, destruction, or alteration of historic buildings.** Project-related demolition, damage, or alteration of historic buildings or their immediate surroundings could impair the significance of a historic resource or adversely alter those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance.

#### Impact Assessment

- a) **Change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

The Proposed Project and Weed Segment would not cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of any known historical resource.

- 1) As discussed above, the Weed Substation was built in 1963 and it is therefore not considered an historic structure. The Weed Substation, therefore, does not qualify

as an historic resource; and, therefore, the project's potential to damage these structures would be a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

- 2) CA-SIS-1470H is a newly-identified historic archaeological site found during the cultural resources survey for this project. As discussed above, this site is determined not to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, this site does not qualify as an historic resource, and the project's potential to damage this historic archaeological site would be a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.
- 3) CA-SIS-345H has been identified as an historical resource under CEQA. While it appears the direct impacts associated with the installation of the electrical poles would avoid the densest concentration of this site, the access to the proposed pole locations and inadvertent affects to the site are possible. It appears poles 20/45, 21/45, 9/47, 10/47, and 11/47 are at the margins of the site boundaries.
- 4) PE#2 (an historic-era refuse deposit) was identified northeast of the Weed Substation and is considered an historical resource. The proposed expansion of the Weed Substation will not adversely impact this resource due to its distance from the proposed project.

**Impact CUL-PPWS-1: Adverse impacts to CA-SIS-345H, an historical resource, may occur with the implementation of the Proposed Project. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-1:** PacifiCorp will retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant who meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*, to monitor ground-disturbing or vegetation removal activity within 500-feet of poles 20/45, 21/45, 9/47, 10/47, and 11/47. Prior to construction, the consulting archaeologist shall also cordon the boundaries of CA-SIS-345H, as defined by SCWA (2007), as an *environmentally sensitive area*. Also prior to construction, the consulting archaeologist will work with contractor to avoid direct impacts to known components of CA-SIS-345H by adjusting the siting of the individual poles and access roads, where feasible. The consulting archaeologist shall perform minor shovel probes or auger tests to determine whether archaeological deposits exist within the proposed locations for pole excavation or road construction. The findings will be used to adjust the location of either the poles or road placement, where feasible.

If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit will cease. The archaeological monitor will be empowered to redirect crews and construction equipment until the deposit is evaluated. The monitor will immediately notify CPUC of the encountered archaeological deposit. The monitor will, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the CPUC and other agencies as required. If the archaeological monitor determines that the area being excavated does not contain archaeological materials, the monitor will modify the level of monitoring as needed.

If CPUC, in consultation with the archaeological monitor, determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the CPUC shall require PacifiCorp to:

- Redesign the project to avoid any adverse effects on the significant archaeological resource; or
- Implement an archaeological data recovery program (ADRP) (unless the archaeologist determines that the resource is of greater interpretive than research significance, and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible). If the circumstances warrant an archaeological data recovery program, an ADRP will be conducted. The project archaeologist and CPUC will meet and consult to determine the scope of the ADRP. The archaeologist will prepare a draft ADRP that will be submitted to CPUC for review and approval. The ADRP will identify how the proposed data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain (i.e., the ADRP will 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 will not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

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

---

**Impact CUL-PPWS-2: Inadvertent impacts to PE-#2 (historic refuse deposit) may result from the expansion of the Weed substation. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2:** Prior to construction, the consulting archaeologist (as designated by implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-1) shall also cordon the boundaries of PE#2, as defined by SCWA (2007), as an *environmentally sensitive area*. No additional testing or monitoring of the site is necessary during construction.

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

---

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

CA-SIS-1470H does not appear to qualify as a unique archaeological site, per Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, and no other potentially unique archaeological resources have been identified along the Proposed Project or Weed Segment corridor. However, this

does not preclude the existence of unidentified, buried archaeological remains. 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 CUL-PPWS-3: If construction of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment encounters 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. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-3:** 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, PacifiCorp shall notify the CPUC, and PacifiCorp and 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 a Cultural Resources Specialist 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, as necessary, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, 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, 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 project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is carried out.

If the CPUC, in consultation with the Specialist, 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 project to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource, if feasible; or
- Implement an archeological data recovery program (ADRP) (unless the 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 data recovery program 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 (Class II).***

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.

Except for the installation of 15 new poles in the 1.2-mile new ROW, ground disturbance for the replacement or installation of the transmission line poles would generally take place in previously disturbed soils. As such, the likelihood of encountering a significant paleontological discovery along the transmission line or at the Weed Substation is considered very unlikely; but significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and project excavation activities could have a deleterious effect on such resources.

**Impact CUL-PPWS-4: Construction activities under the Proposed Project and Weed Substation could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-4:** In the event of unanticipated paleontologic discoveries, PacifiCorp shall notify the CPUC and a qualified paleontologist (per Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP, 1995) who shall document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. 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 the qualified paleontologist. 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, then the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the 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 (Class II).***

There is no indication that any area along the transmission corridor or in the vicinity of the Weed Substation has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during project construction. However, damage could occur to previously unknown locations of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during grading and other construction related activities.

**Impact CUL-PPWS-5: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-5:** In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered during construction activities for the project, PacifiCorp shall immediately halt all work, contact the Siskiyou 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.

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

---

## 4.5.4 Cumulative Impacts

Section 4.5.3 includes several mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources during construction of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment (i.e., accidental damage or destruction of previously unknown archaeological sites) to a less than significant level. The study area contains a significant archaeological and historical record that, in many cases, has not been well documented or recorded. Thus, there is the potential for future development projects in the vicinity to disturb landscapes that may contain known or unknown cultural resources. However, future projects with potentially significant impacts to cultural resources would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations and ordinances protecting cultural resources through implementation of similar mitigation measures during construction. Therefore, the potential construction impacts of the Proposed Project and Weed Segment in combination

with other projects in the area would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact on cultural resources (Class II).

---

## 4.5.5 Alternatives

### PacifiCorp Option 4 Alternative

This alternative would include upgrading the existing 69 kV line from Pole 15/44 south to Pole 8/45 as described under the Proposed Project. At Pole 8/45 the 115 kV single circuit line would continue south with pole-for-pole replacement to Pole 19/45, where the alignment would veer east parallel to an existing 69 kV line generally along Highway 97 into the Weed Junction Substation. Existing poles in this route would be removed and replaced with new poles 15 feet further north (thus shifting the ROW easement 15 feet north).

Temporary disturbance for structure work areas would be the same under this alternative as for the Proposed Project on a per-pole basis, but the total disturbed work area for pole installation and removal would be approximately two acres greater than the Proposed Project.

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

Archival and field efforts within the boundaries of this alternative identified CA-SIS-345H, which has been identified as an historical resource under CEQA. No additional historical resources have been identified within the study area. While it appears the direct impacts associated with the installation of the transmission line poles would avoid the densest concentration of this site, the access to the proposed pole location and inadvertent affects to the site would be possible. It appears poles 20/45, 21/45, 9/47, 10/47, and 11/47 are at the margins of the site boundaries.

CA-SIS-1470H is a newly-identified historic archaeological site found during the cultural resources survey for this project. As discussed above, this site is determined not to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, this site does not qualify as an historic resource, and the project's potential to damage this historic archaeological site would be a less than significant impact.

**Impact CUL-OPT4-1: Adverse impacts to CA-SIS-345H, an historical resource, may occur with the implementation of the proposed alternative. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-OPT4-1: Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-1.**

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

---

**Impact CUL-OPT4-2: Inadvertent impacts to PE-#2 (historic refuse deposit) may result from the expansion of the Weed substation. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-OPT4-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2.

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

---

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

On the basis of the archival and pedestrian survey methods, no significant unique archaeological resources have been identified along this alternative, but this does not preclude the existence of unidentified, buried archaeological remains. 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 CUL-OPT4-3: If construction of the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative encounters 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. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-OPT4-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-3.

**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 (Class II).***

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.

Ground disturbance for the replacement or installation of the transmission line poles under the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative would generally take place in previously disturbed soils. As such, the likelihood of encountering a significant paleontological discovery is considered very unlikely; but significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and project excavation activities could have a deleterious effect on such resources.

**Impact CUL-OPT4-4: Construction activities under the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-OPT4-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-4.

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

---

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

There is no indication that any area along this alternative has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction. However, damage could occur to previously unknown locations of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during grading and other construction related activities.

**Impact CUL-OPT4-5: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-OPT4-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-5.

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

---

## **Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A Alternative**

This alternative achieves construction of the transmission line upgrade entirely within PacifiCorp's existing ROW. Similar to the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative analyzed above, this alternative would upgrade the existing 69 kV line from Pole 15/44 south to Pole 8/45 as described

under the Proposed Project. At Pole 8/45 the 115 kV single circuit line would continue south with pole-for-pole replacement to Pole 19/45, where the alignment would veer east within an existing 69 kV line ROW generally along Highway 97 until reaching the Weed Junction Substation. Under this alternative, a temporary substation would be constructed at the Weed Substation resulting in an additional approximately 5,000 square feet of temporary disturbance.

Temporary disturbance for structure work areas would be the same under this alternative as for the Proposed Project on a per-pole basis, but the total disturbed work area for pole installation and removal would be approximately two acres greater than the Proposed Project.

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

Archival and field efforts within the boundaries of this alternative identified CA-SIS-345H, which has been identified as an historical resource under CEQA. No additional historical resources have been identified within the study area. While it appears the direct impacts associated with the installation of the transmission line poles would avoid the densest concentration of this site, the access to the proposed pole location and inadvertent affects to the site would be possible. It appears poles 20/45, 21/45, 9/47, 10/47, and 11/47 are at the margins of the site boundaries.

CA-SIS-1470H is a newly-identified historic archaeological site found during the cultural resources survey for this project. As discussed above, this site is determined not to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, this site does not qualify as an historic resource, and the project's potential to damage this historic archaeological site would be a less than significant impact.

**Impact CUL-VAR/A-1: Adverse impacts to CA-SIS-345H, an historical resource, may occur with the implementation of the proposed alternative. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/A-1:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-1.

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

---

**Impact CUL-VAR/A-2: Inadvertent impacts to PE-#2 (historic refuse deposit) may result from the expansion of the Weed substation. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/A-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less then Significant.

---

b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

On the basis of the archival and pedestrian survey methods, no significant unique archaeological resources have been identified along this alternative, but this does not preclude the existence of unidentified, buried archaeological remains. 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 CUL-VAR/A-3: If construction of the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A alternative encounters 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. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/A-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-3.

**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* (Class II).**

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.

Ground disturbance for the replacement or installation of the transmission line poles under the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A alternative would generally take place in previously disturbed soils, although it would require approximately 12 more new poles compared to total under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment. The likelihood of encountering a significant paleontological discovery is considered very unlikely; but significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and project excavation activities could have a deleterious effect on such resources.

**Impact CUL-VAR/A-4: Construction activities under the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation A alternative could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/A-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-4.

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

---

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

There is no indication that any area along this alternative has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction. However, damage could occur to previously unknown locations of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during grading and other construction related activities.

**Impact CUL-VAR/A-5: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/A-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-5.

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

---

## **Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B Alternative**

Similar to the PacifiCorp Option 4 alternative, this alternative would upgrade the existing 69 kV line from Pole 15/44 south to Pole 8/45 as described under the Proposed Project. At Pole 8/45 the 115 kV single circuit line would continue south with pole-for-pole replacement to Pole 19/45, where the alignment would veer east within an existing 69 kV line ROW following generally along Highway 97 until reaching the Weed Junction Substation. Under this alternative, a temporary pole line would be installed within the existing ROW then removed once the new 115 kV transmission line was constructed.

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

Archival and field efforts within the boundaries of this alternative identified CA-SIS-345H, which has been identified as an historical resource under CEQA. No additional historical resources have been identified within the study area. While it appears the direct

impacts associated with the installation of the transmission line poles would avoid the densest concentration of this site, the access to the proposed pole location and inadvertent affects to the site would be possible. It appears poles 20/45, 21/45, 9/47, 10/47, and 11/47 are at the margins of the site boundaries.

CA-SIS-1470H is a newly-identified historic archaeological site found during the cultural resources survey for this project. As discussed above, this site is determined not to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, this site does not qualify as an historic resource, and the project's potential to damage this historic archaeological site would be a less than significant impact.

**Impact CUL-VAR/B-1: Adverse impacts to CA-SIS-345H, an historical resource, may occur with the implementation of the proposed alternative. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/B-1:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-1.

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

---

**Impact CUL-VAR/B-2: Inadvertent impacts to PE-#2 (historic refuse deposit) may result from the expansion of the Weed substation. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/B-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less then Significant.

---

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

On the basis of the archival and pedestrian survey methods, no significant unique archaeological resources have been identified along this alternative, but this does not preclude the existence of unidentified, buried archaeological remains. 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 CUL-VAR/B-3: If construction of the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B alternative encounters 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. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/B-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-3.

**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 (Class II).***

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.

Ground disturbance for the replacement or installation of the transmission line poles under the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B alternative would generally take place in previously disturbed soils. Installation and removal of the temporary pole line would require approximately 12 more new poles and 33 temporary poles compared to the total under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment. The likelihood of encountering a significant paleontological discovery is considered very unlikely; but significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and project excavation activities could have a deleterious effect on such resources.

**Impact CUL-VAR/B-4: Construction activities under the Mackintosh/ALJ Variation B alternative could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/B-4:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-4.

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

---

- f) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

There is no indication that any area along this alternative has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during construction. However, damage could occur to previously unknown locations of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during grading and other construction related activities.

**Impact CUL-VAR/B-5: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II).***

**Mitigation Measure CUL-VAR/B-5:** Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-5.

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

---

## No Project

For the purposes of this analysis, the No Project Alternative includes the following two assumptions: 1) the project would not be implemented and the existing conditions in the study area would not be changed; and 2) a new transmission line and/or additional power generation would be constructed in or near the study area to supply power to the Weed area. Given the highly speculative nature of the No Project Alternative assumptions, this analysis is qualitative.

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.**

The construction of a new transmission line and/or a power plant under the No Project scenario would likely result in potential impacts similar to what would occur under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment; however, because historical resources are highly discrete and localized, impacts to historical resources may be avoided by construction-related impacts. The siting and placement of the transmission line and the power plant would determine whether impacts to known or unknown historical resources would result from project operations. At a minimum, an accidental find mitigation would be standard for most any project where ground disturbance would occur (see Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2). Further mitigation may be necessary if buildings or historical settings are potentially affected by a project.

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.**

The potential for impacts to unique archaeological resources under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment. As discussed under a) above, the localized nature of archaeological resources, the type of archaeological site, and a project's proximity to known sites would determine whether the project's actions would adversely affect a given resource. Consequently, due to the speculative nature of the No Project scenario, it cannot be determined if unique archaeological resources would be significantly impacted by project actions. At a minimum, an accidental find mitigation would be standard for most any project where ground disturbance would occur (see Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-2).

---

**c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.**

The potential for impacts to paleontological resources under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment. Paleontological resources are also highly localized and may occur in many areas where fossils have been previously identified. Consequently, due to the speculative nature of the No Project scenario, it cannot be determined if paleontological resources would be significantly impacted by project actions. At a minimum, an accidental find mitigation would be standard for most any project where ground disturbance would occur (see Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-3).

---

**a) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.**

The potential for impacts to human remains under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified under the Proposed Project and Weed Segment. In most cases, the existence of human remains or burials are unknown unless a previously identified archaeological site that yielded burials exists within a project area or vicinity. Given the unknown location of construction activity that would occur under the No Project alternative, potential impacts to human remains cannot be assessed. At a minimum, however, a procedural mitigation for accidental discoveries of human remains would be standard for most any project where ground disturbance would occur (see Mitigation Measure CUL-PPWS-4).

---

## References – Cultural Resources

- Arrington, Cindy J. 2006. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Weed Transmission Utility Upgrade Project, Siskiyou County, California. SWCA Environmental Consultants, Sacramento. Submitted to PacifiCorp, Portland.
- Bass, Henry O. 1974. Archaeological Reconnaissance of Selected Portions of State Route 97 Weed to Dorris, Siskiyou County, California. Society of California Archaeology District II Clearinghouse, Chico. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #534.
- Clewett, S. E., 1968. Original unpublished field notes from the Chaney Site, Siskiyou County. Ms. on file, Shasta College Archaeological Research Facility, Redding.
- Coyote & Fox Enterprises, 2004. Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Proposed North Airport Business Park at Airport Road and State Highway 44, Redding, Shasta County, California, submitted to Shasta County Department of Resource Management/Planning Division, 2004.
- Coyote & Fox Enterprises, 2005. Archaeological Reconnaissance for Spring Grove Subdivision (APN 093-130-013, Tentative Tract 1930 & Zone Amendment 05-041), On Highway 44 East of Millville, Shasta County, California, submitted to Shasta County Department of Resource Management/Planning Division, 2005.
- Dixon, Roland B., 1907 The Shasta. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 17(5):381-489, New York.
- Hamusek, B., E. F. Ritter, and J. Burcell, 1997. Archaeological Explorations in Shasta Valley, California. Cultural Resources Publications, Archaeology, Bureau of Land Management, Redding Resource Area, Redding.
- Heizer, Robert F., 1972. The Eighteen Unratified Treaties of 1851-1852 Between the California Indians and the United States Government. University of California Archaeological Research Facility, Berkeley.
- Holt, C., 1946. Shasta Ethnography. University of California Anthropological Records 3(4):299-349, Berkeley.
- Hopkins, Joseph W., 1979. A Cultural Resources Survey of the Garrick Creek Bridge on the Edgewood/Big Springs Road, Siskiyou County, California. Submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, Yreka. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #497.
- Jensen, Peter M., 1994. Archaeological Inventory Survey International Paper Realty Corporation's Proposed Subdivision, c. 456 Acres at Weed, Siskiyou County, California. Jensen & Associates, Chico. Submitted to Siskiyou County Planning Department, Yreka. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #2998.
- Johnson, Keith, 1975. Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Weed-Shastina Water Quality Control Project, Siskiyou County, California. District 2 Clearinghouse, Society for California Archaeology. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #509.

- Johnston, J., and E. Nilsson, 1983. Archaeological Test Excavations at the Meek Site (CA-SIS-900), Siskiyou County, California. Mountain Anthropological Research, Chico. Submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, Yreka.
- Kroeber, A. L., 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. Dover Publications, New York.
- Linville, Alford, 2000. Abner Weed. The Siskiyou Pioneer 2000, pp 102. Siskiyou County Historical Society, Yreka.
- Luecke, Mary, 1982. Siskiyou County Place Names. The Siskiyou Pioneer. Siskiyou County Historical Society, Yreka.
- Major, J., 1988. California Climate in Relation to Vegetation. In Terrestrial Vegetation of California, edited by M. Barbour and J. Major, pp. 11–74. Special Publication No. 9. California Native Plant Society, Sacramento.
- Manning, James P., 1982. Archaeological Survey of the International Paper Company Property West of the City of Weed, Siskiyou County, California. Submitted to International Paper Company, Weed. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #SI-L-90.
- Marschner, Janice, 2001. California 1850: A Snapshot in Time. Academic Press, New York.
- Mount Shasta Region Travel Center [MSRTC], 2006. Siskiyou County in Northern California. Electronic document accessed March 24, 2006. Online at [http://www.shastahome.org/siskiyou\\_county.htm](http://www.shastahome.org/siskiyou_county.htm).
- Nilsson, Elena, 1985. Archaeological Test Excavations at CA-SIS-1088, Siskiyou County, California. Mountain Anthropological Research, Chico. Submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, Yreka.
- Mountain Anthropological Research, 1987. *Draft Archaeological Test Excavations at CA-SIS-154, CA-SIS-1103, and CA-SIS-1105, Siskiyou County, California*, submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, 1987.
- Mountain Anthropological Research, 1988. *Archaeological Test Excavations at the Ager Sites CA-SIS-331, CA-SIS-332, CA-SIS-1281, and CA-SIS-1282, Siskiyou County, California*, submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, 1988.
- Society for California Archaeology, 1991. *Coming of Age: Archaeological Research within Shasta Valley, Siskiyou County, California*, paper presented at the 25th Annual meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, Sacramento, 1991.
- Nilsson, Elena, K. M. Banks, and G. Greenway, 1989. Archaeological Data Recovery Excavations at CA-SIS-900: A Late Prehistoric Site in Shasta Valley, California. Mountain Anthropological Research, Chico. Submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, Yreka.
- Peak & Associates, Inc., 1988. Cultural Resources Assessment of AT&T's Medford, Oregon to Redding, California Fiber Optic Cable. Peak & Associates, Sacramento. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #1421.
- Ritter, Eric W., 1989. Sheep Rock Shelter (CA-SIS-266): Archaeological Test Excavations in Shasta Valley. Bureau of Land Management, Redding Field Office.

- Rock, James T., 1985. *The State of Jefferson: A Dream that Died, Or Did It?* Siskiyou County Historical Society, Yreka.
- SWCA, Letter Report, *Verification of Verification of Condition of Archaeological Site CA-SIS-345/H for the Weed Transmission Utility Upgrade Project, Siskiyou County, California*, Prepared by Sikes, N.E. and Liu, D., May 31, 2007.
- Silva, Richard, and Keith Arnold, 1999. *The Yreka Trail and Other Routes to Siskiyou County. The Siskiyou Pioneer.* Siskiyou County Historical Society, Yreka.
- Silver, Shirley, 1978. Shastan Peoples. In *California*, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp 180-189. *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8*, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Vaughan, Trudy, 1999. *Archaeological Survey Report for the County Road A12 Improvement Project, Siskiyou County, California.* Coyote & Fox Enterprises, Redding. Submitted to Siskiyou County Department of Public Works, Yreka. Ms. on file, NE/CHRIS Report #3571.
- Wallace, W. J., and E. S. Taylor, 1952. *Excavation of SIS-13, A Rock Shelter in Siskiyou County, California.* University of California Archaeological Survey Reports 15, Berkeley.4.