
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
5.2.8 Cultural Resources	1
5.2.8.1 Affected Environment	1
5.2.8.2 Impacts of Proposed Action	10
5.2.8.3 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	17

List of Tables

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Table 5.2.8-2. Impacts to Cultural Resources.

5.2.8 Cultural Resources

This section pertains to the cultural resources and the affected environment. The conducted investigations are described as well as the impacts of the Proposed Action. Southern California Edison Company (SCE) has conducted investigations to identify cultural resources and evaluate their historical significance according to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility criteria. Additionally, SCE has consulted with Indian Tribes, Native American organizations and individuals, and other stakeholders to identify cultural resources that are considered by them to be culturally important, even though the resources may not meet NRHP eligibility standards. Cultural resources include any prehistoric or historic object, site, district, structure or building created or modified by human activity. Cultural resources that qualify for listing in the NRHP are designated as historic properties. Preservation of historic properties must be taken into consideration by Federal agencies prior to taking a federal action, such as issuing licenses for the four Big Creek Alternative Licensing Process (ALP) Projects covered by this Amended Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (APDEA).

Information for this section is primarily derived from reports sponsored by SCE (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27); SCE 2006). Identification of affected resources, their cultural and historical significance, and management measures for their preservation are summarized and described in SCE's Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)). Other information sources are as cited in the following text.

5.2.8.1 Affected Environment

Human use of the southern Sierra Nevada Mountains is documented in the archaeological record for at least the past 7,000 years. Archaeological sites demonstrate Native American use of regional uplands for settlement, food and other resource procurement, trade, and travel. Historical records indicate traditional use of the four Big Creek ALP Project areas by Mono and Paiute people, although other Native American groups (e.g., Miwok and Yokuts) may have used the area as well, especially on trading ventures.

Earliest encounters between Native Americans and Europeans probably date to the late 1700's when incidental Spanish exploration of the region began. By the 1820's, contact between Mono, Yokuts and other indigenous groups and Spanish expeditions intensified and Native American groups came under military attack. Around this time, European diseases were introduced and devastated susceptible Native American populations. In the 1830's American trappers began exploring the region, but it was the Gold Rush of the late 1840's and early 1850's that brought the greatest influx of Americans and other nationalities. While the southern Sierra was not the focus of Gold Rush activities, disappointed would-be miners and others recognized the abundant timber and grazing potential of the region. They began timbering, livestock grazing, and homesteading, with some limited mining. These activities further disrupted traditional Native American lifeways as Euro-Americans displaced Mono and other native groups

from their traditional lands. Some displaced Native American groups were confined to reservations and rancherias, denied access to subsistence and other resources, and they were assimilated into Euro American cash-based economies. In the 20th century, the local economy was oriented to timbering and lumbering, grazing, hydropower development and production, and recreation.

Consultation and Determination of Area of Potential Effect

In a letter dated December 7, 2000, SCE requested that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC) authorize SCE to represent the Commission in consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The Commission granted permission per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(4) in a letter dated January 25, 2001. A meeting was held on February 20, 2001, with SHPO, SCE, and the Sierra National Forest (SNF) staff at which the Section 106 consultation process and an Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the four Big Creek ALP Projects were discussed. This APDEA summarizes consultation regarding cultural resources identification, evaluation of historical significance, management, and definition of the APE, with the SHPO, U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service (USDA-FS), National Park Service (NPS), as well as the following groups and agencies: federally recognized Indian Tribes (Bishop Paiute Tribe, North Fork Rancheria, Picayune Rancheria, Big Sandy Rancheria, Cold Springs Rancheria, and Table Mountain Rancheria); other interested parties (Big Sandy Elders Committee, North Fork Mono Tribe, Dunlap Band of Mono Indians, Huntington Lake Association, Huntington Lake Big Creek Historical Conservancy, Central Sierra Historical Society, County of Fresno, Sierra Nevada Native American Coalition, Shaver Crossing Railroad Station, Sierra Mono Museum, Native Earth Foundation, Mono Nation, Sierra Nevada Access Multiple Use Stewardship Coalition (SAMS), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)); and individuals (as named in the Big Creek Collaborative Plenary and Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting minutes. This consultation occurred in the context of the four Big Creek ALP Projects relicensing effort. Commission staff participated in numerous meetings of the CRWG for the four Big Creek ALP Projects proceedings to address technical and process oriented questions.

For licensing purposes, the Commission has determined the APE to be the area within the license boundaries of the four Big Creek ALP Projects. Additionally, any part of a Historic Property that is outside the FERC project boundary and that may be adversely affected by any SCE activity required under a project license will be considered to be within the APE. SCE prepared a HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)) and a supporting Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006) describing how SCE proposes to take into account and resolve Project-related adverse effects on historic properties consistent with National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106. The HPMP also defines measures SCE will implement to manage cultural resources that are not NRHP-eligible.

Cultural Resources Investigations

Cultural resources investigations sponsored by SCE are described in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)) and in the supporting Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006). In consultation with the CRWG, SCE identified specific topics and issues to be addressed by cultural resource studies, which included:

- Identifying and evaluating the historical significance of archaeological and historic era resources;
- Identifying cultural resources of concern to Native Americans;
- Defining means for public education and involvement in historic preservation;
- Identifying facilities for the curation of artifacts, historic records and archival materials associated with the Big Creek ALP Projects; and
- Preparing an HPMP describing how SCE shall manage historic properties, consistent with Section 106 of the NHPA, and other cultural resources, to preserve their significant historic and cultural characteristics.

Archaeological and Historical Resources Investigations

SCE examined records on file with the SNF, the California Historical Resources Inventory System, and SCE's archives regarding the archaeology and history of the four Big Creek Project-related areas. This review indicated the presence of previously reported prehistoric and historic era properties and other cultural resources in the APE of the four Big Creek ALP Projects. SCE sponsored a comprehensive archaeological survey of the area within the FERC boundaries of the four Big Creek ALP Projects. The survey located prehistoric and historic era archaeological sites, objects, buildings, structures, districts and other cultural resources as described in the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006) and as summarized in Table 5.2.8-1. SCE sponsored shovel probe investigations at appropriate archaeological sites (mostly prehistoric sites in reservoir pool areas) to determine if those sites could be eligible for listing in the NRHP or to determine if portions of sites in the APE could yield information that would contribute to a site's NRHP eligibility. The NRHP evaluations of some archaeological sites were not completed because SNF would not issue permits for shovel probe investigations at those sites, or because some of the sites were inaccessible deep within Project reservoirs. Native American monitors participated in archaeological studies of Native American resources.

Investigations

The results of investigations to inventory and evaluate cultural resources associated with the four Big Creek ALP Projects are detailed in the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006).

The Prehistoric era cultural resources in the APE primarily include archaeological sites representing Native American food procurement and processing, and habitation locations. Most prehistoric era sites lack evidence of use in historic times by Native Americans, and contemporary Native Americans report no association with most of the sites that would qualify as traditional cultural places/properties. Some archaeological sites at Mammoth Pool are, based on Native American history, associated with a Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area (a proposed Traditional Cultural Property identified by members of the North Fork Mono community). Also associated with the Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area are historic era artifacts from CA-FRE-341 (Table 5.2.8-1), which may indicate its use after Native American/Euro-American contact.

Historic era cultural resources include sites and a Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area where Native Americans lived in historic times or with which they have maintained a cultural identification; Native American trail routes; sites representing remains of 19th and 20th Century logging and milling activities; sites, structures and buildings associated with the development and operation of the Big Creek Hydroelectric System, some of which comprise a Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District (BCHSHD) (i.e., those buildings and structures retaining historical integrity and dating from A.D. 1911 to 1929); and a Huntington Lake Historic Recreation District (HLHRD) comprising recreation-related developments made between A.D. 1913 and 1960, which surround Huntington Lake. Some archaeological sites associated with the Mammoth Pool Project (FERC Project No. 2085) are recognized as contributing elements of a Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area (a proposed Traditional Cultural Property). The boundaries of the Cultural Use Area extend well beyond the FERC Project No. 2085 boundaries and only those archaeological sites, reported trail routes, and a river crossing within the APE will be managed by SCE with regard to Project-related effects.

Elements contributing to the BCHSHD are mostly within the boundaries of Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 (FERC Project No. 2175), Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8 and Eastwood (FERC Project No. 67), and Big Creek No. 3 (FERC Project No. 120), but a final determination of all properties that comprise the district will result from future consultation with the California SHPO regarding a formal nomination of the District to the NRHP. Prospective boundaries of a HLHRD extend well beyond the Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 Project boundary and Huntington Lake itself is the only contributing element recognized within the Project boundary. A historical context for evaluating the significance of a HLHRD has been presented elsewhere (Morgan and Jackson 2004).

Historic era buildings and structures in the Big Creek ALP Projects areas and APE are mostly associated with the development and operation of the Big Creek Hydroelectric System. Remains of demolished buildings and structures are considered historic era archaeological sites. Extant buildings and structures include, for example, dams/reservoirs, railways, powerhouses, workshops, domestic houses, penstocks, switchyards, tunnels and adits, and roads (e.g., Kaiser Pass Road, Lower Canyon Road/Million Dollar Mile, and other roads within the original hydroelectric system developments). Many buildings and structures have been maintained by SCE without compromising their historic characteristics, and those that date between A.D. 1911 and A.D. 1929 are recognized as contributing elements of the NRHP-eligible BCHSHD

(Shoup 1988). Records that define the inventory of buildings and structures which are either contributing or non-contributing elements of the BCHSHD are inconsistent and incomplete. As described in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)), SCE will sponsor preparation of a formal nomination of the BCHSHD to the NRHP. In that process, SCE will compile a complete inventory of contributing and non-contributing elements of the Historic District, consult with SHPO for a formal determination of contributing and non-contributing elements, and then forward the nomination to the Keeper of the NRHP requesting that the property be listed.

The only structures associated with the HLHRD within the Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 boundary are Huntington Lake itself, and the dams and control structures that impound and regulate the lake. These resources are contributing elements of the BCHSHD and might be considered contributing elements of the HLHRD as well. SCE reports that the SNF is considering the merits of integrating the Historic District into its planning framework and may prepare a determination of NRHP eligibility (Morgan and Jackson 2004).

Two structures are associated with the HLHRD within the Big Creek 2A, 8 and Eastwood Project and the BCHSHD. Kaiser Pass Cabin (P-10-005539) is an isolated SCE-owned building at Kaiser Meadow. It has been moved to its present location and is therefore not eligible for the NRHP. Kaiser Pass Road was constructed in 1920 to facilitate expansion of the Big Creek system at Florence Lake. It is evaluated as NRHP-eligible and contributing to the BCHSHD.

Ethnographic and Native American History Investigations

Historical records document that lands in the vicinity of the four Big Creek ALP Projects were occupied or used by Mono, Yokuts, and Paiute people, as described in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)) and the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006). Most of the land about the upper reaches of the San Joaquin River was the territory of Mono groups, and was used and visited by Owens Valley Paiute, with lower elevations along the river occupied by Foothill Yokuts. Trail networks throughout the region facilitated travel and trade among various groups. The Mono Trail and associated trails are important to contemporary Mono, Paiute, and others who commemorate prehistoric and historic trans-Sierra travel along trails over Mono Pass or Paiute Pass in an annual "walk."

To identify affected Native American tribes and groups and to identify places and resources important to local Native Americans, SCE used reports of previous ethnographic studies made in the region of the four Big Creek ALP Projects as described in the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006). In consultation with the CRWG, SCE notified Native American tribes and individuals about the four Big Creek ALP Projects to solicit any interests or concerns that might be volunteered. SCE retained a professional ethnographer, and hired a Native American liaison, as well as Native American monitors for archaeological fieldwork. Native Americans who wished to learn more about the four Big Creek ALP Projects, and who then wished to provide cultural information to be considered by SCE could do so through whatever venue they

felt appropriate, including participating in the CRWG, providing information to the Native American liaison, giving information to SCE's ethnographer, and/or by addressing SCE or the Commission directly. Native American monitors of archaeological investigations were requested to record observations about those investigations and relay their records to their sponsoring organizations, as well as other tribes involved in the CRWG.

To facilitate consultation with Native American tribes and individuals, and to explain the ALP, SCE representatives attended and made presentations at tribal meetings; sponsored field trips to various Project areas; provided training for Native Americans monitoring archaeological investigations; sponsored a workshop regarding Traditional Cultural Properties presented by speakers from the California SHPO and the USDA-FS Regional Office; and conducted regular meetings of the CRWG and Plenary for the Big Creek Collaborative. Native American tribes and individuals also participated in Settlement Agreement negotiations for the ALP.

SCE has considered the following expressed Native American concerns:

- Access to and protection of harvestable stands of culturally significant plants;
- Protection of Native American related archaeological sites;
- Acknowledgement of Native American cultural traditions—past and present—in the area of the four Big Creek ALP Projects;
- Management of appropriate cultural resources in cooperation with Native Americans;
- Curation of artifacts at repositories that are local, in compliance with professional curation standards, and acceptable to Native Americans;
- Restoration of Native American ownership of Project area lands;
- Water rights and rights to other resources; and
- Compensation for historical mistreatment of Native American people and for loss of lands and resources.

As noted above, Native American trail networks that passed through what is now the four Big Creek ALP Projects areas are of cultural significance. However, these are typically inundated within reservoir basins and there is no apparent physical evidence of most trails within the four Big Creek ALP Projects boundaries.

No currently used traditional plant collecting areas within the four Big Creek ALP Projects APE were identified to SCE researchers. There may be several reasons for this lack of contemporary use: (1) Native Americans have not had access to areas beyond gated road segments for many years and are unfamiliar with these areas; (2) there has been concern among Native Americans that they would be cited by USDA-FS law enforcement for collecting plants on Forest lands without a permit; or

(3) Native Americans have adequate access to plant resources in other areas and do not need to collect plants in the relatively remote Big Creek ALP Project areas. Some harvestable stands of traditionally used plants were noted by Native Americans within or near the APE and interest was expressed in continued opportunities to evaluate suitability of stands within the APE for harvest. A concern expressed by Native Americans is that application of herbicides by SCE or others to even small stands of plants useful to Native Americans could result in health issues if such plants were collected, consumed or handled after being contaminated.

Native Americans consider all archaeological sites associated with their past to be culturally important. For Native Americans, the presence of pounding rocks (bedrock mortars), obsidian chips, artifacts, and other remains reinforces for them a long cultural heritage in the Sierra Nevada that they feel is often unrecognized by non-Native Americans. Sites retain their importance to Native Americans regardless of their condition. A number of archaeological sites at the Mammoth Pool Project were found to be contributing elements of a proposed Traditional Cultural Property as discussed above, because they figure importantly in the traditional history of Mono people with close cultural affiliation with that area.

Native Americans express a sense of frustration that they are not perceived and acknowledged by others in modern American society as distinctive historical and contemporary cultures. They point out, for example, that there are not adequate public interpretation facilities or signage that addresses Mono, Paiute, or Yokut culture, history and traditions in the region. Nor is there acknowledgement that construction of the Big Creek Hydroelectric Project facilities likely resulted in the destruction and inundation of many places of cultural significance to local Native Americans.

Native Americans consider that there are recreation facilities and other places in the vicinity of the four Big Creek ALP Projects that could be managed by the USDA-FS or SCE co-operatively with Native Americans. Native Americans believe they can offer a holistic and culturally unique perspective on the management of natural and cultural resources. They also believe that co-management of a recreation area would allow Native Americans a place to gather and perpetuate traditional values.

As reported to SCE, artifacts collected from sites occupied by Native Americans should be curated at a local facility acceptable to Native Americans. Currently, the Sierra Mono Museum in North Fork, California is considered such a place. The museum houses collections generated by projects sponsored by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Company, California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), SNF, and SCE, among others, as well as artifacts donated by Native Americans. The museum seeks to be recognized as compliant with regulations at 36 CFR 79, so as to be able to receive collections from local sites through federal agencies. Neither SCE nor the Commission can determine where collections from the four Big Creek ALP Projects are curated, because this determination is reserved to the USDA-FS.

Historical Significance of Cultural Resources

The federal standard for determining the historical significance of a property (i.e., a site, building, structure, object, or district) eligible for listing in the NRHP is defined at 36 CFR 60. Properties determined in consultation with the SHPO to retain historical integrity and to meet any of the NRHP eligibility criteria are considered “historic properties” and are to be preserved in accordance with the NHPA and regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA. In addition to this consideration, SCE consulted with Tribal and other ALP stakeholders to identify properties that, while not meeting the eligibility criteria for NRHP listing, were still considered culturally important to stakeholders. SCE has made provisions for managing these properties in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)).

SCE found that a number of properties in the four Big Creek ALP Projects areas had been previously determined either “eligible” or “not eligible” for listing in the NRHP with concurrence of the California SHPO. Under the “NRHP Status” column on Table 5.2.8-1, eligible properties are designated “HP” (Historic Property), and ineligible properties are designated “NE” (Not Eligible) or “NCR” (Non-Contributing Resource to the BCHSHD).

Many previously unevaluated prehistoric and historic cultural resources were evaluated by SCE for their significance according to the criteria established at 36 CFR 60.4 for listing properties in the NRHP. The evaluation of properties is discussed in the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006) and measures to be taken by SCE to manage them are defined in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)).

Properties evaluated as NRHP-eligible are identified in Table 5.2.8-1 under the “NRHP Status” column as “RE” (Recommended Eligible) or “RCR” (Recommended Contributing Resource), and those recommended not eligible are designated “RNE” (Recommended Not Eligible). SCE and the Commission will consult with the SHPO to determine the NRHP eligibility of evaluated properties.

Most archaeological sites determined to be NRHP-eligible are eligible because of their potential to yield information important in prehistory (i.e., scientific values per NRHP eligibility criterion d, 36 CFR 60.4). Some archaeological sites associated with the Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area (FERC Project No. 2085) are evaluated as NRHP-eligible because of their association with Native American contributions to broad patterns in American history (NRHP eligibility criterion a, 36 CFR 60.4). Buildings and structures associated with the BCHSHD are determined to be eligible because of their associations with patterns of American history (NRHP eligibility criterion a, 36 CFR 60.4), their association with important historical figures (NRHP eligibility criterion b, 36 CFR 60.4), and their important contributions in engineering (NRHP eligibility criterion c, 36 CFR 60.4). The historical context for the HLHRD suggests its significance is associated with broad patterns in American history (NRHP eligibility criterion a, 36 CFR 60.4) relative to the development of recreational opportunities for Americans visiting the National Forests, and for its association with an important architect (NRHP eligibility criterion b, 36 CFR 60.4). Native American trail routes throughout the four Big Creek

ALP Projects areas are recommended by SCE as NRHP-eligible, but are the subject of an evaluation strategy proposed by the SNF.

Most properties evaluated as not NRHP-eligible lack integrity or lack the potential to yield scientific information important in history or prehistory (NRHP eligibility criterion d, 36 CFR 60.4). As indicated in SCE's HPMP, the SHPO will be asked to concur in evaluations of eligibility made in SCE's Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006).

The NRHP eligibility of some cultural resources has not been evaluated. Unevaluated resources are identified in Table 5.2.8-1 by the designation "U" under the "NRHP Status" column. SCE has committed to evaluating these resources as described in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)). SCE will not have management responsibilities for any cultural resource or portion of a cultural resource outside the APE.

Cultural Resources Affected Environment

Prehistoric and historic era archaeological sites in the four Big Creek ALP Projects areas have been affected by previous development of recreation facilities (e.g., Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8 and Eastwood Project campgrounds, day-use areas, boat launch and Forest Service recreation facilities at Huntington Lake and Jackass Meadow areas); recreation visitor use (e.g., incidental or deliberate removal of artifacts from sites); construction, repair and maintenance of roads; inundation and erosion associated with reservoir operations; installation of an electrical transmission tower and distribution line poles; use of one site area as an SCE work facility; or indirect Project-related effects (e.g., deliberate vandalism). Sites are also variously affected by natural erosion, off-road vehicle use, incidental vandalism, grazing, and development of recreation facilities by the SNF. In general, the effects of these activities and phenomena have been damaging to the resources. The current condition of archaeological resources in each of the four Big Creek ALP Projects is described in the text and appendices of the Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006).

"Deliberate vandalism" refers to illegal activities of persons who deliberately go to an archaeological site for the purpose of removing artifacts from the site, often by excavating large areas of the site. "Incidental vandalism" refers to activities of recreation visitors and others who remove artifacts from sites as they are encountered. For example, a person sees an arrowhead or obsidian chips on a site or in the drawdown area of a reservoir and takes the artifact(s) away in violation of the law. It is difficult to know how many sites are affected by incidental vandalism because the existing site records are not detailed enough to provide a measure for what has been lost since a site was first recorded. For this analysis, "incidental vandalism" is considered a recreation-related impact that is ongoing. Deliberate vandalism of at least one site is also believed to be ongoing.

Historically significant buildings and structures associated with the BCHSHD (including Huntington Lake/dams associated with the HLHRD) have typically retained their historic

integrity but have been slightly altered during ongoing use and improvement of the operating system.

Some archaeological sites and trail routes of cultural significance to Native Americans have been inundated or otherwise affected by the four Big Creek ALP Projects reservoirs and other facilities. Operation of Mammoth Pool Reservoir affects the Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area (traditional cultural property), inundating archaeological sites, Native American trail routes, and a traditional river crossing area.

5.2.8.2 Impacts of Proposed Action

For this analysis, impacts to cultural resources are considered in two contexts. First, cultural resources determined to be NRHP-eligible (i.e., Historic Properties) are considered with reference to the NHPA. Second, impacts to cultural resources evaluated as NRHP-ineligible are not considered according to the NHPA.

SCE studies have identified Historic Properties already determined to be eligible for NRHP listing, and cultural resources that SCE has evaluated as NRHP-eligible (HPMP, SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27); SCE 2006). Consultation with SHPO will be conducted by FERC and SCE to seek SHPO concurrence in SCE's NRHP eligibility recommendations. SCE proposes to manage impacts to all properties determined to be NRHP-eligible consistent with the HPMP. NRHP-eligible properties will be managed to resolve the four Big Creek ALP Project-related adverse effects/impacts consistent with a Programmatic Agreement (PA) implementing the HPMP and consistent with the Federal regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800.14). The PA will be drafted by the Commission, and the Commission will consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the SHPO, other federal agencies, Indian Tribes, and other interested parties to resolve the effects/impacts of the four Big Creek ALP Projects on Historic Properties.

Adverse effects/impacts to Historic Properties are defined in the Federal regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA as "when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the location, design, setting, or association of the historic property" (36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)). In the case of archaeological sites, for example, an adverse effect results when artifacts or features are damaged, destroyed, or removed from their original contexts so that they lose scientific value for understanding past cultures when such sites are determined NRHP-eligible under eligibility Criterion d. Sites evaluated as eligible under other criteria, for example, Criterion a (in the case of Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area sites), sustain adverse effects when they are no longer accessible to Native Americans who value them as contributing to the maintenance of their cultural identity, or when the sites or resources cannot be used in traditional ways.

Cultural resources determined, in consultation with SHPO, to be ineligible for NRHP listing will not be considered further in the context of the NHPA. Archaeological sites with artifacts and features manifesting Native American cultures in the region retain

important cultural values for Native Americans regardless of the condition of their artifacts or features or NRHP status. While a resolution of adverse effects/impacts may be achieved consistent with Federal regulations, some Native Americans feel that there can be no adequate mitigation for the loss of cultural resources associated with their heritage.

Potential Resource Issues

Impacts of ongoing SCE operation and maintenance activities on properties listed in the NRHP, or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as impacts to properties considered by ALP stakeholders to be culturally important are potential resource issues. Table 5.2.8-2 summarizes ongoing impacts sustained by historic properties and other cultural resources. Historic properties listed in the table are those properties that have been determined NRHP-eligible and those that have been evaluated as NRHP-eligible. Note that a resource sustaining more than one type of impact will be identified in more than one impact type category. Resources that sustain no discernable Project-related impacts are listed in Table 5.2.8-2 under the impact type "None."

Potential resource issues depend on the NRHP eligibility of each cultural resource and the type of impact that each resource is sustaining or may continue to sustain as a result of SCE Project operations and maintenance. Based on SCE's Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006) and in consultation with the CRWG, the types of impacts to cultural resources can be defined as follows.

Recreation-Related Impacts that Result from Development of Facilities such as Campgrounds, Day-Use Areas and Boat Launches

These developments have damaged archaeological resources when roads, walkways, camp spots, toilets, water lines and other infrastructure were created on archaeological sites. SCE has only one developed recreational facility at Camp Edison, and there are day-use areas on the shores of Shaver Lake. The prehistoric archaeological site located within Camp Edison has been evaluated in SCE's Cultural Resources Technical Report and HPMP (SCE 2006; SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)) as NRHP-ineligible. SCE proposes to manage this site consistent with its HPMP pertaining to NRHP-ineligible sites. Impacts identified by FERC due to issuance of the Big Creek 2A, 8 and Eastwood License required SCE to create recreation developments at Shaver Lake and Jackass Meadows. These measures were implemented in the 1980's in accordance with the Federal regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA. The campgrounds at Jackass Meadows affects one prehistoric archaeological site not previously considered by FERC (CA-FRE-421) and which is not yet evaluated for its eligibility for NRHP listing. Use of these campgrounds by visitors is perceived to cause ongoing damage to the archaeological resources within the APE. SCE proposes in its HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)) to evaluate the site and manage it in a manner appropriate to its NRHP evaluation and effects/impacts related to Big Creek Nos. 2A, 8 and Eastwood (FERC Project 67). Forest Service developed campgrounds at Huntington Lake have caused adverse impacts to archaeological sites. Although

SCE does not manage recreation facilities on USDA-FS lands, use of these facilities is perceived to cause ongoing damage to archaeological resources within the APE.

In its HPMP, SCE proposes placing advisory or educational/interpretive signage at recreation facilities to educate visitors regarding the illegal and adverse impacts of removing artifacts from archaeological sites and thereby discourage them from doing this activity. Advisory signage is designed to alert the public to laws that prohibit the removal of, or damage to, archaeological resources. Educational/interpretive signage is designed to provide information about cultural resources to the public. Although some CRWG stakeholders advocated that recreation facilities be removed from archaeological sites to prevent further damage, SCE does not have the authority to remove recreation facilities managed by the USDA-FS.

Recreation-Related Impacts are those that Result from Visitor Use of Recreation Facilities and Lands in the Four Big Creek ALP Projects Boundaries

Visitors attracted by reservoirs to the area of the four Big Creek ALP Projects are suspected of vandalizing archaeological sites by removing artifacts from the surface of archaeological sites and from along the shores of reservoirs where artifacts may be displaced by erosion caused by reservoir operations. As described previously, this is regarded as “incidental vandalism.” “Deliberate vandalism” is documented at one site and is regarded as a potential indirect impact of the Big Creek No. 2A, 8 and Eastwood Project.

In its HPMP, SCE proposes placing advisory or educational/interpretive signage at recreation facilities to advise visitors of laws prohibiting removal of artifacts and to educate visitors regarding the adverse impacts of removing artifacts from archaeological sites. In the case of deliberate vandalism, SCE proposes to monitor the affected archaeological site to ascertain if vandalism of the site is persistent. SCE will evaluate how best to manage the resource to prevent vandalism, to obstruct access to the site, or to consider archaeological data recovery at the site. SCE proposes in the HPMP to make such management decisions in consultation with the FERC, USDA-FS, Native Americans and SHPO.

At Mammoth Pool Reservoir, a boat launch facility leads boaters to drive vehicles and boat trailers to the water’s edge to launch their craft from the archaeological site exposed when the reservoir is less than full. At Shaver Lake, an archaeological site has been all but obliterated by creation of the main boat launch at the Marina. At Florence Lake, a boat launch and related vehicle track cross an archaeological site. Damage to archaeological sites at boat launches results from vehicular traffic across the sites which damages artifacts and displaces site soils. Boaters may observe and collect artifacts from exposed sites.

At Mammoth Pool, SCE proposes to place educational/interpretive and advisory signage to inform recreationalists of Native American use of the area, and to discourage boaters now using the area from taking artifacts from the archaeological site. Barriers may be erected, if feasible, to constrain the location from which boats can be launched.

SCE proposes no action at Shaver Lake and Florence Lake except to avoid future impacts by SCE activities to the bedrock mortars that remain at the sites in those places. Educational/interpretive and advisory signage will be placed at all reservoirs. Reservoirs will be operated in their regular manner.

Project Access Roads Maintenance Can, and Has, Resulted in Effects to Heritage Resources

A number of archaeological sites have SCE-maintained access roads through or skirting them. Initial construction of roads through sites may have damaged or destroyed the affected part of the archaeological sites. In some cases, a roadway has not been excavated through the entire depth of an archaeological deposit, so that continuing maintenance by grading, for example, is an ongoing effect. Access roads also provide access to non-SCE persons who may recognize and vandalize archaeological sites. Damage to archaeological sites can be minimized or avoided at many sites affected by Project access roads by placing fill over the roadway so that future maintenance grading is made unnecessary or significantly reduced. SCE cannot entirely prevent unauthorized persons from using publicly accessible roads to access sites.

In its HPMP, SCE proposes a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) that will be followed by SCE personnel when maintaining Project access roads and vegetation along the roads. This SOP is written to be consistent with the Transportation System Management Plan and the Vegetation and Integrated Pest Management Plan (SCE 2007; Volume 4, SD-G (Books 19 and 24)). Prior to maintenance involving ground disturbing activities or vegetation management, SCE will survey the affected road segment to identify archaeological sites and any harvestable stands of plants of concern to Native Americans. These resources will be monitored during road maintenance to ensure that they are not disturbed. Compliance with the SOP will be reported annually. Native American monitors will be invited to participate in the implementation of the SOP.

Inundation and Erosion of Cultural Resources by Reservoirs

The most conspicuous impacts on cultural resources of the operation and maintenance of the four Big Creek ALP Projects are their inundation and erosion by reservoir operations. Project effects caused by reservoirs are discussed in detail in SCE's Cultural Resources Technical Report (SCE 2006). In summary, archaeological sites in reservoirs are typically severely damaged or destroyed depending on their location in a reservoir. Artifacts from eroded archaeological sites may be deposited elsewhere in a reservoir, creating a "false" site. Exposed sites in reservoirs are subject to wind erosion that deflates the archaeological deposit, destroying stratigraphic contexts of artifacts and features, and exposing artifacts on the reservoir floor to collectors. Archaeological sites on the margins of reservoirs may be partially destroyed, but a surviving portion of a site along the lake margin may continue to have artifacts displaced onto the reservoir shore where they are either further eroded or are collected by visitors. Some archaeological sites are capped by sediments retained in a reservoir. These sites may be made inaccessible to Native Americans and for scientific research. Some reservoirs retain large "minimum pools" and are rarely drawn down to a level where most of the

reservoir basin is accessible for cultural resources inventory. Thus, for Mammoth Pool, Huntington Lake and Shaver Lake, there has not been the opportunity during the period of the four Big Creek ALP Projects studies to access the deeper reservoir basins to locate cultural resources that may be present.

Reservoirs inundate archaeological sites that are places of significance to Native Americans. Short segments of historically documented trail routes occur in each of the reservoirs of the four Big Creek ALP Projects and are culturally significant to Native Americans. Inundation of these cultural resources renders them inaccessible to Native Americans for their traditional use.

SCE proposes in the HPMP several measures to address effects to cultural resources affected by reservoir operations and maintenance. Archaeological sites that have already been identified but which have not been evaluated for NRHP significance may be evaluated provided that the USDA-FS issues necessary permits. Some members of local Native American communities have requested that the Commission and USDA-FS not authorize further excavations at these archaeological sites. Management of sites in and around reservoirs includes avoidance of further non-reservoir operation impacts by SCE personnel, placement of advisory and educational/interpretive signage near but not at archaeological sites, monitoring of reservoir effects to determine if ongoing damage is occurring at NRHP-eligible resources, and archaeological data recovery if there is adequate demonstration that scientifically valuable data are at risk of loss, and provided that the USDA-FS issues the necessary permits.

Other Types of Impacts

Project power lines cross four archaeological sites and an SCE work facility is situated on another site. Wooden distribution line poles have been placed at sites in the past. SCE has indicated that to the extent feasible it will, in the future, remove wooden poles from affected archaeological sites, and take other measures to avoid impacts to sites if poles cannot be relocated off-site. A steel lattice transmission tower is located on one archaeological site evaluated as not NRHP-eligible. The tower cannot be relocated off-site, but maintenance of the tower by SCE does not adversely affect the site. Use of an SCE work facility on one other archaeological site has resulted in a persistent degradation of the resource. Artifacts formerly conspicuous on the site surface are now rare. Materials storage on the site and periodic maintenance of a firebreak damage the site surface.

None of the wooden distribution power line poles affecting archaeological sites are part of the four Big Creek ALP Projects facilities. Nevertheless, outside of the licensing process, SCE proposes to remove wooden power line poles from archaeological sites wherever feasible. Existing poles at sites will be cut off near the base and the base of the pole left in place. New poles will be installed off-site. This work will be monitored by an archaeologist and a Native American monitor will be invited to participate. The steel lattice transmission line tower will be left in place. SCE judges that removal of the tower would cause more damage to the NRHP-ineligible site, than to leave it in place. Maintenance of the Project access road to the tower is proposed to include placing

tunnel muck fill over the roadway to minimize the need to grade that portion of the roadway through the archaeological site.

Native American Concerns

SCE has considered the following expressed Native American concerns:

- Access to and protection of harvestable stands of culturally significant plants;
- Protection of Native American-related archaeological sites;
- Acknowledgement of Native American cultural traditions—past and present—in the area of the four Big Creek ALP Projects;
- Management of appropriate cultural resources in cooperation with Native Americans;
- Curation of artifacts at repositories acceptable to Native Americans;
- Restoration of Native American ownership of Project area lands;
- Water and other resource rights; and
- Compensation for historical treatment of Native American and for loss of lands and resources.

In the HPMP, SCE proposes to conduct detailed botanical surveys, with Native American participation, along Project access roads and around Project facilities to identify any harvestable stands of plants of cultural value to Native Americans and to make provisions for protecting such plants.

The HPMP acknowledges the cultural significance for Native Americans of all archaeological sites with Native American associations. These places demonstrate the Native American presence on the landscape of the four Big Creek ALP Projects in the past. Archaeological sites in the Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area are recognized as contributing elements of the proposed Traditional Cultural Property. Most of the other archaeological sites are not NRHP-eligible, but SCE support their preservation by avoiding causing future impacts to sites, except that sites in reservoirs will continue to be affected by reservoir operations and maintenance.

Native Americans have expressed concern that the loss of cultural resources associated with their culture is exacerbated by a lack of acknowledgement on the part of SCE, government agencies, and the public, that the four Big Creek ALP Projects lands are the homelands of Mono and other Indian tribes. In the HPMP, SCE has proposed to create educational and interpretive signage at appropriate campgrounds and other facilities that address Native American cultures of the area.

Native Americans have requested that cultural resources of significance to them be managed in cooperation with tribes, groups or individuals. SCE acknowledges this

request, but SCE is the entity that will be responsible for cultural resource management under the conditions of the four Big Creek ALP Projects licenses. SCE has sought Native American input for the HPMP and many of those recommendations have been incorporated into the HPMP. The HPMP will provide for ongoing Native American participation in cultural resource management by creating a Big Creek Heritage Advisory Committee that will annually review SCE's management of cultural resources in the APE. Native American monitors are proposed by SCE to be present during future archaeological studies and during botanical surveys to locate harvestable stands of plants, which are of particular concern to Native Americans. Native Americans will have opportunities to draft, review and comment on interpretive and educational signage and other material created by SCE.

Concerns have been raised to SCE that artifacts from local archaeological sites should be curated at a local facility acceptable to Native Americans. The USDA-FS determines where artifacts and other related archaeological materials from lands administered by the USDA-FS are curated and neither the Commission nor SCE has authority in the matter. The HPMP proposes that any artifacts and other archaeological materials from sites on SCE lands be curated at a local museum, provided that the museum demonstrates that it meets curation standards defined in Federal regulation 36 CFR 79.

All of the lands within the four Big Creek ALP Projects boundaries were formerly occupied and used by Native Americans before the arrival of European and American immigrants. These lands, and access to resources on them, have largely been lost by Native Americans and most of the land is now administered as the SNF or is in private ownership. Native Americans have sought the recovery of lands and resource rights, as well as monetary compensation for perceived losses and past mistreatment by other ethnic groups. SCE has, in CRWG meetings, indicated that it will not be responsible for the return of lands or resource rights, or for providing monetary or other compensation for Native American claims.

Project Impact

The HPMP reflects SCE's consultation with the SHPO, federal agencies, the public, Native Americans and other stakeholders in the ALP regarding the identification and resolution of impacts to cultural resources for the four Big Creek ALP Projects. The HPMP distinguishes between the management of properties determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and those "important cultural resources" that do not qualify for NRHP listing. SCE proposes to implement management measures appropriate to Project-related impacts for each resource. The measures include avoiding impacts to historic properties and other cultural resources during SCE routine operations and maintenance activities other than reservoir operations; implementing a standard operating procedure for roads and vegetation management to avoid adverse impacts to cultural resources and to promote consistency with the Vegetation and Integrated Pest Management Plan and Transportation System Management Plan (SCE 2007; Volume 4, SD-G (Books 19 and 24)); concealing portions of archaeological sites to reduce the potential for visitors removing artifacts; archaeological data recovery at some prehistoric sites; installing educational/interpretive and advisory signage at public access facilities;

ongoing consultation with Native Americans, other stakeholders and SHPO regarding management of cultural resources; monitoring of Project effects at certain places; and revising the HPMP to improve SCE's management of cultural resources as necessary. Management measures to be implemented for each affected historic property and other important cultural resources are detailed in the HPMP (SCE 2005; Volume 4, SD-I (Book 27)).

SCE proposes that implementation of the HPMP would resolve any adverse effects to NRHP-eligible historic properties consistent with the regulation implementing Section 106 of the NHPA. The HPMP, as incorporated in the Proposed Action, will have a beneficial effect on management of these resources as compared to current operations, the No-Action Alternative.

5.2.8.3 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

SCE acknowledges that some adverse effects cannot be completely mitigated when the transcendent cultural values associated with historic properties and other important cultural resources are lost to living communities who identify with the resources. Operation of reservoirs and associated facilities under the new licenses of the Proposed Action will continue to damage archaeological sites and Native American trail routes by erosion, inundation, or recreation-related effects, despite mitigation measures that may resolve adverse effects to the information values of sites eligible for National Register listing under Criterion D. Such damage and the associated loss of access for traditional Native American uses are unavoidable adverse impacts of the Proposed Action.

TABLES

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 2085 APE (Mammoth Pool)					
P-20-002533	55-016	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
P-10-001604	53-780	<u>PAS</u> : Rock Ring	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
P-10-001605	55-788	<u>PAS</u> : Rock Ring	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-001606	55-790	<u>PAS</u> : Rock Ring	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-344	53-166	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-1282	53-655	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Chawanakee Flats	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-1284	53-657	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Chawanakee Flats	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-83	55-632	<u>PAS</u> : Rock Shelter, BRM, Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-85	55-586	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter(?)	Mammoth Pool	U	Site is inundated and could not be evaluated for ALP.
CA-MAD-895	55-631	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated (ACRS 1983) not eligible Criterion D. Recommendation not submitted to SHPO. Evaluated for ALP; recommended eligible under Criterion A.
CA-MAD-896	55-784	<u>PAS</u> : Rock-shelter, BRM	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluation same as MAD-895.
CA-MAD-897	55-785	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluation same as MAD-895.
CA-MAD-898	55-786	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluation same as MAD-895.
CA-MAD-899	55-787	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP; recommended eligible under Criterion A.
CA-MAD-900	55-789	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluation same as MAD-895.
CA-MAD-2076	55-908	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Kinsman Flat	U	Site has not been evaluated due to USDA-FS permit restrictions.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 2085 APE (Mammoth Pool) (continued)					
Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area	-	Traditional Cultural Property	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluation process to be determined in consultation with USDA-FS.
Native American Trail Segments	-	Historically documented trail routes and river crossings in Project area. No physical evidence of trails in Project boundary.	Mammoth Pool	RE	Evaluated for ALP as part of Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area.
CA-FRE-3370 PL-MAM-003	53-1276	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3371 PL-MAM-005	53-507	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-1474 PL-MAM-006	51-1321	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Hooker's Creek	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2400 PL-MAM-001	51-1320	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Mammoth Pool	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2401 PL-MAM-007	51-1322	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Dam 6 Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2402 PL-MAM-008	51-1323	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Lion Point	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2403 PL-MAM-009	51-1324	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Lion Point	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2404 PL-MAM-010	51-1325	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Powerhouse No. 3	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-MAD-2405 PL-MAM-011	51-1326	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Lion Point	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project 2175 APE (Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2)					
P-10-00548	53-1151/1152	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Foundations and Debris	Powerhouse 2	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
Big Creek Incline	53-493	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Structures, Foundations, Debris Scatter, Incline RR	Sunset Point	RCR	Contributing resource of the BCHSHD (Shoup 1988).
CA-FRE-117	53-624	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter (?)	Huntington Lake	U	Site is inundated and could not be evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-148	53-62	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Big Creek	RNE	Site tested in 1981 (Taylor 1981), RNE to SHPO; rejected 2/9/1981 due to insufficient information. To date, no further SHPO correspondence.
CA-FRE-158/H	53-87	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Huntington Lake	U	Unable to evaluate site due to USDA-FS permit restrictions.
CA-FRE-224	53-89	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-291/2037	53-88/516	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter, BRM	Huntington Lake	HP	Previously evaluated (Jackson 1989), SHPO concurred 12/14/1989. Reservoir bank stabilization treatment in 1990.
CA-FRE-297	53-76	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	Grouse Creek	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-300	53-100	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-301	53-98	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project 2175 APE (Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2) (continued)					
CA-FRE-302/3030	53-1093	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluation for ALP applies only to area of site in APE. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-303	53-81	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated.
CA-FRE-304	53-82	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated.
CA-FRE-1008H	53-713	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter, RR Grade	Big Creek Canyon	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-1631H	53-866	<u>HAS</u> : SJ&E RR Grade	Dawn	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2029/2567H	53-429/1015	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Aqueduct Structures and Debris, Penstocks, Incline RR Grade, West Portal; Camp 5 Train Station & Chinese Habitation	SJ&E RR Grade	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2038/H	53-517	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes. Additional testing may be necessary for evaluation.
CA-FRE-2880H	53-1028	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Big Creek Canyon	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2881H	53-1029	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Big Creek Canyon	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project 2175 APE (Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2) (continued)					
CA-FRE-2882H	53-1026	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Big Creek Canyon	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2929H	53-1047	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Sunset Point	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2931H	53-1049	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Foundation and Debris, Historic Debris Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005550 PL-HUN-001H	53-1277	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Structure Foundations	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005551 PL-HUN-002H	53-1278	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Structure Foundations	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3372 PL-HUN-003	53-1279	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3373 PL-HUN-004	53-1280	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3374 PL-HUN-005	53-1281	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Huntington Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated.
CA-FRE-3378/H GRO-003	-	<u>PAS</u> : Possible BRM; <u>HAS</u> : Remains of demolished "lodge"	Huntington Lake	U	BRM is most likely a natural erosion feature. Site has not been evaluated.
WWII bomber remains	-	Fuselage and wings of B-24 bomber	Huntington Lake	U	The aircraft remains have not been exposed during ALP studies.
Huntington Lake Historic Recreation District	-	Historic Recreation Tracts	Huntington Lake	U	SNF will evaluate.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project 2175 APE (Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2) (continued)					
Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District	-	Hydroelectric Generating Facilities & Associated Infrastructure	Florence Lake, Shaver Lake	HP	Previously evaluated historic district (Shoup 1988).
Native American Trail Routes	-	Historically document trail routes in Project area. No physical evidence of trails in Project boundary.	Huntington Lake	RE	Evaluated for ALP.
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood)					
P-10-005558	53-1149	HAS: Historic Debris Scatter	Musick Mountain	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005559	53-1150	HAS: Historic Debris Scatter	PH 8	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-239H	53-19	HAS: Historic Foundation and Debris Scatter, Tunnel Muck	N. Fork. Stevenson Creek	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-295/H	53-50	PAS: BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris; HAS: Historic Structures, Debris Scatter	Pitman Creek	U	Site has not been evaluated.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-365/H	53-228	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Foundations, Camp 63 Historic Debris Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-366/H	53-12	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-367/ 820/851/H	53-16/ 582/ 583/ 584	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Mill Site and Debris	N. Fork. Stevenson Creek	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-374	53-15	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-382	53-559	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-411/422/H	53-230	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Jackass Meadow	HP	FRE-422 previously evaluated (ACRS 1983), SHPO concurred 7/29/1983. FRE-411 combined with 422 – entire site is eligible.
CA-FRE-421	53-231	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Jackass Meadow	U	Site has not been evaluated.
CA-FRE-798/ 800	53-574/ 576	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	HWY 168	HP/U	FRE-798 previously evaluated (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 5/2/1983. Data recovery in 1984 (Jackson 1984). 800H not evaluated.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-799/823/H	53-573/ 575	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	HWY 168	RNE/NE	To date, status of FRE-799 not resolved. SHPO determined 799 eligible in 1981; FERC did not concur. Request for DOE sent to Keeper in 1982. SHPO Keeper confirmed via email 12/29/2004 to Pacific Legacy that no determination has been made. This email correspondence is on file with Pacific Legacy. FRE-823H tested (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 2/9/1981.
CA-FRE-801/824/H	53-577/ 578	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	HWY 168	U/NE	FRE-824H previously tested (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 2/9/1981. FRE-801 not tested.
CA-FRE-805	53-613	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	HWY 168	HP	Previously evaluated (O'Brien 1981), SHPO concurred 5/2/1983. Data recovery 1984 (Jackson 1984).
CA-FRE-809/835/H	53-590/ 591	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Shaver Lake	HP/U	FRE-809 previously evaluated (ACRS 1983), SHPO concurred 7/29/1983. 835/H not evaluated.
CA-FRE-811	53-570	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	Balsam Meadow	HP	Previously evaluated (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 5/2/1983. Data recovery 1984 (Goldberg, et al. 1984).
CA-FRE-812	53-569	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	Balsam Meadow	HP	Previously tested (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 5/2/1983. Data recovery in 1984 (Infotec 1984).
CA-FRE-818	53-568	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Balsam Meadow	HP	Previously tested (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 5/2/1983. Data recovery in 1984 (Infotec 1984).
CA-FRE-834H	53-592	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-850H	53-571	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Feature (Corral)	Balsam Meadow	NE	Previously evaluated (Moratto and Riley 1980), SHPO concurred 2/9/1981.
CA-FRE-942/H	53-306	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Mono Diversion	NE	Previously evaluated (ACRS 1983), SHPO concurred 7/29/1983.
CA-FRE-1208	53-448	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Jackass Meadow	HP	Previously evaluated (ACRS 1983), SHPO concurred 7/29/1983.
CA-FRE-1210	53-450	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-1211	53-451	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	HP	Previously evaluated (ACRS 1983), SHPO concurred 7/29/1983.
CA-FRE-1608H	53-767	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter (Camp 72), Historic Features	Snowslide Creek	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-2927/H	53-49	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Pitman Creek	U	Site has not been evaluated.
CA-FRE-2893	53-498	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3174/H	53-111	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Mono Diversion	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. (Tested for Vermilion project, Jackson et al. 2001)
P-10-005512 Florence Lake Work Camp	53-1245	Historic Structures, Buildings Facilities	Florence Lake	NCR	Previously evaluated (Nave 2001), SHPO concurred 12/4/2001.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-3345/H; PL-FLO-001/H	53-1246	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter (Camp 65 Mill Site)	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3346; PL-FLO-002	53-1247	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3347/H; PL-FLO-003/H	53-1248	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3348; PL-FLO-004	53-1249	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris; <u>HAS</u> : Rock Feature(?)	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3349; PL-FLO-005	53-1250	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3350; PL-FLO-006	53-1251	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3351; PL-FLO-007	53-1252	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3352; PL-FLO-008	53-1253	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3353; PL-FLO-009	53-1254	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Florence Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated due to USDA-FS permit restrictions.
P-10-005522; PL-FLO-BSO1H	53-1255	Bridge Remnants	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005523; PL-FLO-LF1H	53-1256	<u>HAS</u> : Rock Alignment	Florence Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-3354/H; PL-NFSTV-001/H	53-1145	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	N. Fork Stevenson Creek	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3355; PL-SHA-001	53-1257	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3356/H; PL-SHA-002/H	53-1258	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Structure Foundation, Historic Debris Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
P-10-005527; PL-SHA-004H	53-1259	<u>HAS</u> : Granite Quarry	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3357/H; PL-SHA-005/H	53-1260	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3358; PL-SHA-006	53-1261	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3359; PL-SHA-007	53-1262	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
P-10-005531; PL-SHA-008H	53-1263	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter, Linear Feature	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3360; PL-SHA-009	53-1264	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-3361/H; PL-SHA-010/H	53-1265	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter, Historic Structure	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3362; PL-SHA-011	53-1266	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3363; PL-SHA-012	53-1267	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3364; PL-SHA-013	53-1268	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3365; PL-SHA-014	53-1269	<u>PAS</u> : Lithic Scatter	Shaver Lake	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. Shovel probes.
CA-FRE-3366; PL-SHA-015	53-1270	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris	Shaver Lake	U	Site has not been evaluated.
Native American Trail Routes	-	Historically documented trail routes in Project area. No physical evidence of trails in Project boundary.	Florence Lake, Shaver Lake, Mono Diversion	RE	SNF will evaluate Mono Trail from Badger Flat to Mono Pass, including segments in Project 67. Florence Lake and Shaver Lake routes evaluated for ALP. Route near Mono Diversion evaluated for Vermilion TLP.
P-10-005539; Kaiser Pass Cabin	53-1272	Historic Structure	Kaiser Pass	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3367H; Kaiser Pass Road	53-1273	Historic Structure (early 20th century road)	Kaiser Pass	RE	Evaluated for ALP.

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project No. 67 APE (Big Creek Nos. 2a, 8 and Eastwood) (continued)					
CA-FRE-3375 Camp 62	53-495	HAS: Historic Building, and Structures, Features and Debris Scatter	Camp 62 Creek	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District	-	Hydroelectric Generating Facilities & Associated Infrastructure	Florence Lake, Shaver Lake	HP	Previously evaluated historic district (Shoup 1988).
FERC Project 120 APE (Big Creek No. 3)					
P-10-005555	53-384	HAS: Historic Debris Scatter	Lower Canyon Rd.	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005556	53-385	HAS: Historic Structure Footings	Lower Canyon Rd.	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3368H	53-1110	HAS: Historic Building Foundations	Powerhouse 3	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005542	53-1140	HAS: Historic Structure Footings	Powerhouse 3	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005543 Lower Canyon Road/Million Dollar Mile	53-1141	Historic Road	Lower Canyon Road	RCR	Contributing resource of the BCHSHD (Shoup 1988).
P-10-005560	53-1153	HAS: Historic Debris Scatter	Tunnel No. 3	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. (Formerly recorded as USDA-FS 05-15-53-379)
P-10-005561	53-1154	HAS: Historic Debris Scatter	Tunnel No. 3	RNE	Evaluated for ALP. (Formerly recorded as USDA-FS 05-15-53-378)

Table 5.2.8-1. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Four Big Creek ALP Projects.

Trinomial or Temporary ID	USDA-FS Number	Resource Type	General Location	NRHP Status	Comment
FERC Project 120 APE (Big Creek No. 3) (continued)					
CA-FRE-208/H	53-22	<u>PAS</u> : BRM, Lithic Scatter, Habitation Debris; <u>HAS</u> : Historic Debris Scatter	Lower Canyon Road	U	Unable to evaluate due to USDA-FS permit restrictions.
CA-FRE-341	53-264	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Powerhouse 3	RE	Previously evaluated (Jackson and McCarthy 1987). Project put on hold, recommendation not submitted to SHPO.
CA-FRE-2018/2562H	53-425/1010/1155	Structure (Wheelhouse), Incline RR Grade	Lower Canyon Road/PH 8	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
CA-FRE-3369H PL-BC2-BC8-002H	53-1142	<u>HAS</u> : Historic Building Foundations	Powerhouse 8	RNE	Evaluated for ALP.
P-10-005545 PL-PH3-001	53-1275	<u>PAS</u> : BRM	Redinger Lake	U	Site is inundated and could not be evaluated for ALP.
Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District	-	Hydroelectric Generating Facilities & Associated Infrastructure	Florence Lake, Shaver Lake	HP	Previously evaluated historic district (Shoup 1988).

NRHP status key: RE = recommended eligible but SHPO not yet consulted; RNE = recommended not eligible but SHPO not yet consulted; HP = historic property (determined NRHP-eligible with SHPO concurrence); NE = determined not NRHP-eligible with SHPO concurrence; RCR = recommended contributing resource of the BCHSHD but SHPO not yet consulted; U = NRHP eligibility has not yet been evaluated.

Table 5.2.8-2. Impacts to Cultural Resources.

Type of Impact	Historic Properties or Properties Evaluated NRHP-Eligible	Other Cultural Resources
Recreation: Campground or day-use facility	CA-FRE-291/2037 CA-FRE-374 CA-FRE-411/422/H CA-FRE-1208	CA-FRE-942/H CA-FRE-2038/H CA-FRE-2893 CA-FRE-3174/H
Recreation: Visitor (includes incidental and deliberate collection/ removal of artifacts)	CA-FRE-805 (deliberate vandalism) CA-FRE-297 CA-MAD-895 CA-MAD-897 CA-MAD-898 CA-MAD-900 CA-MAD-2400 CA-FRE-3371 P-20-002533	CA-FRE-224 CA-FRE-295/H CA-FRE-300 CA-FRE-301 CA-FRE-302/3030 CA-FRE-303 CA-FRE-304 CA-FRE-366/H CA-FRE-382 CA-FRE-834H CA-FRE-1210 CA-FRE-3345/H CA-FRE-3346 CA-FRE-3348 CA-FRE-3349 CA-FRE-3350 CA-FRE-3351 CA-FRE-3352 CA-FRE-3355 CA-FRE-3356 CA-FRE-3357 CA-FRE-3358 CA-FRE-3359 CA-FRE-3361 CA-FRE-3362 CA-FRE-3364 CA-FRE-3365 CA-FRE-3372 CA-FRE-3373 CA-FRE-3374 P-10-005531

Table 5.2.8-2. Impacts to Cultural Resources.

Type of Impact	Historic Properties or Properties Evaluated NRHP-Eligible	Other Cultural Resources
Recreation: Boat launch	P-20-002533	CA-FRE-302/3030 CA-FRE-365/H CA-FRE-382 CA-FRE-3351
Road	CA-FRE-297 CA-FRE-367/820/851 CA-FRE-805 CA-FRE-809/835/H	CA-FRE-208/H CA-FRE-295/H CA-FRE-421 CA-FRE-799/823/H CA-FRE-801/824/H CA-FRE-834H CA-FRE-1282 CA-FRE-1284 CA-FRE-2401 CA-FRE-2402 CA-FRE-2403 CA-FRE-2404 CA-FRE-2405 CA-FRE-3378 CA-MAD-2076
Reservoir: inundation/erosion	Properties evaluated eligible per Criterion A: Native American Trail Routes Mammoth Pool Cultural Use Area: CA-FRE-344 CA-MAD-83 CA-MAD-895 CA-MAD-896 CA-MAD-897 CA-MAD-899 CA-MAD-2400 CA-MAD-3370 CA-MAD-3371 P-20-002533	CA-FRE-117 CA-FRE-158/H (?) CA-FRE-224 CA-FRE-300 CA-FRE-301 CA-FRE-303 CA-FRE-304 CA-FRE-365/H CA-FRE-366/H CA-FRE-382 CA-FRE-834H CA-FRE-2038/H CA-FRE-2893 CA-FRE-3174/H CA-FRE-3345/H

Table 5.2.8-2. Impacts to Cultural Resources.

Type of Impact	Historic Properties or Properties Evaluated NRHP-Eligible	Other Cultural Resources
Reservoir: inundation/erosion (continued)	Properties evaluated eligible per Criterion D: P-20-002533 CA-FRE-291/2037(reservoir impact uncertain)	CA-FRE-3346 CA-FRE-3347 CA-FRE-3348 CA-FRE-3349 CA-FRE-3350 CA-FRE-3351 CA-FRE-3352 CA-FRE-3353 CA-FRE-3355 CA-FRE-3356 CA-FRE-3357 CA-FRE-3358 CA-FRE-3359 CA-FRE-3360 CA-FRE-3361 CA-FRE-3362 CA-FRE-3363 CA-FRE-3364 CA-FRE-3365 CA-FRE-3372 CA-FRE-3373 CA-FRE-3374 CA-MAD-85 P-10-005545 P-10-005550 P-10-005551 B-25 bomber remains
Other	CA-FRE-341 (in SCE corporation yard) CA-FRE-367/820/851 (distribution line poles)	CA-FRE-208/H (distribution line poles) CA-FRE-799/823/H (distribution line poles) CA-FRE-1282 (distribution line poles) CA-FRE-2403 (transmission tower) CA-FRE-3366 (distribution line poles) CA-FRE-3378 (distribution line poles)

Table 5.2.8-2. Impacts to Cultural Resources.

Type of Impact	Historic Properties or Properties Evaluated NRHP-Eligible	Other Cultural Resources
None	CA-FRE-798/800 CA-FRE-811 CA-FRE-812 CA-FRE-818 CA-FRE-1211 CA-FRE-3367H (Kaiser Pass Road) CA-MAD-1474 FS 53-1274 (Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District) P-10-001604 P-10-001605 P-10-001606 P-10-005543 (Lower Canyon Road) P-10-005549 (Big Creek Incline) Huntington Lake Historic Recreation District	CA-FRE-148 CA-FRE-239H CA-FRE-850 CA-FRE-1008H CA-FRE-1608H CA-FRE-1631H CA-FRE-2018/2562H CA-FRE-2029/2567H CA-FRE-2880H CA-FRE-2881H CA-FRE-2882H CA-FRE-2927 CA-FRE-2929H CA-FRE-2931H CA-FRE-3354/H CA-FRE-3368H CA-FRE-3369H CA-FRE-3375H P-10-005512 P-10-005522 P-10-005523 P-10-005527 P-10-005542 P-10-005548 P-10-005555 P-10-005556 P-10-005558 P-10-005559 P-10-005560 P-10-005561

Note: properties/resources sustaining more than one type of effect are listed under each type of effect