

SCA PAPER 2009

FIVE DECADES OF HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, CULTURAL,
MATERIAL, and SACRED SITES of *WAH-HO-GA* VILLAGE
[CA-Mrp-305], YOSEMITE, CALIFORNIA, US

Submitted by: Sandra Gaskell, RPA, Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation Tribal Consultant, ARC
Archaeology Resources & Culture, Mariposa, CA; Anthony C. Brochini, Chairman, Southern
Sierra Miwuk Nation, Yosemite, CA; Danette Johnson, Tribal GIS Analyst, Mariposa, CA

ABSTRACT

While the NPS held scoping meetings in *Wah-ho-ga* Village with tribal participation, the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation Tribal GIS mapping system began an inventory of cultural resources and sacred sites. Chronology and practical activities of daily living such as contemporary bedrock mortars in context with the ancient mortar usage, leaching basins, fish and game hunting, automotive repair, and life in general in the New Indian Village, will be studied as part of the historic component of the CA-MRP-305 investigations from the 2008 fieldwork. Ethnography of the Tribe by the Tribe can interpret historic features and artifacts.

WAH-HO-GA

The American Indian Council of Mariposa County (AICMC, Inc.) *aka* the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation confidential Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping database was undertaken during February of 2002. While the National Park Service (NPS) was conducting scoping meetings in *Wah-ho-ga* Village with tribal member participation,¹ the Southern Sierra Miwuk Tribal Archives established the GIS mapping system and began an inventory of cultural

resources and sacred sites. Analysis of all elements of material culture and artifacts of historic and prehistoric findings with oral histories will serve as the mechanics for coordinating the *Wah-ho-ga Village* project ethnographic findings.

This paper will attempt to organize the historic Chronology of occupation in Yosemite Valley, what the activities of daily living were in *Wah-ho-ga*, and how the Yosemite Valley indigenous population ended up at one location in the New Indian Village. Tribal historians tell their own ethnography in order to interpret historic features and artifacts as they relate to contemporary use. What are some contemporary uses? Things that have been discussed within the families are bedrock mortars in context with the ancient mortar usage, leaching basins, fish and game hunting, automotive repair, basketry, and social community events.

In order to establish the links between the prehistoric, ethnohistoric and historic archaeological research during the project, the genealogical and lineage information in the confidential database of archived documents gave examples of the local families. Pre-archaeological research was conducted whereas all of the archaeological records and listings of artifacts were scanned and referenced to the theme layers for the regions of the village maps. Site records for the surrounding archaeological resources are found in CA-Mrp-163, 305, 748, 765, 63, and 304. ²GIS theme layers have the ability to differentiate materials by type, composition, age, or any other qualifying characteristic. Materials already inventoried and accessioned can be placed into this database and are able to be retrieved by this means.

Historic evidence within the last Yosemite Indian Village refers back to previous habitation locations and villages of occupancy throughout the Valley and out into the outer Miwuk territory. There will be a later discussion which will explain the territorial implications of the habitation pattern throughout the Yosemite Valley floor as it related to the watershed communities mapped through the linguistic probes at the turn of the century. This cultural overlay appears in the population make-up of the last Yosemite Indian Village. The GIS cultural boundaries as they have been developed to answer cultural resource questions raised by the

Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation, lend a broader range of interpretation of village inhabitants.

While positioning land use management principles based upon primary source documents for the traditional cultural values found in the memories of the local community, the final disposition of resource use as viewed through the lives of the decade by decade inhabitants of *Wah-ho-ga* Village will enlighten pre-field research to delineate the potential hypotheses that may apply to historic-era sites.³

Since family items over the years have been held closely and not donated to the Yosemite Museum, there may have been cultural reasons to hold back this large body of knowledge. Through respecting these cultural differences, and through the use of provisional guidelines for confidentiality, not only between the NPS and the Tribe, but also between the Tribal families themselves, the end results of the statistically directed non-specific inventory may produce a methodology to be incorporated into the planning tools of other National Parks.

BROAD BOUNDARIES AND *WAH-HO-GA* GIS

Historic Native American land tenure is a means to examine conservation technology in the region of the Yosemite-Mariposa Miwuk. The Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation has continued to maintain resource use and occupancy. This occupancy has changed over time without leaving this fluid boundary area, commonly near the original village structural elements. Significant relationships between the land tenure, the resource uses, and the moral and legal rights of occupancy mapped over time reveal that the population has remained along the sister village chain routes. Along these chains of village locations, some of the land tenants obtained allotment rights. Some of the village areas remain within original genealogical group allotments and under private ownership. Other private lands are inaccessible to family descendants where there are historic gathering areas and known burials.

Through an appraisal of collections of family historic documents, the evidence for the landbase mapping can be compiled to confirm the locations of historic Indian homeland and land

ownership patterns. One of the purposes of the cultural resource department of the Southern Sierra Miwuk was for landowners to research familial genealogical origins. This department in the tribal government depends upon the oral history and photographs of families to help landowners learn how to determine locations of place name descriptors.⁴ Details about family to land relationships (pertaining to planning and zoning), and processes involved in its management and ownership, require documentation in order to answer the requests for comment by the local county government. This oral tradition has not been written down. The lack of physical records is due to the culturally sensitive nature of land use that has been kept safe in the Tribal keeper's memories. Consultation with the correct family insures knowledge transfer during the planning process. In order to preserve the land use patterns inherent in Mariposa County today, the oldest generation alive today has the ability to identify landmarks and photographs for documentation. First hand knowledge of the village occupancy can be confirmed by using the photographs and family collections not housed in any repository, but in the possession of private individuals.⁵

PARK RESEARCH DESIGN: TRIBAL GIS

Moratto (in Hull and Moratto 1999) has proposed a cultural chronology for Yosemite National Park (YNP) that makes clear the need for refinement of the understanding of the assemblages/complexes that apply through time.⁶ The challenge of the NPS to date has been to understand a time period before any searchable record system was available. Tribal population base held a record keeping system. Mythology that had been frozen in time through the efforts of ethnographers at the turn of the century documented the cultural practices and lifeways of specific people groups. Kinship studies from this time period have been instrumental in the lineage documentation for the federal recognition process. Since the initial 1982 efforts to document the lineal descendants of these clans, there has been further research on behalf of each individual clan through research and family private collections that were not made available to the government agencies.⁷

During the initial site surveys of CA-MRP-305,⁸ there appears to be a consistent difference in the use of the bedrock mortars, the portable mortars, and of the pestles. Given the availability of over 20 people who lived in the Indian Village and participated in the practices there, the Tribe has a cumulative memory of a time frame from 1916 through 1969 and beyond. The tribal members who were born in “Old Indian Village” named *Yawokachi* behind the present Yosemite Hospital remember this time. At the time of the village construction between 1925 and 1929, there were existing ancient bedrock mortars which came back into use. There were also stories of portable mortars being brought in or repositioned with the use of a horse or leverage. There are histories of decade by decade use of the bedrock mortars for food preparation. Given the occupation of the villages over the valley in prehistoric and contact eras, the members of the last village would have been practicing separate food processing technologies. Goals that have been listed in the Moratto and Hull (1999) synthesis relating to material collection and identification might be to: identify types of subsistence activities (e.g., hunting, gathering, and fishing); determine the types of resource exploited (i.e., specific plants and animals used); and interpret methods of procurement and processing of different economic resources.⁹

Hull and Moratto (1999) also call for a focus on assessing potential division of labor in subsistence tasks and evidence for resource intensification; in other cases there may be the need for outside reference to ethnographic/ethnohistoric studies to provide interpretations from archeological data. But with the partnership of the local community through a confidential agreement, the Tribal partners could interpret through analysis when compared to the memories and photographic inventory of the Tribal collections. The importance of how historic residents of *Wah-ho-ga* represented more than one cultural group shown through results of the amalgamated yet unrelated facts gained through confidential disclosure can be mapped without revealing any sources. The broad cultural relationships over tribal territorial/linguistic boundaries are today being revealed on confidential maps created in the Tribal Archives. This extension can plot facts on a global scale without revealing sources resulting in cultural maps that explain occupancy

trends over time. ¹⁰ Since also it is not ethical for any one tribal member to disclose all tribal affiliations, this methodology for identifying tribal affiliation of all known inhabitants of the historic village through non-disclosure has proven to work.

Identifying tribal affiliation of all known inhabitants of the historic village through non-disclosure is a process facilitated in the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation during genealogical interrogatory interviews. These interviews are performed by the tribe and held in confidence for each family branch. The GIS analysis of this database is biased depending on how many family units are reporting. Limitations of this sort are overcome through various means, but the most important element to secure this information is to control the interview participants to tribal members only, and to confine the interviewers to reject non-tribal questioning individuals. Questions we can hope to answer using the 20 living residents of the village are the social physics of the endemic settlement patterns, the reasoning behind conforming to the one habitation location from the 6 villages that existed in 1920. By dividing the occupants between those who obtained permits to live in *Wah-ho-ga* at 1930 and those who had no permits, these names may relate to identify the eleven cultures (18 lineages) of watershed kinship. ¹¹

DEMOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Noted differences in the prescribed research process for the *Wah-ho-ga* Village should draw factual conclusions regarding origins of ethnographic correlations, unlike any archaeological conclusion that might be drawn without tribal historians. Since the current research shows that the *Wah-ho-ga* Village area may have been a satellite village of a larger roundhouse village, *Wah-ho-ga* lies between the Eagle Creek watershed and the Yosemite Creek watershed identifying that it may have been managed by either the family associated with *Koomine* at the Lower Yosemite Falls, or the family associated with *Hak-kiah* on Eagle Creek. ¹² Tribal Elders understand the territorial ownership over time related to these villages. The current project should focus on the following specific paleodemography topics such as recognition of

past diachronic trends in population size and rates of change, and recognition of population movements or replacements by different ethnic groups through time.

Identifying trends in population in YNP is the principal focus advocated by the Park Research Design for this research topic. Without advancement on that topic, and better chronological controls of archeological data, this project's data ultimately may contribute to a third research focus suggested by Hull and Moratto (1999) - estimating the number of individuals inhabiting Yosemite Valley at particular times.¹³ Since the Tribal Archives have established a chronology of village occupation sites around the county at all elevations, the contributions of oral tradition to the villages in Yosemite could gain from this knowledge within confidential intellectual property frameworks to be developed surrounding family routes.¹⁴

Conclusions arrived at through the compilation of data into the GIS database may be inconclusive until more progress has been made regarding the quality of the data included. The types of datapoints and information to be installed into the memory can be queried to begin to ask some of the questions regarding where each historic period began and ended, how the population movements affected individual village occupancy across the "range" of a family territory which affected resource usage, and kinship related occupation questions. An overview of the combined theme layers of oral history, artifact findings, and geomorphology could reveal information to define the Protohistoric Period-1800-1847 Emergent, the Historic Period 1-A.D. 1848, the Transformational Periods until the end of the New Indian Village *Wah-ho-ga* in 1969.¹⁵

Practical activities of daily living such as: bedrock mortar mapping, contemporary bedrock mortars in context with the ancient mortar usage, leaching basins, laundry activities, native California plant propagation and harvesting, taking out the trash and cleaning up activities, fish and game hunting and preparation locations in the village, locations of automotive related activities, and how the great floods affected the village population are among questions needing definition. Using the cabin-by-cabin over all five decades of habitation in the *Wah-ho-ga* historic village other physical characteristics of the village may also be explained. The decade of 1920-30

was spent deciding where to relocate the village, and the following four decades were in *Wah-ho-ga*. Parts of the geography of the village like the rock shelters, rock fall from Three Brothers affecting one side of the village more than another,¹⁶ dump sites, the vegetation communities and boundaries, ancient trail systems, the wildlife wandering through the village—these are things that can be mapped over time in the GIS to determine how historic practices changed.

The shapes of familial temporal habitation characteristics are important for understanding culture change and the transformation over a five decade time span. The evidence cannot be surmised from only one individual, it must be gathered over the population, and it must be done by the Tribe using a confidential system of procurement. Plotting the data from the geographic information relating to family life can improve understanding of cultural change during rapid transformation.

Pre-archaeological interviews enhance the archaeological finding interpretation reshaping concepts and recording theme layers for the regions of the village maps. GIS theme layers, while differentiating materials and artifacts, interpret village life when corroborated by living inhabitant information. The AICMC, Inc. Council of the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation confidential GIS mapping database inclusion of *Wah-ho-ga* Village history will enhance the tribal database while interpreting another village in the chains of occupation sites already existing in the GIS historic record. Analysis of the elements of the historic and prehistoric findings using oral history will serve to report findings, record links to georeference points and coordinate the *Wah-ho-ga* Village project findings.

HISTORIC WAH-HO-GA VILLAGE

So—what was it like to be born and raised in the Indian Villages of *Awani*...under the watchful eye of the Eagle? “We lived under the Eagle, with the eagle’s eye always watching us” stated Anthony C. Brochini, Chairman of the Tribe and born in Yosemite. (FIGURE 1a, 1b) What does *Wah-ho-ga* mean? According to the writings of Power’s the name was documented as

WOHO-KA (EAGLE PEAK).¹⁷ An informant to Samuel A. Barrett in 1908 said that it was “...also known as the meadow west of what is called now *Soldier Camp*.” What is Soldier Camp? According to a postcard from a folder in the office of the National Park ethnographer, it was the first military encampment at the base of Yosemite Falls.¹⁸ (FIGURE 2) This camp had conical tents, and was established after the events reported to Ranger Bingaman by Sally Ann Dick who remembered the night when the soldiers came and burnt them out of their homes at the *Koomine* village.¹⁹

Wah-ho-ga was next door to the village *Koomine* which was razed in 1906 where Captain Dick’s *Rancheria* was replaced by the military installation, and then eventually the Yosemite Lodge. (FIGURE 3) People who saw or reported this place before the transformation were: Stephen Powers: Nine villages of 1866 (#1. *Wa-ha-ka*: A village at the base of the Three Brothers; also, that rock itself. This was the westernmost village in the Valley.) ; C. Hart Merriam: Nine villages of 1897 (#6. *Wahhoga* [Zone 2]: Powers and Merriam recorded occupation and it was rebuilt in 1930); Frank Latta 1936-Interview Record with Map (#15 *Wah-ho’-gah*); H. J. Taylor 1936- Villages of Yosemite (#7 *Wah-ho-gah*-small village west-southwest of *Koomine* on or near edge of meadow); Bennyhoff 1956 – Plate 4 Concordance of Villages (#M-7. *Wahogah*); Kroeber 1925 (combined #102 “*Awani*”); and Pioneer Diaries and Correspondences from between 1853-1910.²⁰

The cry “give us our village back” began in 1970, just after the last cabin was razed, and with the assistance of the Yosemite Fund, and hopefully the village will be completed in the near future. Family outcry began in 1969, and during a meeting on the east side with the Park Service. Jay Johnson, Les James, Ralph and Julia Parker and others began FORMALLY asking for the village back, which in turn had it included in the 1980 General Management Plan, and then in 2000 the Park Service formally began the process of compliance for building the village which was documented during the final scoping meetings in 2002 with the architectural design approval. A Yosemite Fund grant to the AICMC, Inc. in 2001 allowed for the contract awarded to

landscape architecture firm of Royston, Hanamoto, Alley & Abey for completion of the site concepts developed in conjunction with AICMC 2001 – 2002.²¹

The chronology of the location of the *Wah-ho-ga* village complex was presented to the Development Advisory Board (DAB) for the Indian Cultural Center as it was named in the 1980 General Management Plan document. The chronology is as follows: Southern Sierra Miwuk Tribe in Yosemite Valley since at least 800 AD; 1851 Mariposa Battalion enters Yosemite Valley; 1864 Yosemite Grant created by President Lincoln; 1906 Yosemite Grant transferred to Federal Government; 1920's Old Village Indian Camp organized at present Clinic site in Yosemite Valley; Prehistoric and Historic use prior to New Indian Village; 1972 American Indian Council of Mariposa County (AICMC) formed by Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation ; 1977 AICMC asked for use of last Village as location for a cultural site; 1980 General Management Plan incorporates concept for ICC; 1997 Memorandum of Understanding executed and specifies ICC; 2000 Yosemite Valley Plan reaffirms Indian Cultural Center concept; 2005 Guided Archaeology Research Design -an internal activity by the Tribe; 2006 Scope of Work under Tribal direction under review; 2008 Summer Fieldwork compliance Yosemite Archaeology; and finally with the 2009 construction of the approved Traditional Village.²² Traditional Elders have been meeting weekly on the site for preparing and stock piling the materials for the construction of the Roundhouse.

VILLAGE COMPACTION 1853-1910

A number of settlement types existed prior to the time when the Old Indian Village (*Yawokachi*) area settlement moved to New Indian Village (*Wah-ho-ga*). During this period, the settlements were in locations along the watersheds entering the Merced River in the Yosemite Valley leading in from villages along the family routes. Although some valley villages had been displaced into neighboring settlement places, Euro development was confined to the south side

which allowed the larger settlement areas to remain until the 1906 Cavalry event.²³ Settlement preferences were usually due to known tribal division usufractory rights held for generations.

Village structures were transformed during this time from traditional (pre-1850) villages, to transformational village structures, and finally into assimilated village structures. There is photographic evidence of these sorts of structures in the historic collections housed in various archives and family records. Who lived here? There are 18 lineages from 11 cultural groups, and 11 cultural routes circling resource harvest and chains of villages. There were 40-45 Captains, Chiefs, Appointed Chiefs, and Dance Captains which have been identified by members. Population in regions according to family relations and kinship patterns are recorded in Tribal genealogical records. There is a list of Headmen from about 1888 who signed a Petition to Congress,²⁴ and families listed on the Unratified Treaties of 1851 for groups of the Southern Sierra Miwuk Family Use Districts (“tracts” according the Whitney).²⁵ These routes consisted of sister villages along the resource gathering routes of each lineage. During the 1920 Indian Field Days, the visitor attraction was really a family “reunion” or transformation of a yearly “gathering” held over repetitive centuries viewed as a visitor experience. By 1910, most families lived at *Yawokachi* where families become a compact group of people culminating the village compaction from other regions of the valley floor.²⁶

Yawokachi (Yowatchke) was the largest concentration of individuals living in the Valley in the 1920s. Being under the usufractory ownership of the descendants of Jim Yawokachi,²⁷ the village was a transformational village of cast-off military tents. (FIGURE 4) There are census lists over the years for this location, many maps, photographs, and detailed mapping of the DBH of trees around the Roundhouse.²⁸ A 1925 utility map of *Yawokachi* shows the Roundhouse of Mary Wilson the Granddaughter of Jim Yawokachi, and the wife of Callipene’s brother Frank “Hooky” Wilson. There is a picture of the Roundhouse from 1931, with a *Yawokachi* family group picture standing to the right of the Roundhouse in the book written by Bates and Lee published by the Yosemite Fund.²⁹ In oral interviews with the granddaughter who lived in the

village of Mary Wilson during the 1920s, it was believed that the village wasn't vacated until the "princess" had passed away in 1930. Mary Wilson's granddaughter's information regarding the Old Indian Village has been recorded in a thesis written in 2002. This was seen by her as an important factor in the move from the Old Indian Village over to the new location.³⁰

THE SEARCH FOR A PLACE TO MOVE THE INDIANS

Starting in the mid 1920s they started a search for a place for the New Indian Village location. They used government Indian Census to determine size and eligibility for living in the New Indian Village. They looked at three possible locations in the Valley for a place to move the Indian population. First they looked at Hollow, the Indian Caves, where people still lived, and were recorded as dancing, interpreting, and pounding acorn near the large bed rock milling feature.³¹ Then secondly, Cook Meadow was reported as another possible location,³² but as it was located in a flood plain, it was less desirable. Finally, east of Rocky Point (close to the rock fall zone) under the Eagle Peak was proposed and finally decided upon.³³ The NPS Park Design for Architectural uniformity was a program throughout the Park Service and documented as a plan for renovating all of the parks in America. These events can be reviewed in the history written by Greene (1987) for the nomination of historic register sites.³⁴ Indian Health issues and letters of inquiry caused attention to be brought to the Indian people's individual medical concerns. Medical documents in the YRL, letters from concerned individuals, and letters requesting the NPS to pay for medical treatments for residents name individuals. Those receiving aid outside of the park, and BIA letters in response to park inquiries regarding reimbursement are records naming individual residents.³⁵ There are archival 'proposed site' photographs from Indian Cave, and near Rocky Point. A 1929 statement by the Superintendent that is commonly quoted from this time period states that the "Moral Right but not the Legal Right" to be residents of the Valley, was made by Thompson. Today there are 15 Tribal members who were born in Old or New Village still with us to tell the story of both places.³⁶

DECADE BY DECADE VILLAGE 1930-1969

Wah-ho-ga Village maps consist of a series of drawings from agencies within the Park Service. The 2008 survey map of the foundation structures confirms the Tribal memory of the occupation locations of their family homes. During the 1950s the cabins were beginning to be destroyed. Jay Johnson's 1930's Indian Village Map shows the village at the height of occupancy. The Government 1953 Census Map showed where homes were located that survived the first wave of removals. Maps were hand drawn during every census and included in the notes of the 1950-60s. Anthony Brochini wrote on a copy of Jay Johnson's 1930 Map showing the village from his memories from his birth in 1951 through the burning of his Great-grandmother's home in 1969. This was confirmed by his Great Aunt who was present at the burning of items from the home in 1969. Utility map from 1930s and 1940s construction and remodeling were overlaid a topographic map in 2001 which was used for formulating the Yosemite Fund village project drawings, and the project map for the 2008 survey map. Blueprints of the original cabin drawings of the houses (they were about 950 square feet) are located in the Yosemite Research Library.³⁷

There were still 6 cabins left in the decade of the 1950s. Out of the original 15 cabin homes built in the village during the 1930s, only 3 remained there in 1960, with cabin 120 moved up behind the maintenance building (FIGURE 5a, 5b). In 1944 four cabins were combined to form two larger houses (FIGURES 6, 7). Cabins still existing during the decade of 1950s were; Cabin 107 was listed as Ralph Parker on 1953 map; Cabin 108 and Cabin 109 were combined as Stanley Castro's house on the 1953 map; Cabin 110 was listed as John Telles' house in 1953; Cabin 111 "good condition 1950"; Cabin 113 "good condition 1950"- last razed in 1969; Cabin 116 "good condition 1950"; Cabin 117 became a combination Cabin. The homes of the indigenous people of Yosemite which were razed during the decade of the 1950s were: Cabin 118 Razed November 1958; Cabin 119 Torn Down November 1956; Cabin 120 moved up behind the Museum; Cabin 121 Torn Down 1953; Cabin 115 Razed November 1958 ; Cabin 114 Torn Down

1953; and Cabin 112 Torn Down 1957. The only cabin still existing is located behind the old maintenance buildings, (FIGURE 8) and is scheduled to be moved back down to its original location and used as a caretaker's facility when the *Wah-ho-ga* complex is finally completed.

The environment before the last Indian village was built during the last part of the 1920s consisted of an area close to the rock fall zone of Rocky Point, under the eye of the Eagle. It was close to the Leidig Meadow, and across the river from the beach near Yellowpine. There was a worn bear trail along the talus near where Cabin's 113, 114, and 115 were built, and Elders remember seeing others talk to the bears. Anthony Brochini remembers sleeping near the bear trail, and feeling them around him, as he explained the 1960s map he traced over the 1930s map of Jay Johnson. There were social gathering areas where activities such as wood cutting, automotive repair work, basketmaking, acorn processing, and regular daily activities occurred. The area west of the Combination Cabin where the archaeological fieldwork took place uncovered some of those domestic components—small fragments of life from across the decades. The clothesline out back in the snow next to woodpiles, and some children playing in the snow were some of the memories of life in the New Indian Village *Wah-ho-ga*.³⁸

More than half of the residences were already gone by the census of 1953. Between 1969 and 1980 family members lobbied the NPS, through meetings, and the formation of the not for profit organization named the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, Inc., and continuous consultation with the local government agencies. Progress was made when finally it was placed into the first General Management Plan (GMP) in 1980.³⁹ In this management plan the Indian Cultural Center was written into the first plan document. Then an agreement for the traditional use and management for the Indian Cultural Center to be used by the families that lived and worked in *Awani* was included during 1997.⁴⁰ Compliance work has been completed in 2009 for the *Wah-ho-ga* village project to move forward, and soon the statement of the indigenous people of Yosemite who asked for their village back may be completed. Their statement of hope has been “We never left...we are here to stay.” (FIGURE 9)

END NOTES

1. Gaskell, Sandra (Dec. 2001). *Planning Issues I & II: Indian Cultural Center, Yosemite National Park, and the American Indian Council of Mariposa County*. Unpublished report to the AICMC and California State University Stanislaus, Planning Issues in Geography. And in the appendices-Gaskell, Sandra (2001-02). *Appendices to Planning Issues I & II: Indian Cultural Center, Yosemite National Park, and the American Indian Council of Mariposa County*. Unpublished report to the AICMC and California State University Stanislaus, Planning Issues in Geography. These hand written notes were taken during the site visits and record the discussions while in the village.
2. During June of 2005 the Tribal Archivist and Archaeologist scanned the original archaeological survey records for the site and sites directly surrounding CA-MRP-305.
3. Sandra Gaskell, (2008). *Tribal Geographic Information System (GIS) Protocol, Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation, Yosemite-Mariposa, California, US*. Mariposa, CA; paper submitted to the ESRI UC and accepted for presentation for the 2009 conference, San Diego, CA. A presentation of the same name was presented during the Society of California Archaeology General Session 1, "Recent Research in the Sierra Nevada" with co-authors Kristina Roper, RPA, Anthony C. Brochini, Chairman, and Danette Johnson, Tribal GIS Analyst, Mariposa, CA. and in the original protocol for consultation titled Gaskell, Sandra, (2005). *Recognition Committee Task Force and GIS Framework for the Mariposa County Consultation Network: SB 18 Resources*. Mariposa, CA; Unpublished internal document for the Southern Sierra Miwuk Archives.
4. Land tenancy and allotment land parcel number information for lands owned by tribal members and held in trust by the government have been entered into the GIS parcel layer. These APN regions explain many of the ancient and historic family village regions.
5. The archives is organized following the lineages with family records kept separate from other records. Gaskell, Sandra (2005). *Records Management Manual of the Southern Sierra Miwuk aka American Indian Council of Mariposa County Tribal Archives*. Mariposa, CA; Unpublished internal document for the Board of Directors for the AICMC, Inc. Also some procedures can be found in Gaskell, Sandra, (2005). *Sacred Sites Inventory: SB 18 Consultation Procedure Manual* by the AICMC, Inc. Mariposa, CA; unpublished manuscript. The Tribal Archivist and Archaeologist trained with the Western Archives Institute http://www.sos.ca.gov/archives/level3_wai.html. and the First Archivist's Circle that was established in 2002, a private archives group comprised of American Indian archives.
6. Hull, Kathleen & Moratto, Michael, (1999). *Archaeological Synthesis and Research Design, Yosemite National Park, California*. Yosemite Research Center Publications in Anthropology No. 21. Yosemite: Yosemite Research Center. Cultural Chronology- pages 121-196.
7. Bean, L. J., & S. Vane (1984). *Petition to the Government of the United States from the American Indian Council of Mariposa County for Acknowledgment as the Yosemite Indian Tribe*. Prepared by Cultural Systems Research, Inc. for the American Indian Council of Mariposa County.
8. Information specific to the site CA-MRP-305 can be found in Hull, Kathleen, and Michael Kelly, (1995). *An Archaeological Inventory of Yosemite Valley, Yosemite National Park, California, Volume 1*. Chico, CA; Dames & Moore, Inc., pages 49-50. A summary of the site is also found in Joseph Mundy and Kathleen L. Hull, (1988). *The 1984 and 1985 Yosemite Valley Archaeological Testing Projects*. Publications in Anthropology No. 5. Yosemite, CA; Yosemite Research Center, US Department of the Interior, pages 52-56, 150-152, 160-162 and 212-220.

9. Ibid. 6. Hull & Moratto, pages 210-231
10. Gaskell, Sandra, (2008). *Village Delineation and GIS Buffers Using the Elements of the Environment*. Paper submitted to ESRI UC, San Diego, CA.
11. Ibid. 3, pages 10- culture codes
12. Eagle Peak and the nomenclature surrounding Wah-ho-ga is found in: Merriam, C. Hart (1917). "Indian Village and Camp Sites in Yosemite Valley." *Sierra Club Bulletin*, X(2): 202-209.; Barrett, S.A., "Samuel Alfred Barrett, 1893-1977." Collection no. BANC MSS 86/172, negative no. 2778, University of California, Berkeley. Microfilm housed in AICMC,Inc Archives; Barrett, S.A. (1908). *The Geography and Dialects of the Miwok Indians*. Berkeley: University of California Press
13. Ibid. 6. pages 277-296.
14. Ibid. 5. Records management pages 22-25.
15. Ibid. 6. page 182.
16. Wieczorek, Gerald F.& Snyder, Jim (1998) *Rock Falls in Yosemite Valley, California*. Yosemite, CA: Unpublished Manuscript in the Yosemite Research Library.
17. Powers, Stephen (1877). "The Tribes of California." *Contributions to American Ethnology, Vol. III*. United States Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region, Washington, D.C..
18. Barrett, S.A. (1908). "Samuel Alfred Barrett, 1893-1977." Collection no. BANC MSS 86/172, negative no. 2778, University of California, Berkeley. Microfilm housed in AICMC,Inc Archives.
19. Bingaman, John W. (1966). *The Ahwahneechees: A story of the Yosemite Indians*. Lodi, CA: End-Kain Publishing Co.
20. Powers, Stephen (1877). "The Tribes of California." *Contributions to American Ethnology, Vol. III*. United States Geographical and Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region, Washington, D.C.; Merriam, C. Hart (1917). "Indian Village and Camp Sites in Yosemite Valley." *Sierra Club Bulletin*, X(2): 202-209.; Kroeber, A. L.(1907) *Handbook of the Indians of California*. University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology, Vol. 4, No. 6. Berkeley: University of California Press; Latta, Frank, (n.d.). *Map of the Miwok villages in Yosemite*. On file in the Frank Latta Collection, Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite National Park; Bennyhoff, James A. (1956) "An Appraisal of the Archaeological Resources of Yosemite National Park. *Reports of the University of California Archeological Survey, 1956, 34*: pp. 1-71. Berkeley, CA: University of California.;
21. Royston, Hanamoto, Alley & Abbey, (2002). *Wahhoga Yosemite Indian Cultural Center, Yosemite Valley*. San Francisco, CA; prepared for the American Indian Council of Mariposa County, Inc.- the report of the architectural project awarded for concept development in 2001.
22. Development Advisory Board (DAB) presentation in Denver Colorado on August 2003 by Superintendent Tollefson included this chronology of events for the site in a Power Point presentation of 14 slides prepared for the approvals to move forward.
23. Ibid. 19. testimony of Sally Ann Dick of 1906 event.
24. Harrison, Michael (1891). "*Report of the acting superintendent of the Yosemite national park to the secretary of the interior.*" Includes "Petition to the Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States in the Behalf of the Remnants of the Former Tribes of the Yosemite Indians Praying for Aid and Assistance, Important, Please Read." Dated 1891 but date of authorship is thought to be 1888 Original copy gifted to Yosemite Research Library. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

25. Heizer, Robert (1972). *The Eighteen Unratified Treaties of 1851–1852 Between the California Indians and the United States government*. Berkeley: Archaeology Research Facility, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. Nomenclature and the description of “tracts” is found in Whitney’s report; Whitney, J. D. (1871). *Geological survey of California, the Yosemite guidebook: a description of the Yosemite Valley and adjacent region of the Sierra Nevada, and of the big trees of California*. Published by authority of the legislature. Cambridge, MA: University Press, Welch, Bigelow, & Co.
26. Ibid. 18. Barrett, 1906, 1908, handwritten records regarding Jim Yawokachi at the Horseshoe Bend region of the riparian village chains along the Merced River Middle fork and North Fork, and owning the major ford at Horseshoe Bend and northern villages at Red Cloud Mine. Jim Yawokachi’s cemetery is located near that ford far under the lake surface. This high ground village is also described by Chris Brown (Chief Lemee) in the myth told to Frank Latta regarding the route from *Yawokachi* to *Ootin* (Bower Cave), the birth place of Mary Wilson- Latta, Frank F., (1935). *Unpublished field notes and interviews with Henry Johnson, and Chris Brown on June 13 – August 25, 1935*. On file in the Frank Latta Collection, Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite National Park. Ranger Eastman also named Mary (Margarite) Wilson’s birth family as “Uhwahcatchee” in the government village census in *Indians General: 1924-1931*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Research Library Rolling Cart. Eastman, Gustave N., U.S. Park Ranger (Jan. 5, 1930). Special Census, Indian Village, Jan. 5, 1930, including Recommendations for Indian Camp by board of Expert Advisors. Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite CA.
27. Merriam, C. Hart (1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1910, 1920) *Field Journals*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress. There was a final bear incident in the village Loiyah causing the last inhabitant to move to the south side with her sister in *Yawokachi*. This happened in September of 1910. Callipene moved to live with her sister-in-law, Mary Wilson, after the bear forced her to finally leave her husband’s village.
28. Thomson, Charles G. (1929, 1930) *Indians General: 1924-1931*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Research Library Rolling Cart. Eastman, Gustave N., U.S. Park Ranger (Jan. 5, 1930). Special Census, Indian Village, Jan. 5, 1930, including Recommendations for Indian Camp by board of Expert Advisors. Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite CA, Indian Box.; Eastman, Ranger (Jan. 29, 1931) Memo to Chief Ranger Forest Townsley, Special report No. 53: Indian Village Housing Conditions.” Key to *Yowatchke* Map.
29. Bates, Craig and Martha Lee, (1993), *Traditions and Innovations: a Basket History of the Indians of the Yosemite-Mono Lake Area*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Association Publication, 1990, Reprinted 1993 (Historical knowledge on the past lives of Yosemite Valley), pp. 152 and 172.
30. Skipper, Mary Wilson-Lovine, (Jan. 2002). Personal communications with Anthony Brochini. Mariposa, CA. Her insights were recorded in the thesis by Sandra Gaskell, 2002, *Interpretive Artistry of Anthropological Myth; the Religious Geography of the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation*. Turlock, CA: Unpublished thesis in partial requirement for the masters degree at CSU, Stanislaus.
31. Anonymous, 1927. Ethnography Village Sites, “Indian cave on new Indian Village site-1927. Neg. no: RL-1945; film size: 5 x 7; Yosemite Research Library, Yosemite, CA.
32. Greene, L. W. (1987). *Historic resource study, Yosemite: The park and it’s resources*. 3 volumes. Denver: CO: USDI National Park Services.
33. Ralph Parker, Personal Conversation with the author during the summer of 2001 regarding the village location search during the 1925-28 because Ralph’s name was on the attendance list for the meetings with Superintendent Thompson. According to Ralph, there were concerns that the Indian village being too close to the new hospital that was finished in 1928 on the east side of Yosemite Creek, across from the village Yawokachi, was noisy.
34. Ibid. 32
35. Ibid. 28, *Indians General: 1924-1931*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Research Library Rolling Cart. Letters regarding health and the bureau of Indian Affairs

36. Thomson, Charles G. (1929, 1930) *Indians General: 1924-1931*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Research Library Rolling Cart.
37. *Indians General: 1924-1931*. Yosemite, CA: Yosemite Research Library Rolling Cart. The permits and cabin blueprints are located in chronologically ordered files by date, topics are mixed in chronological order. There are copies of the building plans and permit forms for occupancy of the cabins.
38. Jackson, Scott, and Barabara Buettner, (2009). *Preliminary Archaeological Results from a Boulder Milling Feature (CA-MRP-305/H) in Yosemite Valley*. Modesto, CA; A paper presented at the Society of California Archaeology Annual Meeting. There is a hand drawn map in the Council Offices with no date Untitled map of grinding rock mortar locations in Yosemite Indian Village *Wahhoga* showing Historic 2, Historic 3 transformational users. Hand drawn, labeled, author unknown-probably Jay Johnson.
39. National Park Service (NPS), U. S. Department of Interior, (1980). General Managemnet Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, Yosemite National Park. Yosemite, CA; Yosemite National Park. And the American INdina Council of Mariposa County 1980 Comments on Yosemite Management Plan (on file with USDI National Park Service, Yosemite National Park).
40. In 1997 the American Indian Council of Mariposa County signed a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the use of the park for traditional activities.