on research questions. Part of this problem is not the authors’ doing. The CoE, as with many Federal agencies, has a stated policy not to allow site location maps in reports. The purpose of this policy is to deter, or at least to not aid, vandalism. While the policy is well-intended, it also greatly restricts the research utility of the reports. In the case of the Santa Ana River survey, it is very difficult to assess the authors’ conclusions because the reader has absolutely no idea where the sites are located vis-à-vis each other or major environmental features. This problem, of course, transcends this report. It only is mentioned here because of its impact on the utility of an otherwise commendable effort.

Overall, the Santa Ana River survey report fits nicely with the other reports on this project. This report clearly concentrates on the history of the region. Given the intense effort placed on the Santa Ana River drainage, it would be extremely useful if the CoE would produce a final, comprehensive volume, this time with maps.
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This volume includes three papers, by Keith Dixon, Joseph and Kerry Chartkoff, and William Wallace, in that order. Dixon’s paper “Archaeology and Geology in the Calico Mountains: Results of the International Conference on the Calico Project,” is reprinted from a 1970 newsletter of California State University, Long Beach. Its appearance in the present collection no doubt was based on initial limited distribution of a carefully balanced report of an important international meeting at San Bernardino in October, 1970. The conference was attended by an unusually impressive group of Paleolithic archaeologists and geologists, literally from all over the world: Japan, Siberia, Africa, Europe, and the Near East, with L. S. B. Leakey, the leading sponsor, being the most well-known on the list here presented.

Despite the eminence of the group and perhaps expectations of definitive conclusions on the dating of the site and its allegedly man-made lithic tools, Dixon was not able to present an entirely favorable picture of the Calico site as the earliest representative of human occupation in the New World. He emphasized meticulous excavation techniques of the group led by Ruth Simpson, and certainly did not write off the site as unprovably ancient or the tools as made by nature. Moreover, he made cogent suggestions as to the direction future research should take regarding analysis of the site and its contents.

Unfortunately, almost twenty years later, the original proposals regarding age and tool associations have not been widely accepted. In neither of the recent summaries (1984) of California archaeology by Moratto and J. L. and K. K. Chartkoff is the Calico site given much more than a dubious status. Meanwhile, Simpson, in 1989, has reported a uranium-series date of 200,000 years as a suggested date of early human occupation of the site, supplementing the 1970 estimates based on geological data. The difficulties of accepting this date, together with what may be
considered negative arguments regarding the nature and dating of the tools (e.g., Payen [1982] in his work with "angle platform scars") would seem to place the Calico material in an even more questionable position than it was in 1970, when Dixon wrote. Nevertheless, Simpson and others appear undaunted, and continue the defense of the Calico Project, presenting copious data on the lithic material which, whatever the dating, appear tantalizingly similar to certified man-made objects.

The Chartkoffs' paper, "Tests of Subsurface Techniques for Archaeological Site Discovery: Investigations at CA-TUO-1029, CA-TUO-1013, and CA-TUO-1284, Tuolumne County, California," outlines pilot transect-interval sampling of sites, using standard excavation and 1/4-inch screening as control. Contents of samples of three different sizes were taken, two with soil augers, and one with a long-handled, square-ended shovel. These were compared with the results from the control excavation, thus allowing models of discovery or assessment of sites using each of the three sizes of transect samples. Each of the latter indeed revealed its relative efficiency in indicating the artifact density disclosed by standard subsurface excavation. Obviously, such sampling varies in effectiveness, depending upon intervals or numbers of samples taken, as well as on special conditions in different topographical regions. Sites having distinctively colored soil apparent require only a minimum size soil sample for detection.

The larger aim of the experiments outlined was to reveal what the least-cost adequate testing program may be. It is noted that such testing models must be developed separately for every part of the state, using local data such as nearness of running water to sites, as background.

The final paper, "Archaeological Investigations at CA-FRE-115, in the Vermilion Valley, Eastern Fresno County, California," is a slightly updated version of a report submitted in 1962 by Wallace to the Southern California Edison Company, in connection with dam building in the valley. Excavation of a house pit at the site had taken place a few years before, and the results published by Lathrap and Shutler in 1955. Data from the latter work were included in the Wallace report, and these, plus a series of excellent illustrations, aid in making the present paper a valuable contribution to high Sierran archaeology.

The site, at an elevation of some 7,600 feet, evidently was one of summer occupation only, and probably served as an important stop along a trailway between Owens Valley to the east and the San Joaquin Valley to the west. It was one of the first high-elevation sites in the southern Sierra Nevada to be excavated.

Ethnographic peoples on both sides of the Sierra Nevada crest have long been known to be related and to have been in fairly close touch with each other. Site CA-FRE-115 joined the growing number of archaeological sites excavated that confirmed the trans-Sierran relationship, dating from about A.D. 1100. Artifacts from lower levels also revealed an earlier culture, terminating at some time around A.D. 500 or 600. It is not clear whether there was a gap separating the two known occupations, or whether another, presently indiscernible, culture intervened. The earlier occupation level, however, approximately corresponds with that found in Yosemite, to the north, as well as at several other localities in the southern Sierra Nevada (e.g., Moratto 1984).

An appendix briefly describes five other sites in the Vermilion Valley. The six sites reported upon may represent all of the sites in the relatively small, secluded valley, which now is flooded. One of the sites possibly
corresponds with McGuire and Garfinkel's Lamont phase, the earliest known in the southern Sierra Nevada, dating from ca. 4,000 B.C. to 1,200 B.C.
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Test Excavations at the May Site (CA-SIS-S7) in Seiad Valley, Northwestern California.
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In 1972, Joseph Chartkoff directed a team of Michigan State University students and U. S. Forest Service trainees in test excavations at the May site (CA-SIS-S7), southeast of the town of Seiad Valley in northwestern California. Situated on a high river terrace east of Grider Creek, a tributary of the Klamath River, the May site is just 11 miles south of the California-Oregon border.

The major findings of this investigation were: (1) the site still retains subsurface integrity; (2) it is stratified; and (3) different activities took place in different parts of the site. The report concludes that additional excavations would be needed to recover more substantive data.

This report suffers, as too many small test excavation reports do, from a lack of synthesis and interpretation. It begins with an introduction of eight pages and ends with a summary and conclusion of eight pages. The remainder of the text is a detailed description of the recovered assemblage. Only one-fifth of the report attempts any synthesis or interpretation while four-fifths deal with artifact description. There seems to be an imbalance here.

The author states that the test excavations were performed to investigate a question concerning the relationship between ecology and prehistoric settlement along the Klamath River. The site was interesting because of its potential for yielding organic materials and because it was located at an ethnographic border. Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1975) previously reported on settlement patterns along the Klamath River. However, the Archives report reviewed here provides no research design linking the Chartkoffs' earlier work with these test excavations. In fact, very little evidence is presented addressing the relationship between ecology and settlement patterns.

The detailed descriptions of the recovered artifacts may be quite useful to future researchers in providing baseline artifact descriptions for this little-studied region. The report also provides us with two radiocarbon dates (1045 ± 80 and 1080 ± 80) for the area. These dates apply to materials recovered from the upper of three occupation levels, known to date from A.D. 1000 to the nineteenth century.