

July 14, 1982

TO: Lake County Planners
FROM: Jim Brown III, Director
RE: Anderson Ranch Initial Study/G-PA82-5

Dear Planners:

I am writing comments and concerns that the people of the Elem Tribe share regarding the proposed General Plan Amendment 82-5 (Anderson Ranch). Eventhough our reservation is removed from the Area in question, many of the families living at Elem are direct descendents of the people who lived on the Anderson Ranch and around the Anderson Marsh.

The cultural (archeological) sites which have been identified on the property do contain information necessary for reconstructing the history of these families. There are several cemeteries located within the area which is schedualled for a suburban residential designation. This type of land use directly conflicts with our spiritual commitments regarding cemeteries.

In addition, many of our people visit the area by boat to collect plants for food, medicine, etc. just exactly the same manner in which we use Rattlesnake Island. We are afraid that the land use changes and later development of the area will severly restrict or cut off our access to these valuable Indian resources.

In some cases, it is possible for development to encroach upon archeological sites as long as such sites are preserved for future generations. However, in this case, the resouces are much more than just a few archeological sites. The resources in the Anderson Ranch and Anderson Marsh area consititute an intergral part of our cultural legacy.

Residential development in this area would deface these cultural values. A good analogy would be to zone the area surrounding the town of the unknown soldier for a Industrial Park, or allowing auto raceing in the Yosemite Valley.

Lake County General Plan objective # 1,2, Pg. V23 states "The County should encourage the protection of Cultural and Archeological sites...". Due to the fact that 3.1 Million dollars is available for the immediate purchase and "Protection" of the area and resources in question by the State Department of Parks and Recreation. It appears that a decision in favor of this General Plan Amendment is to inconsistant with the County Archeological and Cultural resources policy.

We strongly recommend that this General Plan Amendment be denied.

Sincerely,

