

5.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES

5.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section addresses potential impacts to cultural resources resulting from development of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* project.

Cultural Resources – Environmental Setting

ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING

The Glen Ellen area is recorded as having been inhabited by the Coast Miwok and possibly the Wappo. The Coast Miwok occupied what are now Marin and Sonoma counties although scholars recognize this as a boundary area for the Wappo located to the north of Glen Ellen primarily in Napa County.^{1 2 3}

The Coast Miwok are one of several Penutian language groups found in the North Coast Ranges, the Central Valley, and the Sierra Nevada. It is hypothesized that the Coast Miwok arrived in the area between 3000-4000 years before present (B.P.).⁴ Two Coast Miwok villages were noted by Barrett (1908) and Kelly (1978) to the north and south of the study area. This includes the villages of *lumen laka-lu* and *wuki liwa*.

The Coast Miwok subsistence strategy was based on fishing, hunting, and gathering. Villages were typically “adjacent to the shore, lagoon, or slough; but come summer, attention shifted to the hills for hunting and for gathering of vegetable products”.⁵ Like most Native Californians, the Coast Miwok extracted and used local resources on a seasonal basis. Harvested plant foods, including seeds, nuts, bulbs, roots, acorns, and fruits were staple vegetables. Fishing for pelagic and seasonally available fish, shellfish, and large and small game provided meat to their diet. Because resources varied throughout the year, villages moved among procurement sites. Predominant on the landscape of the bayshore are the large mounds known as *shellmounds* containing large quantities of shell, large and small mammal bone, fire-cracked rock, and other discarded items. The mounds generally, but not always, contain human remains.

¹ Coast Miwok in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, I. Kelly, 1978

² *The Ethno-geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians*, S.A Barrett, 1908.

³ Wappo in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, J.O. Sawyer, 1978.

⁴ *California Archaeology*, M.J. Moratto, 1984.

⁵ Coast Miwok in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, I. Kelly, 1978

The Wappo occupied the upper Napa Valley, extending from above the present day cities of Napa and Sonoma in the south to Cloverdale and Middletown in the north.^{6 7 8} The name *Wappo* is believed to be derived from the Americanization of the Spanish word *guapo* meaning harsh, severe, daring, brave, or handsome.^{9 10}

The Wappo language is one of four languages in the Yukian language stock found in the North California Coast.^{11 12} The Proto-Yukians are thought to have been the first inhabitants of the North Coast Ranges, occupying the region from the San Francisco Bay to the Klamath Mountains. After various population shifts, the Wappo eventually came to occupy a more restricted area.

Many Native Americans were baptized by the Franciscan mission system in Mission San Francisco de Asis in 1821, Mission San Raphael in 1822 and 1823, and Mission San Francisco Solano in 1825 and 1832.¹³ In 1834, the Franciscan mission system was officially secularized, and the majority of the mission Native population dispersed to local ranches, villages, or nearby pueblos. Indigenous labor was used by early Spanish settlers, such as Vallejo, to work on their ranchos.

PREHISTORIC SETTING

Native American occupation and use of the North Coast Ranges region appears to extend to at least the end of the Pleistocene, roughly 10,000 to 11,000 years ago. The earliest extensive surveys in Sonoma County were conducted by Jesse Peter beginning in 1903.¹⁴ In 1921, Peter directed the excavation of CA-SON-84 near the Annadel obsidian source, finding evidence of seasonal occupation over a long period of time. In Napa County, D.T. Davis recorded sites within the Wappo territory including CA-NAP-1 on the west bank of the Napa River. This site was later found to correspond to

⁶ Wappo in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, J.O. Sawyer, 1978

⁷ *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769-1810*. R. Milliken, 1995.

⁸ *California Archaeology*, M.J. Moratto, 1984.

⁹ Wappo in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, J.O. Sawyer, 1978

¹⁰ *An Archaeological Survey of the Graywood Ranch near Kenwood, Sonoma County, California*, R.A Stradford and D. A. Fredrickson, 1976.

¹¹ *California Archaeology*, M.J. Moratto, 1984.

¹² Wappo in *Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8*, J.O. Sawyer, 1978

¹³ *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769-1810*. R. Milliken, 1995.

¹⁴ *California Archaeology*, M.J. Moratto, 1984.

the early Berkeley Pattern which can be identified throughout Sonoma, Napa and Southern Lake Counties.¹⁵

Based on this and other work, a tentative scheme has been developed which can be extrapolated to the present study area. Following the Paleoindian period, the earliest phase is the Borax Lake Aspect of the Borax Lake Pattern (5,000-8,000 years B.P.). This is followed by the Mendocino Aspect of the Borax Lake Pattern (3,000-5,000 years B.P.), followed by the Houx Aspect of the Berkeley Pattern (1,500-3,000 years B.P.), which is limited to the southern portion of the North Coast Ranges. The most recent period is the Augustine Pattern (1,500 years B.P.-historic period), with both a prehistoric and historic phase, which probably marks the appearance of Pomo society.

HISTORIC SETTING

Soon after the establishment of the mission system, the process of granting *ranchos* was begun. Large parcels of land were created and granted to prominent individuals, beginning in the Spanish Period and continuing throughout the Mexican Period. Within a few years, ranchos occupied large tracts of land in the vicinity of the missions, and a pastoral economy involving the missions, the ranchos, and Native inhabitants was established.

In 1833, Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, Commander of the Presidio of San Francisco, was sent to the lands north of the San Francisco Bay by Governor Jose Figueroa to establish settlements in the fertile valleys. Vallejo was a *Californio* by birth, the son of Ignacio Vallejo who was a soldier at San Diego in 1775 and thereafter resided in Monterey.¹⁶ Governor Figueroa greatly expanded Vallejo's power and appointed him to the position of Military Commander and Director of Colonization of the Northern Frontier.¹⁷

With his new position, Vallejo was directed, as part of the secularization of the mission system by the Mexican government, to take charge of the mission in Sonoma and reduce it to the status of a parish church. In addition, Vallejo was to free the Indian laborers at the mission and distribute the lands and assets to the population at large. Vallejo established the major settlement of the northern frontier at Sonoma and laid out the town in 1835.¹⁸ Vallejo named the town after the Indian name of the area, which meant Valley of the Moon.¹⁹

As a reward for his efforts in the North Bay and also to encourage the development and settlement of this frontier region, Governor Figueroa granted Vallejo ten leagues (approximately 44,000 acres) of land primarily in the Petaluma Valley. The *Wolf House Inn* project site lies at the southernmost end of Vallejo's Rancho Petaluma. Although Vallejo's personal rancho was centered in Petaluma, he made his home in Sonoma. Vallejo surveyed and established the Pueblo of Sonoma, provided land grants in

¹⁵ *California Archaeology*, M.J. Moratto, 1984.

¹⁶ *The Census of 1790: A Demographic History of Colonial California*, W.M. Mason, 1998.

¹⁷ *Historic Spots in California*, M.B. Hoover et al., 1970.

¹⁸ *Historic Spots in California*, M.B. Hoover et al., 1970.

¹⁹ *The Spanish West*, G.G. Daniels, 1976.

the area to private citizens, and also directed the military affairs of the region. The 1860 plat map of the Petaluma Rancho shows Vallejo's sawmill which is located on the parcel adjacent to the *Wolf House Inn* project site. The sawmill was constructed by Vallejo in 1852.²⁰

The latter half of the nineteenth century saw a continued Anglo-American immigration into the San Francisco Bay area, and consequent changes in the culture and economy of the area. Anglo-American culture steadily became the predominant influence in California, though Hispanic culture continued to exist. Dispersed farmsteads slowly replaced the immense Mexican ranchos.

Vallejo sold off the parcel which contained the sawmill to Joshua Chauvet in 1856.²¹ The 1867 Map of Sonoma County has a flour mill marked at the location of the sawmill while the 1877 Thompson and West map show a distillery. Chauvet added the flour mill which he subsequently discontinued opting for a winery. In 1881, Chauvet built a three-story cement and stone building for his winery.²² Also in 1881, a railroad was constructed on the east side of Sonoma Creek which allowed Chauvet to move his wine to the railroad via a bridge across the creek. The Glen Ellen winery was operated by Chauvet until the early 1900s when the property was sold to the Pagani family. The Glen Ellen Winery continued to operate until the 1940s when the property was sold to Charles Beardsley and his partner. The winemaking operation was discontinued and the buildings were used as a restaurant and a center for artists.²³ One of the stone and concrete buildings built by Chauvet was demolished in 1985-86. The renovated 1856 sawmill and waterwheel still remain as part of the Jack London Village shop complex.

Following Anglo-American expansion, Sonoma Valley became an important agricultural region. Vineyards and wineries, and more recently tourism, continue to be important industries in Sonoma County.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

A record and information search of the project site was conducted with the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at Sonoma State University on December 13, 2005. This included a review of: National Register of Historic Places (Directory of Determinations of Eligibility; California Office of Historic Preservation, Volumes I and II, 2001); California Inventory of Historic Resources (State of California 1976); California Historical Landmarks (State of California, 1996); California Points of Historical Interest listing (State of California, 1992); Historic Property Data File (State of California, 2005); CALTRANS State and Local Bridge Survey (State of California, 1989); Survey of Surveys (State of California, 1989); and, other pertinent historic data on file with Pacific Legacy (e.g., Plat maps).

²⁰ *Cultural Resources Element for the Jack London Village Development, Glen Ellen, Sonoma County, California*, S. Stewart, 1987 [Study #9474 on file at the NWIC, Sonoma State University]

²¹ *Cultural Resources Element for the Jack London Village Development, Glen Ellen, Sonoma County, California*, S. Stewart, 1987 [Study #9474 on file at the NWIC, Sonoma State University]

²² *Cultural Resources Element for the Jack London Village Development, Glen Ellen, Sonoma County, California*, S. Stewart, 1987 [Study #9474 on file at the NWIC, Sonoma State University]

²³ *Cultural Resources Element for the Jack London Village Development, Glen Ellen, Sonoma County, California*, S. Stewart, 1987 [Study #9474 on file at the NWIC, Sonoma State University]

The record search did not result in the identification of any previously recorded cultural resources on the north parcel (i.e., APN 054-070-32). The Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for Sonoma County lists three properties on the central parcel of the Jack London Village (i.e., 14301 Arnold Drive). This includes the Glen Ellen Mill and Winery Stone Structure (No. 2891), the Glen Ellen Mill and Winery Building (No. 2892), and the Glen Ellen Mill and Winery Waterwheel (No. 2893). These structures have been assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code of "7" which means these properties have not been evaluated either for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or they need to be reevaluated. This does not preclude them from being on either registry. The structures located at 14301 Arnold Drive were placed on the Sonoma County Historic Landmarks list in January 1981 by resolution of the County Board of Supervisors. One of the buildings, the stone and concrete structure, was demolished in 1985-86.²⁴

Two prehistoric sites, CA-SON-113 and CA-SON-989, were noted as within one half mile of the project site. These are not within the parcel proposed for development. Two historic bridges, one crossing Calabazas Creek and the other over Sonoma Creek, have been recorded within one half mile of the project site. These lie to the north and south of the project site.

In 1987, a Cultural Resources element was prepared for the Jack London Village Development.²⁵ The study area encompassed the north, central, and south parcels (i.e., APN 054-070-30, APN 054-070-31, and APN 054-070-32). No field work was undertaken for the project. The study noted that the renovated mill and waterwheel were within the Jack London Village study area on parcels 30 and 31. The study concluded that the development was in an area of considerable prehistoric and historic archaeological sensitivity with a high probability for prehistoric sites due to the parcels location adjacent to Sonoma Creek and confluence of two streams. The potential for subsurface deposits was noted due to the significance of the historic structures in and around the study. The study recommended intensive surface reconnaissance after the removal of fill soils and before construction.

A surface survey of the north parcel (i.e., APN 054-070-032) was conducted by the EIR consultant John Holson of Pacific Legacy on January 19, 2006. Approximately 50 percent of the southern portion of this parcel is an asphalt parking lot. The remaining ground was previously graded and covered with a layer of gravel that obscured the native soil in the area. An examination of the geotechnical report noted four bores in the area of the proposed structure. The report concludes that the northeastern portion of the site is covered with fill which varies in depth. Fill material with cobble zones was recorded to depths of seven feet. Along the Sonoma Creek bank, native soils are visible in some areas. The bank area has been graded and fill soils were pushed towards the creek. Presently, a graded sewer easement exists mid-slope on the Sonoma Creek bank. Overall visibility was poor and the area has been graded extensively. The low water mark of the creek bank could not be inspected due to the steepness of the terrain and high water.

All visible soils were inspected for evidence of cultural resources including midden soil, fire-altered rock, flakes, shell, bone, and other prehistoric and historic artifacts. Soil at the project site was a dark brown sandy loam that was moderately compact with small cobbles and angular and subangular pebbles. In the undeveloped parcel to the north of the parking lot, modern debris was noted, including

²⁴ Referenced materials were vague about which structure was demolished, but it is believed to be Structure No. 2891.

²⁵ *Cultural Resources Element for the Jack London Village Development, Glen Ellen, Sonoma County, California*, S. Stewart, 1987 [Study #9474 on file at the NWIC, Sonoma State University]

clear and colored bottle glass, plastic, cloth, and metal items. No historic or prehistoric cultural materials were noted.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

The EIR consultant requested a search of the *Sacred Lands Inventory* maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in December 2005. Records review by the NAHC indicated that no known sacred sites exist within the project site.²⁶ Additional information was requested from members of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and Ya-Ka-Ama Indian Education. A response from the Federated Indians of the Graton Rancheria indicated that no known sacred sites are within the project area but recommended that they be kept informed of the project schedule and plans.²⁷ Due to the potential for the discovery of prehistoric resources, it was further recommended a Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities.

County staff conducted additional consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria as required by California Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) for projects involving General Plan Amendments in August 2007. Tribal representatives submitted a list of sacred plants native to the Glen Ellen that they requested be preserved if present at the project site. *Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities of Section 5.6 Biological Resources* addresses project impacts and recommended mitigation with respect to removal of native vegetation.

²⁶ Letter to John Holson, Pacific Legacy from Debbie Pilas-Treadway, North American Heritage Commission, December 16, 2005.

²⁷ Letter to John Holson, Pacific Legacy from Gene Buvelot, Federated Indians of the Graton Rancheria, January 25, 2006.

Cultural Resources – Significance Criteria

The cultural resources analysis uses criteria from the *State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines)*. According to these criteria, the project would have a significant cultural resources impact if it:

- Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource;
- Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; or
- Disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries.

Definitions of *substantial adverse change*, *historical resource*, and *archaeological resource* are summarized below:

Substantial Adverse Change

Substantial adverse change is defined as:

- Physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired; or
- Demolition or material alteration in an adverse manner of those physical characteristics of an historical resource which convey its historical significance and justify its inclusion in or eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, inclusion in a local register, or identification in an historical resources survey.

Historical Resource

Historical resource is defined as:

- A resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (mandatory significance); or
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey unless the preponderance of evidence suggests it is not significant (i.e., presumptive significance).

A historical resource still may be considered significant in the absence of a federal, State, or local listing if substantial evidence demonstrates its significance (i.e., discretionary significance). This includes any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Generally, a resource shall be historically significant if it:

- Associates with events which made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Associates with the lives of people important in our past;

- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Yields or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Archaeological Resource

The *State CEQA Guidelines* state that CEQA applies to effects on archaeological sites and direct that, when a project would impact an archaeological site, the lead agency should first determine whether the site is an historic resource as defined immediately above or whether it meets the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” contained in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code. *Unique archaeological resource* refers to an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability it:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Cultural Resources – Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 5.9-1 Potential Subsurface Cultural Deposits

While no discernible impacts to subsurface cultural resources including human remains are anticipated, the possibility cannot be precluded that prehistoric cultural deposits and features are present below the ground surface and could be damaged during land alteration activities. This would be a potentially significant impact.

The record review, site survey, and Native American consultation did not result in the identification of any ethnographic, prehistoric or historic sites within the north parcel of the *Wolf House Inn* project site. While the subject parcel has been subjected to grading, filling or other land altering activities, buried or otherwise obscured cultural resources associated with prehistoric and historic period use of the area may still exist.²⁸

While no archaeological sites were identified as a result of this study, ground-disturbing activities could disturb previously unidentified buried or otherwise obscured cultural deposits and result in the loss of integrity of cultural deposits and the loss of information. Such adverse changes would represent a significant cultural resources impact.

Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 The following mitigation measure would be required to mitigate potential significant cultural resources impacts:

- Workers involved in ground disturbing activities shall be trained in the recognition of archaeological resources (e.g., historic and prehistoric artifacts typical of the general area), procedures to report such discoveries, and other appropriate protocols to ensure that construction activities avoid or minimize impacts to potentially significant cultural resources;
- In the event that archaeological artifacts, features or other cultural deposits are encountered during future grading, excavating, or other land alterations, stop all work in the immediate vicinity of the find until the discovery area can be evaluated by an archaeologist. This would include prehistoric and historic materials. Depending on the extent and cultural composition of the discovered materials, it may be advisable to have subsequent excavation monitored by an archaeologist who would be ready to record, recover, and / or protect significant cultural materials from further damage. In the case of prehistoric resources, consultation with interested Native American groups is advised; and
- In the event that human skeletal remains are discovered anywhere on the site, discontinue work in the vicinity of the discovery and contact the Sonoma County Coroner. If skeletal remains are found to be prehistoric Native American (not modern), the Coroner shall call the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento within 24 hours who will identify the person(s) it believes to be the "Most Likely Descendant" of the deceased Native American. The Most Likely Descendant would be responsible for recommending the disposition and treatment of the remains. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the

²⁸ See *Section 5.7 Geology and Soils* for additional information regarding on-site soils.

excavation work for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Significance After Mitigation Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.9-1 would reduce potential adverse effects to subsurface cultural deposits to a less-than-significant impact.

Responsibility and Monitoring The applicant would be responsible for including this measure in the contracts of all contractors engaged in applicant-implemented construction. In the event that prehistoric archaeological resources are discovered, local Native American organizations should be consulted and involved in making resource management decisions. All applicable State and local requirements concerning the handling and disposition of archaeological finds should be strictly enforced.

Impact 5.9-2 Historical Structures of Glen Ellen

Development of the proposed Wolf House Inn project would not result in adverse changes to identified historical resources located in Jack London Village: Glen Ellen Mill, Winery Building, and Winery Waterwheel. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

Record review and site survey did not result in the identification of any historic resources within the *Wolf House Inn* project site (i.e., the northern parcel of the Jack London village). As previously discussed, two identified historic period resources exist adjacent to the project site on the central parcel of the Jack London Village. These resources are associated with commercial development in Glen Ellen beginning in 1852 and are currently used for commercial purposes in Jack London Village. Grading and construction activities for the proposed *Wolf House Inn* would occur on the north parcel and would not result in any adverse changes to these resources. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 5.9-2 No mitigation would be required.