APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES RESEARCH AT THE GLEN COVE WATERFRONT PARK, VALLEJO, SOLANO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

PRESENTED TO: LANDPEOPLE
638 ½ FIRST STREET
BENICIA, CALIFORNIA

PREPARED BY: MILEY PAUL HOLMAN
HOLMAN & ASSOCIATES
3615 FOLSOM STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

APRIL, 2005

SCOPE OF SERVICES

In accordance with an agreement signed between Holman & Associates and Landpeople in October, 2004, Holman & Associates agreed to conduct an updated reconnaissance-level investigation of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources Glen Cove Waterfront Park site. This study intended to address cultural resource issues related to CEQA that may by of concern to local stakeholders and/or state agencies, including funding agencies. The study includes the following tasks:

a. Conduct update cultural resources literature review, including search of the California Historical Resources Information System.

b. Review documents from the previous Master Plan or obtained elsewhere regarding the Stremmel mansion's historical significance.

c. Review conceptual plans and potential uses to comment on the potential impacts to cultural resources pertinent to CEQA.

d. Conduct a field inspection to confirm existing conditions on the site.

e. Provide recommendations for mitigation of potential impacts to all cultural resources that could result from the park use and improvement. This will include an evaluation of the potential presence of Native American cultural resources at the mansion site, and, if pertinent any impacts of demolition of the mansion and new uses on those resources.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY

An archaeological literature review was conducted for this project at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) on November 9, 2004 (file no. 04-439). Records and reports available at the NWIC and in the possession of the Greater Vallejo Recreation District chronicle an almost 100 year interest in the archaeological resources of the park. Interest in the Native American village, CA-Sol-236, dates back almost another 100 years to the beginning of the 19th century when the inhabitants came into direct contact with the Mission system.

Renewed concern about the cultural resources inside the park, both prehistoric and historic, is being driven by the development of a new master plan for its development. Any proposals to remove and/or renovate the main house and to alter elements of its historical setting may not only damage these potentially significant historical resources, but may in the process also damage the prehistoric archaeological resource, Sol-236, which has been recorded throughout a large section of the park property. Previous archaeological researchers have also pointed out the possibility that ground disturbance may also uncover unrecorded historic deposits as well.

For those interested in the park and how a new master plan may affect cultural resources, it is necessary to present a chronology of the work which has been done on site since at least 1907, when the archaeological site was first formally recorded. A flurry of archaeological research began after the land was acquired for a park in the mid 1980s, culminating in the early 1990s when a large scale building removal program was completed.

While each successive researcher has added something to our understanding of the historical and prehistoric resources inside the park, this understanding is still incomplete and at times misleading. The following is a chronology of recorded research and interest in the site, followed with comments on how useful the information is to date in helping with the development of a new master plan.

1907: Glen Cove was first visited by N.C. Nelson who was then in the process of recording the major "shellmounds" of the Bay Area. Originally recorded as Number 236, Nelson produced a simple sketch map and provided notes which described the cultural soils (midden) found in close proximity to the existing main house location. The notes provide some additional information about its size, depth and constituents.

DISCUSSION: The Nelson Site form and notes did inspire researchers at U.C. Berkeley to visit the site (see below), resulting in excavation. In terms of mapping the site location or reaching a better understanding its scientific importance, the Nelson file was just a beginning step.

1912: L.L. Loud of U.C. Berkeley visited the site in 1912, evidently digging a 40 foot trench through the western edge of the archaeological deposit (Flynn 1985). A wealth of archaeological data and artifacts was recovered, along with human cremations and burials.

DISCUSSION: the Loud excavation led to the recovery of archaeological information which resided at Berkeley and which was used for at least two subsequent studies. It should be noted that the 40 foot trench also led to the destruction of a portion of the site. The exact location of this excavation is not currently known. Subsequent research (see below) done at Berkeley suggests that the University once held a considerable collection of archaeological materials and data from the site.

1916: E.W. Gifford of U.C. Berkeley cited his analysis of the shellfish constituents of Sol-236 in a paper he did on the composition of shellmounds, his attempt to estimate the age of the mounds based upon the buildup of its constituents. The ARS report produced in 1988 contains a short summary of Gifford's work.

DISCUSSION: Gifford's work was an early attempt to use constituent elements of the shell mound to estimate its age; carbon dating and other methods have supplanted this approach.

1954: Sol-236 once again appears in archaeological literature in Richard Beardsley's study of temporal and areal relationships of archaeological sites in Central California. The ARS (1988) report contains a summary of Beardsley's analysis of the materials retrieved by Loud in 1912.
DISCUSSION: The Beardsley report is the first to provide estimates of the age of the site based upon an analysis of artifacts and burials retrieved from the site–his estimate of a beginning date of around 400 A.D. through approximately 1500 A.D., and to link the site to observed cultural development patterns in Central California. His age estimate has held up with slight revisions by later researchers. The Beardsley report could also be considered sufficient documentation to demonstrate the eligibility of Sol-236 for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

1977: David Chavez and Miley Holman were hired to conduct a survey of the property as part of a larger CEQA generated environmental study. Access to the property at that time was blocked.

DISCUSSION: this report contributes nothing to our understanding of the cultural resources at Glen Cove, other than to note that the general area was already undergoing development.

1984: An archaeologist named Dan Foster visited the property to observe damage caused to Sol-236 by workers clearing the grounds for its new owners, the Greater Vallejo Recreation District (GVRD). Foster's visit led to the production of an amended archaeological site form and a new map showing where he felt the archaeological deposit was primarily located.

DISCUSSION: The accidental disturbance of the archaeological site led to a commitment by the Parks to include cultural resource issues in any future park planning activities, leading to the 1988 ARS research (see below).

1985: Peak & Associates, consulting archaeologists, visited the area to inspect the proposed location of a pump station and connector lines for the subdivision then planned just north of the park border. A visual inspection of the surface of the ground led them to recommend that the connector line be moved farther north; backhoe testing (the exact location unknown) failed to find midden in the connector line alternative location.

DISCUSSION: The Peak report unfortunately does not include maps showing exactly where they found midden north of the main house (and/or how far north it ran) which led them to recommend that the connector line be moved even farther north; it is assumed that the trench for the connector line (the chosen alternative) is outside of the park borders.

1985: In February, Dan Foster submitted a new map of his idea of where the borders of Sol-236 were located.

DISCUSSION: this map was prepared based upon a surface survey and from observations of damage done to the site by the park improvements done in late 1984; it was not done at the request of the GVRD.
1986: Peak & Associates revisited the archaeological site for an engineering firm after a human burial was uncovered west of the recorded site location (based both on the Nelson and Foster maps). They noted that the archaeological site extended considerably *west* of the border of the site as mapped by Foster. The midden was found under as much as 5 feet of fill when a new access road was being constructed to the condo complex then under construction. Peak then conducted backhoe testing 40 feet west of the observed midden, but failed to find any additional materials. A new map was produced which shows the extent of midden *only in the area graded for the new roadway.*

DISCUSSION: The Peak report and subsequent map pushed the border of Sol-236 west of that marked by Foster the preceding year, but did not resolve the issue of just how far the archaeological site did extend in that area, either inside or outside the park borders.

1986: Dan Foster prepared a site supplement for Sol-236, including a new site map produced by Pete Rhode, who observed the discovery of additional midden when grading for the adjacent condo complex was underway.

DISCUSSION: it is unclear if this midden still exists, or has been filled on. Based upon the Pete Rhode map, it corresponds to the general area noted by Peak in 1986, suggesting that a large portion of Sol-236 exists (or existed) west of the Nelson and 1984 Foster mapped locations, and that it may or may not extend outside of the park into private property.

1988: ARS was hired by the Greater Vallejo Recreation District to research the archaeological site for future planning purposes. The report discussed the scientific significance of the site based upon its 19th Century contact with the Mission system, and presented summaries of the research done there by Nelson, Gifford and Beardsley in the 20th Century.

Based upon a visual inspection and a limited program of hand augering, ARS provided GVRD with a new map showing their version of where "intact" versus "historically disturbed" midden could be found inside the project area. The report also discusses the historical building and use of the area, and speculated that there might be discrete historical archaeological deposits, including early American and possibly Chinese historical activity present.

The augering led ARS to conclude that the most significant (intact) portion of the site corresponded to the location originally recorded by N.C. Nelson, and that historic land alteration (in particular, the construction of the tennis court) had resulted in massive disturbance of the site as it headed north away from the shoreline and north of the main house, where it decreased rapidly in depth.

The report concluded with a comprehensive set of recommendations for future park planning. Working from a premise that it would be best to preserve the midden deposit whenever and wherever possible, they recommended that future removal of buildings, other improvements and intrusive landscaping elements be done in a manner which reduced and/or eliminated damage to the midden deposits in their currently recorded locations.

DISCUSSION: this report contains the first summary of archaeological research done at the site, and built the case for considering the site to be significant under then current CEQA guidelines. The recommendations for future park improvements are comprehensive and were designed to eliminate or greatly reduce impacts to the midden and/or possible historical archaeological resources regardless of whether or not they were found in what was considered "intact" midden or historically disturbed areas.

The map of Sol-236 showing new borders of the midden may not be useful for current planning purposes. The report lacks logs of the augering done, and does not note the depths at which midden stops and sterile soils are encountered, making it impossible to compute the volume of midden at any given point inside their new site borders. It is unclear for example, how much midden exists around the main house.

1991: ARS returned to the site in late 1990 to monitor the removal of landscape elements, pavement and buildings; at the completion of that work the only structures which remained were the main house, caretaker's house and the utility box to the east of them. The report states that GVRD followed their 1988 recommendations and limited impacts to midden in every way possible.

The report also concluded that observations of the building removal and specifically the removal of pavement from the tennis court validated their findings of where the archaeological site was located based upon their 1988 augering.

DISCUSSION:

In a discussion of their conclusions on where "intact" (and therefore scientifically more important) midden was located as opposed to "disturbed" midden, the report relies on a discussion of shellfish remains and their relative

size to differentiate between disturbed and intact material: the premise was that areas not disturbed historically will have larger shell fragments because they haven't been dragged around and thus broken up into smaller pieces.

Recent research at a shell mound done by Holman & Associates (2000) in Marin County showed that shellfish remains can survive historic dumping without breaking into smaller pieces, in the process recreating what appears to the eye to be historically undisturbed midden. Observation at the Larkspur Landing site led to the conclusion that it can be difficult or impossible to tell the difference between intact and disturbed midden unless specific features are encountered: for example, articulated human or animal skeletons can only be found in an intact midden context; they won't survive historic displacement. Conversely historically disturbed shell midden often can only be defined as such by the discovery of architectural features and/or large amounts of historic materials *under layers of what appears as intact midden.* Gophers may be able to move a coke bottle to the bottom of a midden deposit, but not larger historic materials. Visual examination alone of shell midden is often an unreliable way of differentiating "intact" from "historically disturbed" shell deposits.

DESCRIPTION OF FIELD INSPECTION

A visual inspection of the park property was conducted by this author in November, 2004 in the presence of the park caretaker, Ray Reagan. The survey was done to visually verify the findings of ARS regarding their estimate of the aerial extent of the archaeological site in and around the project area.

The visual inspection was hampered by the presence of dense vegetation covering much of the area mapped by ARS as archaeological site. Shellfish remains however are to be found at numerous locations on the surface surrounding the main house; the spread of materials doesn't necessarily conform with the latest map produced by ARS in 1988 showing the aerial extent of the site.

DISCUSSION

While Holman & Associates was preparing this report GVRD was soliciting proposals for the re-use of the existing building. Variations on such proposals could include renovation and/or removal of the building itself along with the caretaker's house and the restoration of the grounds to a natural landscape, utilizing existing vegetation and/or removing trees and other plants which have been introduced historically.

Of primary concern to this author is the possible re-use and rehabilitation of the house, and/or its removal along with the caretaker's house. Roop (1991) asserted that his understanding of the aerial extent and depth of midden was demonstrated through their earlier hand augering program, and that the house was located on what was construed to be an edge of the archaeological deposit.

As stated earlier in this report, it is the opinion of this author that sufficient data does not exist to assess the impacts which may be caused to the archaeological site either by landscape alteration and/or the rehabilitation of the house and removal of the caretaker's house. Any removal of plants, architectural features or other forms of even surface grading may cause damage to intact archaeological deposits, and may unearth intact or disturbed human remains.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Future management plans for the park should start from the assumption that any alteration of the landscape inside the general borders of the archaeological site and for a buffer zone of approximately 50 feet outside the borders as mapped by ARS will impact the archaeological site. The degree to which impacts will occur will be based upon the extent existing soils will be disturbed, either by grading, grubbing up of plants and trees, and/or the removal of existing structures.

Any such plans should take into account the mitigation measures originally proposed by ARS to minimize damage: wherever possible foundations should be left in the ground and simply backfilled and covered over; trees should be removed to grade and then drilled to remove the stumps but should not be pulled; the roots will remove a large amount of the native soils surrounding them and thus could cause damage to the archaeological deposit.

For the sake of planning, it should be assumed that any areas containing shellfish remains are potentially intact archaeological deposits, and not historically redeposited materials. Hand excavation, the only reliable method of discerning between intact deposits and/or historically disturbed materials, may not be useful in telling the two deposits apart unless compelling historical deposits are encountered mixed up with the midden, and/or if intact cultural features (such as house floors, ash pits, artifact caches) or human or animal burials are encountered.

Of primary importance is the determination of the depth and aerial extent of midden around the house and caretaker's house: the ARS report lacks the information to verify their findings; a new program of mechanical subsurface presence/absence testing should be completed utilizing a 2 inch core sampler. This method of soil sampling does minimal damage to the soils, and removes a core in a column which aids in the interpretation of stratigraphy, without mixing materials as a hand auger or power auger does. Other methods, in particular ground penetrating radar, have not shown any ability to either identify midden and/or map its depth below the surface.

More accurate mapping of the archaeological site borders cannot completely eliminate damage which would occur even with the most careful removal of ground cover, trees and bushes and/or the two buildings. Mapping will aid in choosing the method of removal and help minimize damage: for example, the buildings could be removed by heavy equipment after a layer of fill has been placed over areas containing midden. Core sampling near the house (if it identifies midden deposits) will help gauge the depth of midden and aid in the design of less intrusive methods of removing the buildings themselves and/or architectural features which cannot be left in place for safety reasons.

REFERENCES CITED

Archaeological Resource Service
1988 AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF SOL-236, THE GLEN COVE SITE, WITHIN GLEN COVE WATERFRONT PARK FOR GREATER VALLEJO RECREATION DISTRICT. On file, Greater Vallejo Recreation District.

Beardsley, Richard K.
1954 Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology. Reports of the University of California Archaeological Survey, No. 24,25. University of California Archaeological Survey, Department of Anthropology, Berkeley.

Chavez, David
1977a ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF AREA 5 (GLEN COVE) CITY OF VALLEJO, SOLANO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. On file, Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sonoma State University S-5091.

1977b Archaeological site supplement for CA-Sol-236. ON file, NWIC. File no. P-48-000083

Conzelmann, Richard T.
1985 Letter report to William Seidel of the State Office of Historic Preservation regarding the need to consider cultural resources in an upcoming master plan for the park. On file, NWIC file no P-48-000083.

Flynn, Kathy
1985 Letter to Dan Foster regarding the excavation of a trench into Sol-236 by Loud. On file, NWIC file no. P-48-000083

Foster, Daniel
1985 Letter sent to William Seidel of the Office of Historic Preservation regarding report of damage to Sol-236. On file, NWIC, File no. P-48-000083.

1986 Archaeological site supplement for CA-Sol-236 demonstrating that the archaeological site extended into the adjacent recently constructed condominium project. On file, NWIC file no. P-48-000083

Holman & Associates
2000 ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS AT CA-MRN-255/H LARKSPUR, MARIN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. On file, NWIC

Hunter, Jim
2004 Letter sent to the Vallejo Inter-Tribal Council regarding archaeological materials seen at the Glen Cove site by the Yokuts Archaeological Advisory Team, Tule River Tribe, in May, 2004. On file, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

Myers, Larry
2004 Letter to the Tule River Tribal Council regarding assignment of the Glen Cove area to the tribal territory of the Patwin Tribe. On file, NAHC.

Nelson, N.C.
1907 Archaeological site form for CA-Sol-236, Nelson site #236. On file, NWIC.

Peak & Associates
1985 CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT OF THE GLEN COVE COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT DISTRICT SANITARY PUMP STATION NO.4, SOLANO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. On file, NWIC S-7671.

1986 Letter report regarding the discovery of skeletal material from the a graded area of the Glen Cove Subdivision, west of the recorded location of CA-Sol-236. On file, NWIC S-8192.

Peyron, Neil
2004 Letter to the Native American Heritage Commission claiming tribal affiliation of the Tule River Tribal Council to the Glen Cove site. On file, NAHC.

Reagan, Ray
2004 Personal communication regarding the history of grading and building removal inside the borders of CA-Sol-236.

Roop, William
1991 A REPORT ON DEMOLITION MONITORING IN THE VICINITY OF SOL-236, WITHIN THE GLEN COVE PARK SITE. On file, NWIC S-13428

Salzman, Sally
2000 Personal communication regarding excavation unit location at the Emeryville Shellmound.