
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR describes the cultural resources, both prehistoric and historic, and the paleontological resources existing or potentially existing on the project site. Prehistoric resources are those sites and artifacts associated with indigenous, non-Euroamerican populations, generally prior to contact with people of European descent. Historical resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region. Paleontological resources consist of the fossils of plants, animals, and other organisms, as well as the geological deposits in which fossils are found.

The extent to which development of the proposed project could remove, damage, or destroy existing cultural or paleontological resources is evaluated in this chapter. The Cultural Resources chapter is based on information in the Sonoma County General Plan,¹ the Sonoma County General Plan EIR,² the Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report prepared by James R. Allen,³ the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by Maximillian Neri of North Coast Resource Management, Inc. (NCRM),⁴ the archaeological investigation conducted by Tom Origer & Associates,⁵ and a supplemental investigation conducted by Tom. M. Origer & Associates.⁶ In conformance with California Government Code Section 6254.10 the cultural resources reports are not provided as appendices to this document to protect sensitive historical resources. The documents are on file with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and are available for the review by qualified persons.

Pertinent comments received in response to the DEIR for the proposed project have been considered in this analysis as well as the two additional archaeological reports prepared for the project site since the release of the DEIR for public review, both of which are not included as appendices to this Partially Recirculated DEIR due to their confidential nature.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is situated on and around the crest of Beatty Ridge, which separates the South Fork of the Gualala River and the Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River from Buckeye Creek and Buckeye Creek's tributaries. Beatty Ridge trends generally northwest to southeast, the portion located in the project site is approximately 700-800 feet above sea level. The ridge crest is relatively gentle with soils belonging primarily to the Goldridge and Hugo series. Goldridge soils are moderately well-drained fine sandy loams underlain with sandstone, while Hugo soils are well-drained gravelly loams underlain by sandstone and shale. In their natural state, Goldridge soils support forest trees including redwood, Douglas fir, baywood, and oak, and Hugo soils support Douglas fir, redwood, and California laurel. Historically, lands that contained these soils were used for timber, orchards, range, and pasture.

The project site consists of mixed grassland and young-growth redwood/Douglas fir forest, with a hardwood component including tanoak, pacific madrone, and various oak species. Historically, a large portion of the site was utilized as an apple orchard and for sheep grazing. Currently, the project site contains an old barn and the remnants of a sawmill. The site has remained fallow since approximately 1964.

Major creeks do not flow through the project area, although drainages forming the heads of several creeks are located throughout the site. Within the general project area, one location might have served as a fresh water source for prehistoric residents. The head of an unnamed creek located near the northeast corner of the property appears to contain a seep based on damp soils and the species of plants observed in that location.

The following discussion of the cultural and historical resources addresses both the paleontological and cultural artifacts potentially located on the project site. Paleontological artifacts are fossilized flora and fauna. Cultural artifacts are those that are related to human habitation, both pre- and post-European contact.

Paleontological History

The geology of the area consists of the Jurassic-Early Tertiary era Franciscan Complex soils overlain by the Pliocene era Ohlson Ranch soil formation. The relationship between the layers is not uniform, and in some areas weathering has exposed Franciscan soils. An extensive collection of marine fauna from the Ohlson Ranch Formation is curated at the California Academy of Sciences (CAS), Golden Gate Park, California, and the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) at U.C. Berkeley. A list of this fauna is included in the Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report. These fossils were collected by Charles G. Higgins and Charles E. Weaver, and studied by Joseph P. Beck. The fossil fauna collected from the Ohlson Ranch Formation to date are predominantly marine pelecypods, gastropods, and vertebrates (in particular, whale). During site investigation, burrows by marine organisms were encountered in the friable sandstone of the Ohlson Ranch Formation. Overlying soils encountered during the site investigation were dominantly 1-2 feet thick and consist of organic A-horizons.

Cultural Setting

Pre-Contact Native American History

Archaeological evidence indicates that human occupation of California began at least 12,000 years ago. Early occupants appear to have had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on extended family units. Later, milling technology and an acorn economy were introduced. As the economy diversified populations grew. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archaeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of trade goods (e.g., shell beads, obsidian tool stone), which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems.

At the time of European settlement, the study area was near the boundary between the Kashaya and Southern Pomo groups. Both groups lived similar lifestyles. In general, the Pomo peoples practiced a diversified hunter-gatherer strategy that exploited various resources according to seasonal availability and territorial access. The relatively rich environment had large carrying capacities that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures. The Pomo settled in large, permanent villages about which were distributed seasonal camps and task specific sites. Primary village sites were occupied throughout the year, and other sites were visited to procure particular resources that were especially abundant or available seasonally. Sites often were situated near fresh water sources and in areas where plant life and animal life were diverse and abundant.

The division between the various Pomo groups is based on distinct linguistic differences. Linguists Sally McLendon and Robert L. Oswalt cite E.W. Gifford in further defining the divisions present within each particular Pomo group: “[Each tribe was] divided into a number of small groups, which at one time or another have been called tribes, villages, village communities or tribelets. Each of these was completely autonomous and owned a tract of land that might or might not be exactly defined, but was substantially recognized by all neighboring communities. According to most informants, nearly every community spoke a slightly but perceptibly distinct subdialect (dialect of one of the seven languages). Each normally possessed a main settlement or village which in many of the groups appears to have been fixed for generations.”⁷

Settlement patterns and the tracts claimed by the various “village-communities” were largely dependent upon the terrain and ecology, with the size of the claim directly related to its ability to provide a suitable resource base. The wide variability in these factors resulted in far-flung communities in the more inhospitable regions and denser, more concentrated habitation in favorable areas such as along the major rivers and creeks. The coastal areas and inland oak forests were the favored source of foodstuffs, with the coastal redwood belt generally providing far less opportunities. Inland groups would make regular trips along various creeks and rivers, and larger ridgelines, as well as to the coast to gather the abundant shellfish, seaweed, and fish resources. Similarly, the large habitation sites such as villages tended to be concentrated on the major inland rivers or the coastal plains, with the interior and coastal ridges used only temporarily or periodically by the various groups; these latter types of use are generally reflected in smaller and potentially more specialized sites reflecting travel or area-specific hunting or gathering activities.

The terrain in the vicinity of Annapolis is generally much gentler and flatter than other inland areas associated with the North Coast Range, making the region somewhat unique and likely more attractive to prehistoric habitation. As such, the location and density of archaeological sites within this particular area may reflect patterns outside of the typical Northern Coastal habitation model. Thus, prehistoric archaeological evidence within the Kashaya Pomo region may actually reflect travel by more inland groups through the region.

Post-Contact History

The earliest documented European contact with the central or northern Pomo peoples was recorded by Colonel Redick McKee on an 1851 reconnaissance of the Russian River region. The Kashaya peoples were first contacted by the Russians associated with the Fort Ross colony of 1812 to 1841.

The significant growth of historical settlement began around 1860, with the coastal areas and interior regions around the Russian River quickly settled by homesteaders. Habitation gradually spread westward from the interior valleys and eastward from the coastal regions as timber harvesting and agriculture became established as the predominant industries.

The project area has been settled by non-Native American homesteaders since at least since 1875, as indicated in the records check; an 1875 Government Land Office (GLO) map depicts the presence of “Maling’s House” in the northeast corner of the THP area along the Annapolis Road. The same map also depicts the “trail from the coast;” the historic route is the same as the current Annapolis Road. The records survey also indicates the presence of historical barns in the northeast portion of the property and suggests that these may have some historical value. The barn and a small outbuilding were likely over 120 years in age and situated on the adjacent property; both were completely destroyed by fire in 2001. The remains of a fruit (apple) dryer is still present adjacent to Annapolis Road in the area where the barns stood.

The Annapolis Historical Society responded to the author’s request for any historical information with an initial letter dated August 12, 2000 describing a brief history of the property and a discussion of some of the known historical resources within the project vicinity. The letter noted the presence of two historical sawmills, the Horicon School and the Annapolis Cemetery. The author subsequently contacted the Historical Society to ascertain whether the locations of the two sawmills were specifically known and received a second response dated October 4, 2000. The second letter indicated that the two historic sawmills were present within the project area. Eventually, in the course of an unrelated project in the Annapolis vicinity, the author was able to meet with local landowner and historical society member Gary Craig and further discuss the presence of the two mills, the exact location of only one of which was known (the mill recorded herein as Artesa Site-06/H).

Timber Industry History

Lumber trade in California began as early as 1776 when timber was shipped from Monterey south to the Misión San Diego Alcalá. While this operation was not large scale, it was enough to supply the lumber needs of the state at that time. Some of the first sawmills in the state were in Sonoma County, the first water-powered mill on Mark West Creek (1834), and the first steam-powered mill near Bodega (1844).

As the population in California grew, so did the construction needs of the people. The lumber industry gradually grew over the next twenty years and in the late 1860s, large-scale logging operations began to be developed in Humboldt County (Cornford 1987:14-15). By the 1880s, investors from the other parts of the United States were beginning to take an interest in the potential profits that the lumber industry in California offered. The Korbel brothers of Sonoma County first created Humboldt Lumber Mill Company in 1883 and four years later investors from Nevada started the Pacific Lumber Company (Cornford 1987:14-15). Locals continued to own most of the mills along the Pacific Coast at this time, however small operations were often unable to compete with larger ones and eventually would sell to larger companies, or go bankrupt (Medin 1994:29).

Lumbering was a dangerous job which required long hours. Worker unrest was common. However, because of the somewhat transient nature of the mill employees, organizing unions and protest meetings was difficult (Medin 1994: 74). Mill owners also refused to acknowledge unions, putting out a statement in 1903 that they would not negotiate with them (Medin 1994:74). The statement was representative of the sentiment of the mill owners for nearly forty years. In spite of these difficulties, Humboldt County lumber workers were able to organize the first international union of lumber workers, the International Brotherhood of Woodsmen and Sawmill Workers (IBWSW) in 1905 (Cornford 1987:135). The Industrial Workers of the World came to town the same year (Medin 1994:75).

The first major labor issue that workers had was the length of the work day. Although the work day varied from mill to mill, the establishment of the 10-hour work day, down from 12-hours, was a major accomplishment (Cornford 1987:24). Throughout the early part of the twentieth century, unions continued to fight for the rights of their members, and mill owners continued to fight against their demands. It was not until the 1940s that unions began to be recognized by mills. This was possibly due to the smaller work force and increased demand brought on by World War II (Medin 1994:76-77).

In 1946 a major strike affected all of California lumbering and closed all the mills in Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte counties (Melendy 1952 cited in Medin 1994:77). However, other sources state that Arrow Mills continued operation after signing wage agreements with the Lumber and Sawmill Union, A.F. of L (Mendocino County Historical Society 1996:3). Although mills were able to hire on enough hands to resume business, the strike did not end until 1948. While unions were unable to obtain the demands made by their members, the strike showed mill owners that labor unions were here to stay. This helped change the mindset of mill owners, and after this point they began to work with unions to help solve hour and wage problems, safety issues, and improve living conditions (Medin 1994:78).

Although logging and milling slowed during the depression, World War II required significant resources which reinvigorated the industry. The boom that came after the war was over continued to support the lumber industry for many years (Mendocino County Historical Society 1996).

Onsite Mill History

The mills on the Artesa property would be considered small in relation to the industrial operations to the north. There were three phases of ownership for the on-site mills. The first mill was owned and operated by John Patchett, Harding Chenoweth, and Jim Peoples beginning in 1938. The mill employed approximately 22 men many of whom lived on site with their families year round. According to local residents this first mill closed around 1941.

The second generation operation likely began in 1946. The owner of the property, Merle Evans, entered into a contract with C. R. Gordon (SCRO 1946) who planned to harvest lumber on the property. At that time, Gordon was also given the right to make any improvements to the parcel needed to conduct his timber harvest. Further documentary evidence of Gordon's operation does not exist, and none of the local residents interviewed by Origer & Associates in April 2008 could

recall any milling activity during Gordon's five year lease. The possibility exists that Gordon's plans were thwarted by the 1946 lumber workers' strike.

The final phase of milling on the property was the Fish and Mullins Lumber Company, which operated from 1952 to about 1956. This operation appears to have been similar in scale to the Patchett, Chenoweth, and People's mill.

Archaeological Context

The northwestern region of Sonoma County has received little archaeological investigation beyond surface surveys. However, nearby localities, such as the Warm Springs Dam to the east and Salt Point State Park to the south have been the locations of several site investigations. Those studies, combined with regional investigations, have provided a basic chronology and understanding of local archaeology.

A regional chronology has been developed for the area, which clearly shows that native peoples have occupied the region for over 12,000 years, and during that time shifts took place in their social, political, and ideological regimes (Fredrickson 1984:506). In addition, a three-phase sequence has been defined for the Warm Springs Dam project area. The sequence emphasizes later occupation of the Warm Springs Dam area spanning a period from 5,000 years ago to the time of Euro-American settlement. The sequence relies heavily on obsidian, which is taken to be an indicator of exchange, neighbor interaction, and population movement. Research at archaeological sites along the Sonoma County Coast that has provided information regarding occupation and use of the coastal environment has been largely based on the importation/movement of interior resources (including obsidian) to the coast.

The current project area is located within a region that has experienced occupation over a long period, stretching from approximately 12,000 years ago until the present. During that time, a number of groups have moved in and out of the region and adapted their social-economic systems to a rich environment that included nearby coastal, riverine, and upland terrestrial resources.

Information generated by the numerous regional site investigations provided Fredrickson (1974, 1994) with data used to develop one of the more recent chronologies applicable to this portion of California's North Coast Ranges. The following chronology is based largely on Fredrickson's (1974, 1994) research with modifications based on recent research.

Emergent Period (approximately 200 – 1,000 years ago)

Upper Emergent Period characteristics include the appearance of the clam disk bead money economy. Local specialization in the production and exchange of goods increased as trade expanded in both volume of goods and distances traveled. South and central exchange systems were interpenetrated.

Lower Emergent Period characteristics included the introduction of the bow and arrow, which largely replaced the dart and atlatl. South coast marine adaptations flourished. Territorial

boundaries became well established, and regularized exchange between groups continued with increased goods being exchanged. Researchers have also found evidence of distinctions in social status within groups that is linked to increased wealth.

Archaic Period (approximately 1,000 – 8,000 years ago)

Upper Archaic Period characteristics include the growth of social-political complexity, including status distinctions based on wealth. Shell beads increased in importance during this period as they appear to serve as indicators of both exchange and wealth. Group-oriented religious organizations are also apparent, which may have been the origin of the Kuksu religious system. Exchange systems became more complex with regularized sustained exchanges occurring between groups. Territorial boundaries remained fluid as groups expanded and contracted.

Middle Archaic Period characteristics include a change in the climate, which became more benign. The economy became more diverse; including the introduction of acorn use as suggested by use of mortars and pestles. However, hunting was also important as evidenced by the abundance of dart tips. Groups were also increasingly sedentary as populations increased.

Lower Archaic Period characteristics include lakes drying due to climatic changes. Abundant milling stones suggest a strong emphasis on plants/small seeds for food, while relatively little hunting appears to have occurred. Limited exchange took place, and there was a reliance on the use of local materials. Wealth was not emphasized during this period, and the dominant social unit appears to be the extended family.

Paleoindian Period (approximately 8,000 – 12,000+ years ago)

Humans first entered California during the Paleoindian Period. Lakeside sites were established with a probable emphasis on hunting. This period is characterized by a lack of milling technology. Exchange of goods was conducted on a one-to-one basis and was not regularized. Social units consisted of extended families that were largely self-reliant, and moved to resources as they became available and were needed.

Existing Cultural Resources

Maximilian Neri Site Investigations

Six cultural sites were observed and recorded by Maximilian Neri during initial site investigations. Neri reported the condition of the six cultural sites as follows:

Artesa Site-01

Artesa Site-01 is a prehistoric site consisting of a dense shell midden deposit with groundstone and a few lithic artifacts. The site is located on a small semi-discreet bench between two seasonal drainages. Vegetation on site consists of seasonal grasses and a few redwood trees; unlike the historically cleared areas to the west and north, the site area appears to have been a natural meadow. A small perennial spring is located in the drainage to the southwest of the site.

Noted on site were thousands of shell fragments, extensive amounts of fire-cracked rock, several groundstone fragments and a few (15+/-) Franciscan chert flakes. Midden soils are a uniform dark brown and were easily distinguished from the surrounding light tan non-midden soils. The midden measures approximately 50 x 30 meters in size and may be up to one meter in depth and possibly even more.

Artesa Site-02

Artesa Site-02 is a prehistoric site consisting of a rather sparse lithic located on a small knoll top within a ridgeline. Vegetation on site is primarily manzanita and tan oak, and is indicative of extensive previous ground disturbance and timber harvesting. The Neri evaluation noted one lanceolate chert projectile point, 15+ Franciscan chert flakes, 5 obsidian flakes, one groundstone (mano) fragment, and several fragments of possibly fire-affected rock on site.

Artesa Site-03

Artesa Site-03 is a prehistoric site consisting of an extremely sparse scatter of Franciscan chert flakes (10+), two groundstone fragments and one Monterey chert biface fragment (designated Artesa Site-03-01). The site is located on the edge of a broad, gently sloping ridgeline, just to the north of a seasonal drainage; vegetation on site consists of seasonal grasses and a few old fruit trees, remnants of a much larger orchard that was originally present. Some portions of the site have suffered from severe topsoil erosion, with several incised channels and broad areas of exposed eroding sandstone bedrock; some artifacts are likely to have eroded away into the seasonal drainage to the south along with the topsoil.

Artesa Site-04

Artesa Site-04 is a prehistoric site consisting of a sparse scatter of Franciscan chert flakes (15 plus), one possible groundstone fragment, three obsidian flakes, one Monterey chert flake, and one Franciscan chert biface fragment. The site is located on a small knoll on the edge of a broad, gently sloping ridgeline, just to the east of a seasonal drainage. Vegetation on site consists of seasonal grasses, redwood trees and various shrubs, including whitethorn; a large and very dense brush patch obscures the central portion of the site, making effective investigation difficult. The entire site has suffered from mechanized impacts and probable agricultural impacts; a seasonal road passes along the eastern edge of the site and through the southern portion.

A small scatter of historical debris, including pottery, glass and metal fragments and auto parts, and a small pile of milled lumber are also present on site. The scatter of historic debris appears to represent a small dump rather than the location of historical activity or habitation.

Artesa Site-05

Artesa Site-05 is a prehistoric site consisting of a widely dispersed low-density lithic scatter located on the edge of a broad, flat ridgetop and bordered on the west by a steeply incised seasonal drainage. The site is situated on the ecotone between mixed hardwood and conifer

forest and some possibly natural meadow areas to the east. Observed on site were approximately 50+ Franciscan chert flakes, several small groundstone fragments, 5+ Monterey chert flakes, 20+ obsidian flakes and several fragments of probable fire cracked rock. The artifacts appear to be somewhat concentrated in the northern portion of the site in the vicinity of a cleared landing but this may be due to increased visibility in this portion of the site.

Mechanized equipment, timber harvesting and some landscaping have heavily impacted all portions of the site; the southeastern portion of the site is close to the historical mill recorded as Artesa Site-06/H that is likely responsible for most of these impacts. The second mill known to have been present in the vicinity may have been located within the site boundaries, however, clear evidence of such was not noted besides the numerous road and landscaped areas. Extensive amounts of more recent trash is present on and around the site area, including a 1960s Jaguar and other auto and truck remains, various logging debris and household trash generally dating to the 1960-70s.

Artesa Site-06H

Artesa Site-06H is a historical mill probably dating to the 1920-30s and located on top of a broad, flat ridgetop. All that remains of the site is an extremely decomposed foundation consisting of large redwood beams with some of the main floor joists still visible as well. Surrounding the foundation is extensive evidence of landscaping and grading, and the entire area adjacent to the mill has clearly been leveled as evidenced by large push piles of soils and some trash present mostly to the southwest of the mill. In addition various historical trash items are present, many in the above mentioned push piles, including iron pipe sections, clear and colored glass fragments, miscellaneous machinery and cable fragments, automotive parts and various food tin fragments.

An improved dirt road passes just south of the mill and a second much smaller collapsed structure that may be a garage is located adjacent to the road and roughly 120 feet southwest of the mill. This structure appears to be more recent than the mill itself despite the fact that the structure is completely collapsed, as the milled board fragments are much less deteriorated than the mill foundation.

Tom Origer & Associates Site Investigations

Based on Neri's descriptions, Tom Origer & Associates was contracted to conduct archaeological investigations of three of the previously discovered prehistoric archaeological sites referred to as Artesa Site-02, Artesa Site-03, and Artesa Site-05. Additionally, a historic/modern lumber mill site, Artesa Site-06H, was subjected to archival research, surface inspection, and mapping to assess the site's historical value. Artesa Site(s)-01 and -04 were not assessed by Tom Origer & Associates as they do not lie within the proposed development area.

Artesa Site-02

The matrix at Artesa Site-02 was generally a light-gray, fine sandy loam. Surface soil had a relatively loose texture; however, with depth the soil became more compact. The parent material

is sandstone. One hundred and twenty eight archaeological specimens were recovered from Artesa Site-02 by Tom Origer & Associates, including: one projectile point, three bifacially worked fragments, three edge modified pieces (EMPs), one chopper made of glaucophane (blue) schist, four grinding slab fragments, six handstones, one pestle, two Annadel obsidian flakes, two Borax Lake obsidian flakes, two Mt. Konocti obsidian flakes, and a large number of chert flakes.

Seven obsidian specimens were recovered at Artesa Site-02, and all were subjected to hydration band analysis. The information obtained from the dating indicates that the use of obsidian at Artesa Site-02 was relatively long in that the period of use spanned from the Middle Archaic through Emergent periods. The hydration measurement range suggests that site occupation ranged from approximately 2,600 to 450 years before present.

Artesa Site-03

The matrix at Artesa Site-03 is generally marked by gray sandy loam. The topsoil is underlain by a transition zone of decomposing sandstone that lies atop sandstone bedrock. Fifty-eight archaeological specimens were recovered from this site, including: two bifacially worked fragments, one EMP, ten Annadel obsidian specimens, 6 Borax Lake obsidian flakes, seven Mt. Konocti obsidian flakes, 22 Napa Valley obsidian flakes, and 10 chert flakes. Specimens were not found below 20cm within the site area, and of the 55 pieces of debitage, 30 were recovered from the ground surface and 25 were recovered from the ground surface down to 20 cm. Origer determined that the site was more substantial than as described by Neri.

Napa Valley obsidian dominates the collection and makes up slightly more than 50 percent of the obsidian debitage. The greater number of Napa Valley specimens, which represent a wider range of debitage types, suggest that the network responsible for transportation of this commodity across space was focused on this obsidian. The predominance of Napa Valley obsidian suggests that there was a relatively strong tie between the occupants of Artesa Site-03 and the people (Wappo) who controlled Napa Valley obsidian.

Twenty specimens were subjected to obsidian hydration dating. Based on the obsidian hydration dating the use of obsidian at Artesa Site-03 was relatively long. The activity spanned primarily from the Middle Archaic through Emergent periods, with emphasis during the Middle Archaic Period. The site occupation ranged from approximately 5,000 to 400 years before present.

Artesa Site-05

The site matrix at Artesa Site-05 generally was marked by deep brown loam soils that included roots and natural stone in low amounts. Generally, the soil strata appeared to be intact with only a small amount of disturbance to the uppermost stratum.

A total of 656 archaeological specimens (excluding the historic/modern items – see Artesa Site-06H Investigation Results) were recovered from Artesa Site-05. Included in the assemblage from this site were: three projectile points, 13 bifacially worked specimens, ten EMPs, four choppers, two mending pieces of a mortar, one pestle fragment, seven handstones, two mending pieces of a grinding slab, one net weight, a fragment of a steatite bowl, 41 Annadel obsidian flakes, 19

Borax Lake obsidian flakes, 65 Mt. Konocti flakes, 175 Napa Valley flakes, chert flakes, and a basalt flake. Steatite bowls are uncommon in this region. Origer found the site to be much more substantial than the “widely dispersed low-density lithic scatter” described by Neri.

Forty-five specimens were subjected to obsidian hydration dating. The measurements indicated that the specimens dated from the Upper Emergent Period to the Lower Archaic periods, a range of up to 7,800 years. Based on the measurements the use of obsidian at Artesa Site-05 was relatively long. The use spanned from the Middle Archaic through Emergent periods, with an emphasis in obsidian knapping/site occupation during the Upper Archaic. The overall site occupation range extended from approximately 5,000 to 200 years before present as estimated by Obsidian Hydration Dating. Possible trends appear with regard to the use of the sources over time. Obsidian from the Napa Valley source appears to dominate the Archaic Period occupation, while Annadel and Mt. Konocti obsidian dominate the Emergent Period occupation.

The findings clearly demonstrate that the site deposit has significant depth, with large numbers of specimens down to 70cm, and lesser numbers extending well below 100cm. Significant quantities of specimens are present across the site, primarily within the core area. Peripheral locations are marked by lower quantities of materials. Based on this investigation, the limits of Artesa Site-05 were adjusted to include a larger area than documented by Neri. The site boundaries were moved to the south and east.

Artesa Site-06H

Archival research with the Sonoma County Recorder’s Office found that the Patchett family owned the property from the 1890s to approximately 1943. The family used the property for fruit farming. John Patchett is listed as a "general farmer" age 31 in the 1920 census and as a "fruit farmer" in the 1930 census (U.S. Bureau of the Census).

The property was sold to a Merle Evans in 1945 (Sonoma County Recorder’s Office), and in 1946 Merle Evans entered into a contract with C. R. Gordon who planned to harvest lumber on the property. At that time, Gordon was also given the right to make any improvements to the parcel needed to conduct his timber harvest. Nothing specific was found regarding the construction of the mill; however, the mill and associated buildings likely date to the period of Gordon’s timber lease. Merle Evans died in 1947, and his wife, who inherited the property (Sonoma County Probate Records), sold the property to their son, George Evans.

Field examination of the site area found that Artesa Site-06H clearly overlapped with the prehistoric archaeological site, Artesa Site-05. Therefore, historic/modern materials recovered from Artesa Site-05 are considered part of Artesa Site-06H.

A variety of objects were found in relation to Artesa Site-05, including: a button, ceramic fragments, glass fragments, nails, rubber fragments, metal objects, shells, and logs with protruding spikes. The objects are attributed to historic use as food and beverage containers, or objects related to work done on the project site.

Supplemental Investigation Site

The 1943 USGS topographic map shows up to six houses that appear to be outside the boundaries of Artesa Site-05, but within the project area and in close proximity to the known lumber mill operations. The portion of the lumber mill site where associated residences appeared to be situated was subjected to a thorough surface examination in a search for historical remains associated with the mill workers' residences. In addition, a metal detector, probe, and pick and shovel were used to search for buried archaeological phenomena (e.g., artifact filled privy pits, trash deposits).

As a result of this work, two types of historic archaeological deposits were found that could satisfy criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) in that they could yield information about the area's history. One type of deposit consists of "sheet refuse" which is often a relatively dispersed scatter of archaeological materials that accumulates at building (in this case, residential) locations. The second type of deposit is marked by concentrations of archaeological specimens. This second type of phenomenon is best described as a "dump" or place where people deliberately discarded items.

The types of archaeological specimens found in sheet refuse scatters and dumps include fragments of flat (window) glass, fragments of glass containers (bottles and jars), fragments of ceramic items (i.e., plates, cups, saucers), ferrous nails (wire shanks), amorphous pieces of metal, and milled boards. A primary distinction made between sheet refuse and dumps is that sheet refuse often presents itself as a thin deposit at and near the ground surface, while, in contrast, dumps can be marked by an accumulation of archaeological materials with substantial depth to the deposit. Six locations where these two types of archaeological deposits are present have been identified within the project area. All six locations of these archaeological deposits are excluded from vineyard development.

Additional Archaeological Sites Identified During Origer & Associates July 2009 Surveys

Origer & Associates conducted subsequent field surveys, which resulted in comprehensive survey coverage of the entire project site conducted on July 16 and 17, 2009.⁸ The results of Origer & Associates' July 2009 surveys indicate that an additional six archaeological sites were identified for further consideration and analysis, five of which have been recommended for avoidance, as required in Mitigation Measure 3.5-2(e). See Impact Statement 3.5-2 below for a full discussion of these additional six sites and the mitigation measures set forth in this DEIR to ensure that the project does not result in adverse impacts to the five cultural resources considered potentially significant.

REGULATORY CONTEXT

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources on federal lands are protected under various laws relating to the protection of public properties; these laws are enforced through the issuance of permits by the

appropriate agencies.⁹ Even though CEQA requires the disclosure of impacts to cultural resources, paleontological resources existing on private property within California are generally unprotected under State law. Although such resources may be protected under local laws or regulations, the Sonoma County General Plan does not specifically address paleontological resources.

Cultural Resources

Federal, state, and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that could be affected by actions that they undertake or regulate. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the Antiquities Act, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are the principal federal and state laws governing preservation of historic and archaeological resources of national, regional, state, and local significance.

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and affords the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Council's implementation regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties," are found in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites that are listed on or have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The criteria for determining National Register eligibility are found in 36 CFR Part 60. Amendments to the Act (1986 and 1992) and subsequent revisions to the implementing regulations have, among other things, strengthened the provision for Native American consultation and participation in the Section 106 review process. Although federal agencies must follow federal regulations, most projects of private developers and landowners do not require this level of compliance. Federal regulations only apply in the private sector if a project requires a federal permit or if the project uses federal money.

Under NHPA, the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, material, handiwork, feeling, and association. Additionally, the National Register of Historic Places requires consideration of significance of any structure over 45 years old.

State

California Environmental Quality Act

State historic preservation regulations affecting this project include the statutes and guidelines contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Public Resources Code sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 and sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines). CEQA

requires lead agencies to carefully consider the potential effects of a project on historical resources. An “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant (Public Resources Code Section 5020.1).

Advice on procedures to identify such resources, evaluate their importance, and estimate potential effects is given in several agency publications such as the series produced by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).¹⁰ The technical advice series produced by OPR strongly recommends that Native American concerns and the concerns of other interested persons and corporate entities, including, but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associations and societies be solicited as part of the process of cultural resources inventory. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of the antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains.¹¹

California Register of Historical Resources

The State Historic Resources Commission oversees the administration of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) [Public Resources Code Section 5020.3(a)(8)]. Properties that are formally determined eligible for, or those that are listed on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP) are automatically listed on the CRHR, along with State Historical Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest [Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(d)(1)]. The CRHR can also include properties designated under certain local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys under certain circumstances [Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(d)(2-3)].

Senate Bill (SB) 18

Senate Bill 18, signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger in September 2004, requires cities and counties to notify and consult with California Native American Tribes about proposed adoption of, or changes to, general plans and specific plans for the purpose of protecting Traditional Tribal Cultural Places (“cultural places”). Interim tribal consultation guidelines were published by OPR on March 1, 2005. However, the proposed project does not fall under the SB 18 requirements as defined by OPR.

Local

Sonoma County General Plan

The following applicable goals, objectives, and policies are from the 1989 Sonoma County General Plan:

- Goal OS-9 Preserve significant archaeological and historical sites, which represent the ethnic, cultural, and economic groups that have lived and worked in Sonoma County.

- Objective OS-9.1 Encourage the preservation and conservation of historic structures by promoting their rehabilitation or adaptation to new uses.
- Objective OS-9.2 Encourage preservation of historic buildings or cemeteries by maintaining a Landmarks Commission to review projects, which may affect historic structures or other cultural resources.
- Objective OS-9.3 Encourage preservation of archaeological resources by reviewing all development projects in archaeologically sensitive areas.
- Policy OS-9c The County Landmarks Commission shall review Historic Building Surveys and make recommendations for designation of structures or cemeteries as county landmarks.
- Policy OS-9e Refer applications, which involve the removal, destruction or alteration of a structure or cemetery identified in a historic building survey to the Landmarks Commission for mitigation. Measures may include reuse, relocation, or photo-documentation.
- Policy OS-9f Refer applications for discretionary permits to the Northwest Information Center to determine if the project site might contain archaeological or historical resources. If a site is likely to have these resources, require a field survey and include mitigation measures if needed. Discourage paving over resources.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Standards of Significance

Paleontology

The proposed project would be considered to have a significant effect on paleontological resources if the project were to cause a substantial adverse change to one or more scientifically significant fossil deposits on the project site, as determined by a qualified paleontologist.

Cultural Resources

Federal

National Register of Historic Places Criteria

Under Section 106, the importance of an identified historic property, or archaeological site is evaluated in terms of NRHP criteria put forth in 36CFR60, as follows:

The quality of significance is present in properties that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- (a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (c) That embody the distinct characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

State

California Register of Historical Resources Criteria

For the purposes of CEQA, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). When a project will impact an archeological site or other cultural resource, the determination must be made whether the site is an historical resource [Public Resources Code Section 15064.5(c)(1)]. According to Public Resources Code Section 15064.5(a)(3), a historical resource is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, or cultural annals of California. Generally, the resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852). The applicable criteria for evaluating cultural resources is as follows:

- (a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- (b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

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

A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

California Forest Practice Rules Criteria

Additionally, 14 CCR Section 929.7 [949.7, 969.7] of the California Forest Practice Rules specifies that a determination of significance shall be made for an identified archaeological or historical site located within the site survey area of a timber harvesting plan (THP) if damaging effects from timber operations cannot be avoided. The determination of significance shall be based upon criteria defined for a “significant archaeological or historical site” found in 14 CCR Section 895.1, any information provided by Native Americans, archaeological, historical, or ethnographic data pertinent to the region or to the site, and the physical characteristics of the site. If required, a preliminary determination of significance shall be made by the Registered Professional Forester (RPF), or RPF’s supervised designee, and included in the Confidential Archaeological Addendum prepared for the THP. The Director of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection shall make the final determination of significance and substantial adverse change, based on advice of a professional archaeologist.

A significant archaeological or historical site is defined in the Forest Practice Rules (14 CCR Section 895.1) as follows:

A significant archaeological or historical site is a specific location, which may contain artifacts or objects and where evidence clearly demonstrates a high probability that the site meets one or more of the following criteria:

- (a) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions,
- (b) Has a special and particular quality such as the oldest or best available example of its type,
- (c) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person,
- (d) Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods, or

- (e) Has significant cultural or religious importance to Native Americans as defined in 14 CCR Section 895.1.

Method of Analysis

Paleontology

Paleontologist James R. Allen conducted a literature study and paleontological site investigation for the Fairfax Conversion/THP project. The site investigation took place on January 25, 2001. The results of the study and investigation are contained in the Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report dated March 25, 2001. The document addresses the paleontological sensitivity of the area proposed for conversion to vineyards.

Cultural Resources

A Cultural Resources Assessment for the project site was conducted by NCRM Consulting Archaeologist Maximillian Neri and is described in the “Confidential Addendum for Timber Operations on Non-federal Lands in California,” dated April 16, 2001, and revised June 19, 2001; December 17, 2001; and March 11, 2004. Prior to fieldwork, Mr. Neri conducted a literature review for the project area and requested a cultural resources records search by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University. Mr. Neri provided written notification of the proposed project to Native American individuals and/or groups included on the Sonoma County portions of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Native American Contact List on June 30, 2000 and May 25, 2001. Mr. Neri also contacted the Annapolis Historical Society regarding historical land uses on the project site, and received from them letters dated August 12, 2000 and October 4, 2000. Additionally, Mr. Neri met with local landowner and historical society member Gary Craig to discuss the presence of the two sawmills described in the historical record.

NCRM staff archaeologist Max Neri searched the project site for cultural resources. Ground visibility was generally fair in the wooded areas, and fair to poor in the grassy meadow areas. Numerous roads and skid trails were present throughout the wooded and grassy areas and provided the best opportunity for observing project soils. The areas of high archaeological sensitivity were investigated completely using pedestrian transects spaced between 20 and 30 meters, and random hoe scrapes. The areas of archaeological sensitivity included ridgelines, midslope benches, creek terraces, saddles, springs, riparian areas, and areas of moderately sloped ecotone transition.

Based on the sites identified by Mr. Neri’s fieldwork, a second field investigation was conducted by Tom M. Origer of Tom Origer & Associates. Archival research was conducted using the State Archives, Sonoma County Recorder’s Office, Sonoma County Assessor’s Office, Sonoma County Courts, County Library History Annex, communication with local residents, examination of old county maps and atlases, census data, and USGS topographic maps.

Fieldwork was conducted on September 8th through 15th, 2006, and September 26th through 29th, 2006 for Artesa Site-02, -03, -05, and -06H. Previously recorded prehistoric archaeological resources Artesa Site-02, -03, and -05 were subjected to the following investigation procedures leading to conclusions regarding their significance. Because Artesa Site-02, Artesa Site-03, and Artesa Site-05 were marked by chipped stone specimens and dubious “groundstone” items, Origer & Associates initially attempted to apply the California Archaeological Resource Identification and Data Acquisition Program (CARIDAP): Sparse Lithic Scatters, (Jackson et al. 1988; 1994) with the intention of treating these sites as sparse lithic scatters. Additionally,

- a. Each site area was mapped with the result being a map that included locations of excavation units, surface finds, and environmental features of note such as rock outcrops, trees, drainages, and springs.
- b. The surface of each site was examined and artifacts were flagged, mapped, and collected for analysis. Examination of the distribution of exposed archaeological materials guided the placement of excavation units.
- c. Based on information gathered from the sites’ surfaces and from information contained on Neri’s site record forms, 25 investigation units were excavated (eight at Artesa Site-02, six at Artesa Site-03, and 11 at Artesa Site-05) in arbitrary 10cm or 20cm levels or according to soil strata. The bulk of the soil removed from the units was screened with 6mm wire mesh; however, soils samples were processed with 3mm wire mesh to search for smaller objects. Soil samples represented approximately 20% of the level (by volume) from which they were taken. Cultural materials caught by the screens were bagged according to provenience (unit and depth below grade) and retained for laboratory processing and analysis.
- d. Standard processing and analysis of recovered specimens was completed and included: cleaning, sorting, classifying, cataloging, and preparing the collection for accessioning. However, the Kashia prefer to have the collection reburied on site if possible (Reno Franklin, personal communication). Analysis of recovered materials included obsidian sourcing and hydration dating, technical analysis of flaked stone debris, species determination of shellfish, and examination of the distribution of site constituents and site structure.

The sites had not been previously tested to determine their importance. Tasks completed at the sites were designed to accurately establish each site’s boundaries, depth, integrity, and contents.

A supplemental investigation was conducted on April 24 and 25, 2008, during which a crew of three archaeologists from Origer & Associates completed a field examination of the previously documented resource locations. Notes were made regarding current conditions at each location. Recording of the lumber mill sites was facilitated by thorough surface inspection. During the ground truthing process, which used a metal detector, probe, and pick and shovel, any archaeological deposits discovered were incorporated into the resource field sketch maps, and notes were taken. Interviews with knowledgeable local residents of the general area added information about the lumber milling activities, especially within the project site. All of the

information was incorporated into the site recording documents. Archival research also added information incorporated onto the DPR 523 forms. Because there was extensive overlap in the locations of mill features, a single record was completed for the two operations.

July 2009 Surveys

Since the release of the DEIR for public review, six previously unrecorded archaeological resources were identified during the June 2009 Pre-Harvest Inspection (PHI), which is a field meeting that is part of the Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) review process, involving the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as lead agency and other government regulatory agencies. One of these resources was discovered just outside of the project site boundaries, near project Unit 8c, on the Mendocino Redwood Company property, while the PHI attendees were inspecting the extreme southern corner of Unit 8c. More specifically, the site is a sparse scatter of stone tools and chipped stone tool-making debris located just beyond the southeast corner of the Artesa property in the southwest quarter of Section 18 (T10N;R13W). One large obsidian tool (bifacially worked) was made from Mt. Konocti obsidian, Lake County, California. Obsidian chipping debris from the Mt. Konocti obsidian source was also identified. Temporally diagnostic artifacts were not observed so no date of occupation can be assigned at this time. Alterations to the site area derived primarily from timber harvest and management activities (i.e., road construction and use).

During an additional follow-up field visit to the project site by CAL FIRE archaeologist Chuck Whatford and Reno Franklin, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) of the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria, another previously unidentified archaeological site was found, containing obsidian and chert flakes. Subsequent to this, Assistant THPO Walter Antone attended a follow-up PHI with Tom Origer of Tom Origer & Associates and Chuck Whatford, during which time the three additional locations were assessed. Based upon the findings made during the above-described field inspections, CAL FIRE Archaeologist Chuck Whatford decided that the 2001 archaeological survey of the project area was not sufficient for the proposed conversion project and requested that another archaeological survey of the project area be performed. As a result, Origer & Associates conducted a systematic archaeological field survey, which resulted in comprehensive survey coverage of the entire project site conducted on July 16 and 17, 2009, with the exception of two areas which were subjected to mixed-strategy survey due to the fact that they were covered by dense patches of brush (see more on this below under “November 2010 Surveys”). The results of Origer & Associates’ archaeological survey and site evaluations are presented in the Confidential Report prepared for CAL FIRE review and approval, entitled “An Archaeological Survey Report for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Harvesting Plan,” dated August 6, 2009. The reviewing CAL FIRE archaeologist provided comments on this report that Origer & Associates incorporated into the revised report cited above.

The goal of the July 2009 survey performed by Origer & Associates was to inspect the three additional locations identified during the PHI, as well as to survey all portions of the property where timberland conversion activities and/or timber harvesting are planned. Special attention was paid to those areas where archaeological specimens were found during the PHI. An intensive surface survey strategy was employed by surveying in a zig-zag pattern on transects approximately 20-25 meters wide. As noted above, dense vegetation prevented intensive survey

coverage in two portions of the project area. In these areas where the presence of very dense vegetation made conducting an intensive archaeological survey impractical, a mixed strategy survey was conducted by making forays into the brush, where possible, to examine the ground surface.

November 2010 Surveys¹²

In consideration of public comment on the DEIR, CAL FIRE requested that the applicant have their archaeologist conduct an intensive archaeological field survey of the two densely vegetated areas, which were surveyed using mixed-strategy survey techniques during the July 2009 field survey. The requested additional survey was conducted on November 10th and 11th, 2010 and focused upon a 5-acre block in the northern portion of the project area and a 15-acre block in the southern portion of the project area. To intensively survey these two dense brush locations, Origer & Associates initially proposed the use of a backhoe to flatten brush and create corridors in which the field crew could closely inspect the exposed the ground surface. After a few initial forays into the dense brush with the backhoe, it quickly became apparent that this method could not be employed without creating ground disturbance that would require a Native American monitor to be present per CAL FIRE directives. Consequently no further use of the backhoe was made during the remainder of the survey effort.

Once use of the backhoe clearing method was terminated, transects were subsequently made through the brush with loppers and other hand tools to clear the brush in locations with somewhat less dense vegetation. In the northern dense brush area (~5 acres) transects no more than 15 meters apart were traversed by a combination of clearing dense brush and crawling, as needed, to complete an intensive survey of the entire five-acre area. The same methods were applied to the southern dense brush area (~15 acres) with less success. Although the original intention was to conduct an intensive survey of the entire 15-acre area, the presence of very dense brush made this strategy impractical and infeasible. As a result, approximately three acres of the 15 acres were intensively surveyed. The remaining 12 acres were surveyed using a mixed strategy approach.

As part of the November 2010 survey effort, Origer & Associates also intensively examined subsurface soils ranging from four to eight inches deep that have become exposed in the road cut across the Wellman property and extending southwest into the project area west of Artesa Site-01. The road bed itself was examined where past construction, use and maintenance of it had cut into native soils and thus provided good ground surface visibility with a hoe and trowel used to clear small patches of low growing grasses and forbs as needed. No darkened soil or archaeological materials were observed on the surface of the approximately 500-foot long segment of existing project road that lies to the west of Artesa Site-01, indicating that the site does not extend to the existing road.

According to “A Supplemental Cultural Resources Survey for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Conversion, Sonoma County, CA,” dated December 15, 2010, no cultural resources were found during the recent survey of the two dense brush areas as described above, or within the road cut and running surface of the existing road segment previously described.

Summary of Archival Research

In 2000, when consulting archaeologist Max Neri conducted the initial record search for this project, he found no documentation on file at the NWIC that any portion of the project area had been surveyed, nor evidence that any sites had been previously recorded in the project area. In 2005 Neri submitted his report to the NWIC and it was assigned report number S- 26495. In 2006 an updated records check was conducted of the property by Tom Origer at the request of Jeff Longcrier, the Registered Professional Forester (RPF) contracted to prepare the timber harvesting plan (THP) for the Fairfax Conversion project. This records check showed that only Origer's 2006 study of specific sites within the study area had been conducted since 2000. This study was assigned report number S-33149 by the NWIC. In 2009 for the purposes of revising the survey of the property a records check was again conducted. This records check did not show any changes since 2006. In 2010 another record search was conducted which revealed documentation of Origer and Associates' 2009 survey of the project area, which resulted in the finding of an additional six resources above Neri's original six archaeological sites and 11 isolates (Origer 2009). This report was assigned number S-36197 by the NWIC.

Three ethnographic sites have been reported near Annapolis, and therefore, in the vicinity of the current project area (Barrett 1908). Barrett's (1908:225) description of the location of ca'mli places this old village approximately one mile south of Annapolis. Barrett's (1908:225) description of the location of koba'te places this old village approximately one mile west of Annapolis. Barrett's (1908:225) description of the location of ma'kawica places this old village northeast of Annapolis. Based upon Barrett's descriptions of these site locations, all three of these named villages appear to be outside the project area. Tribal scholar Otis Parrish has mapped several sites in the Kashia Pomo territory. He places sites qayéeli ("where manzanita is place") and k abát^hwi ("madrone fork") nearby, but outside of, the project area (Parrish 1996).

Review of Barrett's ethnographic information shows some three dozen named places within two miles of the coast with another 30 or so at interior locations. The densest concentration of named places lies approximately six miles north of Plantation where five old villages and one old camp site are shown within 2.5 miles of each other (see Barrett 1908: map titled Pomo Linguistic Stock). Two other concentrations of Barrett named places in Kashia Pomo territory are marked by concentrations of four places each. Near Annapolis, Barrett shows three named places within 2.5 miles of each other (see preceding paragraph). This suggests that, while there are important Native American sites in the vicinity of Annapolis, it is not a unique area in terms of archaeological and/or cultural site density.

Laboratory Procedures and Analyses

Procedures used to process cultural materials obtained ~~by~~ through subsurface field investigation at ~~the sites~~ Artesa Site-02, -03 and -05 included cleaning, sorting, classifying, and cataloging. Analyses included obsidian sourcing, obsidian hydration dating, and technical analysis of flaked stone debris. Additionally, the provenience of recovered specimens was examined to assess site integrity as well as depositional history and to search for patterns in the distribution of constituents. Discernment of intra-site patterns could lead to an understanding of the activities that took place at each site and where within the sites those activities took place.

Obsidian Sources

Archaeological studies have developed the ability to assign dates of manufacture and use through projectile point analysis. In addition, Origer's (1987) Masters Thesis provides basic data regarding hydration dating of obsidian specimens to establish approximate habitation dates. Obsidian specimens are often one of the few datable constituents consistently found at prehistoric archaeological sites in the region. All obsidian specimens were subjected to examination to determine their geologic origins. Most southern North Coast Ranges obsidian specimens possess macroscopic characteristics that allow them to be "sourced."

The main Annadel obsidian source is located just east of Santa Rosa approximately 45 miles southeast of Annapolis. Napa Valley obsidian could have derived from any of the source locations within Napa County from northwest of Calistoga south to the area around the town of St. Helena. These source localities are from 40 to 50 miles east-southeast of Annapolis.

Lake County obsidian sources are present on the east side of Clear Lake (the Borax Lake obsidian source) and south of Clear Lake (the Mt. Konocti obsidian source). Mt Konocti obsidian, approximately 35 miles northeast of Annapolis, is often black or grey with a high luster and occasional banding. Borax Lake obsidian, approximately 45 miles northeast of Annapolis, ranges from black to grey and can have surfaces that range from smooth to rough.

Obsidian Hydration Dating

Obsidian is a glassy volcanic stone that takes in moisture (hydrates) from its environment and develops what is known as a hydration band or rim. Hydration bands form at the surface of obsidian specimens and they enlarge as moisture "soaks" into a specimen's matrix. Hydration bands begin to form when a freshly created obsidian surface is exposed and enlarge over time. The rate of growth is dependent upon the chemistry of the obsidian and ambient temperature.

As a dating tool, obsidian hydration is based on the growth of hydration bands and an understanding of the rates at which they grow. Consequently, to establish a date the specimen must be assigned to a chemical source (sourced), the ambient temperature must be known, and the rate of hydration must be understood. Research by Origer (1987) provides the basic information needed to use obsidian hydration dating in project area.

Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.5-1 Impacts to paleontological resources.

Generally speaking, paleontological resources on private lands in California have less protection than prehistoric and historic cultural resources, which are protected by existing federal, State, and local laws and policies. The Sonoma County General Plan does not specifically address paleontological resources.

The Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report (p. 3) for the proposed project states that fossil localities have not been identified in the immediate project area. However, during the site investigation conducted by James R. Allen, burrows by marine organisms were encountered in the friable sandstone of the Ohlson Ranch Formation. This fossiliferous geological formation is covered by a thin 1-2 foot veneer of organic A-horizon soils on the project site.

If fossils were encountered during project implementation, they would be deemed significant for both scientific study and overall geologic history of this part of the Ohlson Ranch Formation. Because fossil-bearing geological strata underlie the project site, and currently unidentified, scientifically significant fossil deposits may be damaged or destroyed during project construction activities, the impact to paleontological resources would be considered *potentially significant*.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measures recommended in the Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report would reduce project impacts to a *less-than-significant* level by ensuring that any paleontological resources uncovered during earthmoving operations would be properly preserved and/or documented.

3.5-1 The applicant shall arrange for a qualified paleontologist to be on-site for two to three full days during the initiation of earthmoving activities on the project site. Following the two to three days of paleontological monitoring, the paleontologist shall meet with the earthmoving equipment operators and the project archaeologist, in order to train them in the identification of fossils potentially existing on the site.

In the event that any paleontological resources are discovered during vineyard development activities, the qualified paleontologist shall be immediately notified by the foreman supervising the excavation activities. The applicant shall provide the foreman with the paleontological contact information prior to initiation of construction activities. If loose, the fossils shall be set aside in a safe location for evaluation of significance by the paleontologist. If discovered within immovable bedrock, all work shall be halted in the vicinity of the find to the extent feasible, and the paleontologist shall be consulted in order to determine whether the find is an isolated example or part of a more complex resource. Upon determining the significance of the resource, the consulting paleontologist, in coordination with the Director of the County Permit and Resource Management Department, shall determine the appropriate actions to be taken. The appropriate measures may include as little as recording the resource with a recognized paleontological authority such as the University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), or as much as excavation, recording, and preservation of the resources that have outstanding paleontological significance. A note requiring compliance with this measure shall be indicated on construction drawings

and in construction contracts for the review and approval of the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits.

3.5-2 Impacts to prehistoric cultural resources.

The Northwest Information Center record search results indicated that the Fairfax Conversion Project site had not been previously surveyed, and that previously documented cultural resources did not exist on the site at the time of the record search. However, the records search noted that the project area should be considered to have a high likelihood of containing unrecorded prehistoric resources.

The NCRM Cultural Resources Assessment states that the archaeological survey resulted in the discovery of five prehistoric sites identified as Artesa Site-01, -02, -03, -04, and -05; as well as several isolates and noted finds. The various prehistoric resources discovered within the project area reflect both intensive and generalized use of the project area by prehistoric peoples. Of the five prehistoric archaeological sites Maximillian Neri recorded, consulting archaeologist Tom Origer evaluated only three, because at the time of the Origer investigations the site plan indicated that only three of the five would be impacted by the proposed project. Tom Origer & Associates conducted field research to better define the site limits and provide necessary information to assess the legal significance and integrity of archaeological sites -02, -03, and -05.

Archaeological Sites Identified as Ineligible for Listing

Artesa Site-03

The Artesa Site-03 is a prehistoric archaeological site. The site does not meet Criterion A(1) as the site does not have a demonstrable association with important events in our history. Criterion B(2) is also not met because the site is not associated with important individuals. Because the site does not have designed elements Criterion C(3) does not apply. Origer's investigation of the site revealed that it is marked by a paucity of archaeological specimens, which included chert and obsidian flakes, within a shallow matrix that had been previously disturbed by cultivation when this area was used as an orchard. The paucity of materials and lack of integrity indicate that the site does not have potential to yield data important in history or prehistory. Therefore, because the site does not meet Criterion D(4), it is not eligible for listing on the NRHP or the CRHR.

Archaeological Sites Identified as Eligible for Listing

Artesa Site-01

The Artesa Site-01 is a prehistoric archaeological site. The site does not meet Criterion A(1) as the site does not have a demonstrable association with important events in our

history. Criterion B(2) is also not met because the site is not associated with important individuals. Because the site has no designed elements, Criterion C(3) does not apply. The Artesa Site-01 appears to retain fair to excellent surface integrity, and the site is very likely to contain an extensive sub-surface archaeological deposit. ~~Furthermore, the site is very possibly the Kashaya Pomo ethnographic village of Kabatui, which is known to have been present in the general vicinity, and that human remains may be present.~~ Therefore, the site meets Criterion D(4) for inclusion on the NRHP and CRHR, and has good integrity. As a result, the site should be excluded from vineyard development. The proposed project would not adversely affect Artesa Site-01, as the proposed site plan has been designed to exclude the site from the development area.

Artesa Site-02

The Artesa Site-02 is a prehistoric archaeological site. The site does not meet Criterion A(1) as the site does not have a demonstrable association with important events in our history. Criterion B(2) is also not met because the site is not associated with important individuals. Because the site has no designed elements, Criterion C(3) does not apply. The site contains a wide range of specimens including projectile points, bifaces, unifacial tools, chipped stone tool manufacture waste debris (e.g., chert and obsidian flakes), and grinding implements such as handstones and grinding slabs. Therefore, the site meets Criterion D(4) for inclusion on the NRHP and CRHR, and has good integrity. As a result, the site should be excluded from vineyard development. The proposed project would not adversely affect Artesa Site-02, as the proposed site plan has been designed to exclude the site from the development area.

Artesa Site-04

The Artesa Site-04 is a prehistoric archaeological site. Based on observation of artifacts visible on the ground surface within the site Neri initially determined that the site exhibited poor surface integrity due to previous mechanized impacts and resulting erosion, especially the slopes descending to the drainage in the western portion of the site, and extensive sub-surface deposits are unlikely to be present. However, pending additional evaluation of the resource by scientific means, this prehistoric site must be considered significant according to Criterion A(1) as the site may have a demonstrable association with important events in our history. Criterion B(2) is not met because the site is not associated with important individuals. Because the site does not have designed elements Criterion C(3) does not apply. The lack of integrity indicates that the site does not have potential to yield data important in history or prehistory; therefore, the site does not meet Criterion D (4). However, as the site may be eligible under Criterion A(1), the site should be avoided. The proposed project would not adversely affect Artesa Site-04, as the proposed site plan has been designed to exclude the site from the development area.

Artesa Site-05

The Artesa Site-04 is a prehistoric archaeological site. The site does not meet Criterion A(1) as the site does not have a demonstrable association with important events in our history. Criterion B(2) is also not met because the site is not associated with important individuals. Because the site does not have designed elements Criterion C(3) does not apply. The site is marked by a relatively wide variety of artifacts including projectile points, bifacial tools, (e.g., knives), unifacial tools (e.g., scrapers), a grooved stone net weight, steatite bowl fragment, handstones, grinding slabs, abundant chert tool knapping debris, obsidian tool knapping debris. The abundance and variety of materials and deep site matrix that appears to extend below any near-surface ground disturbance suggest that this site retains integrity. Therefore, the site does meet Criterion D(4) and is eligible for listing on the NRHP and the CRHR. The proposed project would not adversely affect Artesa Site-05, as the proposed site plan has been designed to exclude the site from the development area.

Additional Archaeological Sites Identified During Origer & Associates' July 2009 Survey

The results of Origer & Associates' July 2009 survey indicate that an additional six locations were identified for further consideration and analysis, five of which have been recommended for avoidance. During the survey effort, the newly found archaeological sites located within portions of the project area where improvements are planned, were subjected to shovel test pit exploration to better understand site boundaries (in addition, several shovel test pits were placed in the vicinity of Neri's Noted Find 05 and Noted Find 06 -- characterized by him as isolated artifacts -- to verify that there was no site present at either location). These six archaeological sites are only described generally below, due to the sensitivity of the information:

1. Artesa Parking Site: The archaeological materials observed at this site have similarities to those observed at Artesa Site-02 (P-49-0003016) and Artesa Site-05 (P-49-0003019). Both of these sites were found to be significant under Criterion D (4) on the NRHP and the CRHR; therefore, it is possible that this additional site could qualify as well. In addition to the CRHR and NRHP criteria, the site is significant under Criterion (e) of the criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 895.1 (the California Forest Practice Rules). The work area limits for the project have been revised to exclude this small site from any disturbance during project implementation. These revised work area limits are reflected in the latest Vineyard Plan presented in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.
2. Bailing Wire Site. This site is located in one of the proposed reserves. The site has the potential to be significant under Criteria 1 and 4 of the CRHR, Criterion D of the NRHP, and Criterion (e) of the California Forest Practice

Rules. Because it is in a protected area excluded from development no further investigation or evaluation is warranted at this time.

3. Artesa Crossing Site. The archaeological materials observed at this site are similar to those observed at Artesa Site-02 (P-49-0003016) and Artesa Site-05 (P-49-0003019). Both of these sites were found to be significant under Criterion D (4) of the NRHP and the CRHR; therefore, it is possible this site could qualify as well. In addition to the CRHR and NRHP criteria, the site is significant under Criterion (e) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules. The work area limits for the project have been revised to exclude this small site from any disturbance. These revised work area limits are reflected in the latest Vineyard Plan presented in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.
4. End of the Day Site. The archaeological materials observed at this site are similar to those observed at Artesa Site-02 (P-49-0003016) and Artesa Site-05 (P-49-0003019). Because both of these sites were found to be significant under Criterion D (4) of the NRHP and the CRHR, it is possible this site could qualify as well. In addition to the CRHR and NRHP criteria, the site is significant under Criterion (e) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules. The work area limits for the project have been revised to exclude this small site from any disturbance. These revised work area limits are reflected in the latest Vineyard Plan presented in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.
5. Among the additional cultural resources identified during Origer and Associates' July 2009 survey was a series of fence segments, some of which are aged, yet many portions appear to have been modified since their original construction and/or are now in a state of disrepair. The type, condition, lengths and appearance of these fence segments have been documented and no further evaluation is warranted. None of the fence segments appears to meet NRHP, CRHR, or California Forest Practice Rules criteria for significance.
6. The 1943 Annapolis 7.5-minute topographic map shows a road intersecting with Annapolis Road at the same location as Red Fern Valley Road extending south along the ridge until it reaches the Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River. Field investigation of this road revealed that at about the 700-foot elevation line the road turns into a trail. Segments of this road are still extant within the project area and the remainder of the property. The portion of the road from its intersection with Annapolis Road through the property to the point where it turns west has been graded and widened. The remainder of the road through the property appears to have been modified during past logging activities and several segments of it are in disrepair.

Although no documentation for the road's purpose has been found, its functions were likely:

1. to provide access to portions of the property, possibly for logging
2. to provide access to a portion of the Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River

Historical research did not yield any evidence that the road was associated with any events which contributed to local or regional history. While it is possible the road was used historically for logging, no clear evidence of this was found. The finding that a trail leads from the road to the river suggests that at least one purpose of the road was to provide access to the Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala River. Based upon these factors Origer & Associates proposed that the road does not meet Criterion A of the NRHP, Criterion 1 of the CRHR, or Criterion (c) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules.

Historical research did yield any documentation that the road was specifically associated with any people found important to Annapolis, Sonoma County or California history, therefore Criterion (b) of the NRHP, Criterion 2 of the CRHR, and Criterion (c) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules has not been met.

Because the road is not a particularly good example of road construction, nor does it appear to contain any important information; it does not meet Criterion (c) of the NRHP, Criterion 3 of the CRHR, or Criterion (b) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules.

The road is unlikely to yield data or information important to the history of Annapolis, Sonoma County, or California; therefore, it does not meet Criterion (d) of the NRHP, Criterion 4 of the CRHR, or Criterion (d) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules.

The road as a physical, geographic feature does not contain information needed to answer important scientific research questions; therefore, Criterion (a) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules has not been met.

The road was not found to have significant cultural or religious importance to Native Americans as defined in 14 CCR § 895.1; therefore, Criterion (e) of the prescribed criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site

defined in Title 14 CCR Section 895.1 of the California Forest Practice Rules has not been met.

Consequently, the road does not meet NRHP, CRHR, or California Forest Practice Rules criteria for significance. Now that the road's description, condition and location have been documented, no further evaluation is warranted.

Conclusion

In summary, Artesa Site(s) -01, -02, -04 and -05 are important archaeological resources. As discussed previously the site plan shows that Artesa Site(s) -01, -02, -04 and -05 ~~have been~~ are to be avoided in the vineyard design and during implementation of the timberland conversion project development process. Therefore, the sites would not be impacted by development and vineyard activities. Artesa Site -03 was identified by the archaeological consultants as being ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP or the CRHR. It should also be noted that, according to *An Archaeological Survey Report for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Harvesting Plan,*" dated August 6, 2009 and revised May 6, 2010, in addition to Origer & Associates' evaluation using the CRHR and NRHP criteria, the site is not significant under any of the criteria for determining the significance of an archaeological or historic-era site listed in the California Forest Practice Rules. Walter Antone, Assistant THPO for the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria, has also indicated that the tribe does not consider the site important.

In addition, two prehistoric isolates and five noted prehistoric finds were documented in Maximilian Neri's Cultural Resources Assessment. The isolates consisted of a single obsidian leaf-shaped biface (probable projectile point) fragment and a single double-sided metate fragment, both of which were discovered along roads. The noted finds were observed throughout the project site and included various Franciscan chert flakes, a single possibly modified blue-schist cobble, and a single Clear Lake Basin obsidian flake. The various discoveries are considered to not have a measurable degree of potential significance, as they simply reflect the widespread prehistoric use of the project area. The discovery of isolated prehistoric artifacts is a common occurrence throughout the region, and the isolates and noted finds encountered within the project area do not constitute particularly unique or diagnostic artifact types. However, the two prehistoric isolates have been collected and will be protected from possible project impacts. ~~According to Neri,~~ proposed that none of the various isolates merit site- or area-specific mitigation measures, a finding that Origer and Associates confirmed.

Furthermore, the five additional archaeological sites identified by Origer & Associates and proposed as potentially significant during the July 2009 intensive re-survey of the entire project area will be protected via avoidance during project implementation, as set forth in Mitigation Measure 3.5-2(e) below. The currently proposed work area limits, as shown in the revised Vineyard Plan, ensure that these additional archaeological sites are not disturbed. As noted above, only two densely vegetated areas were not surveyed

intensively in July 2009 by Origer & Associates; however, 8 of the 20 densely vegetated acres were subsequently surveyed by Origer & Associates in November 2010 and no cultural resources were found (“A Supplemental Cultural Resources Survey for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Conversion, Sonoma County, CA,” December 15, 2010). Yet, because 12 densely vegetated acres of the project site remain surveyed at a level that is less than intensive, the applicant has excluded these 12 acres from vineyard development. This reduction in the vineyard acreage has been reflected on the latest version of the Vineyard Plan exhibit, which is included in Chapter 1, Introduction, of this Partially Recirculated DEIR (see Figure 1-1).

Based upon the number of prehistoric Native American archaeological sites identified within the study area, the potential for the sites to comprise an archaeological district was considered. While these sites reflect substantial use of the study area, and are likely related by cultural and temporal affiliation, they are a fraction of the number of sites known and reported within the greater Annapolis area. Guidelines for delineating district boundaries recommend that such boundaries should encompass "...the full extent of the significant resources and land area" making up the district (NPS 1991).

The distribution of known and reported archaeological sites in the Annapolis area, outside the Fairfax Conversion property, suggests that an appropriate boundary for an “Annapolis Archaeological District” would include the land above the 600-foot contour interval on both Beatty Ridge and Brushy Ridge. This would be consistent with guidelines for establishing district boundaries, which recommend using natural topographic features such as ridges, and for large properties suggests the use of USGS contour lines as boundaries (NPS 1991:56). However, the NPS guidelines preclude the creation of a district comprising only the sites within a specific study area. While the creation of an “Annapolis Archaeological District” could help to highlight the research potential of the archaeological resources in the area, state and federal laws call for avoidance of all known cultural resources to the extent feasible. At present there is a lack of sufficient data to link the various prehistoric sites temporally or thematically as a District. While such analyses could be performed, doing so would likely result in further disturbance to these sites that are to be avoided during project implementation. Therefore, creation of an archaeological district would not afford the sites greater protection than they will receive as individual recorded archaeological sites that have been determined to be potentially significant under one or more of the relevant criteria for significant archaeological and/or historic-era sites.

Although the known significant archaeological sites ~~on~~ within the project ~~site~~ area are to ~~would~~ be avoided during project implementation, other portions of the project site area could contain ~~further~~ additional significant prehistoric sites that have yet to be discovered. Furthermore, the potential exists that ~~unknown human remains exist on the project site.~~ Ground-related construction activities could result in the ~~uncovering of undiscovered~~ discovery of presently unidentified cultural resources ~~and/or human remains~~. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would could result in a ***potentially significant*** impact to unknown prehistoric cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce project impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

- 3.5-2(a) ~~*In the event that any buried cultural resources (including, but not limited to: chipped chert and obsidian stone tools and tool manufacture waste flakes; grinding and hammering implements that look like fist-sized river tumbled stones; and/or locally darkened soil with artifacts, deposits of marine shell, dietary bone) are discovered during vineyard development activities, all work shall be halted within 50 feet of the find and a qualified consulting archaeologist, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Region Headquarters Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) shall be consulted in order to evaluate the materials and offer recommendations for their treatment. The decision about how to proceed shall be made through consultation among the consulting archaeologist, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Region Headquarters Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO (or his designee) in coordination with the appropriate County representative. Appropriate treatment measures may include recording the resource with the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Inventory System database, data recovery excavation, analysis and reporting, and/or complete avoidance of the sites that have outstanding cultural or historic significance. A note requiring compliance with this measure shall be indicated on construction drawings and in construction contracts for the review and approval of the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits.*~~

Prior to beginning any timber and/or ground disturbing operations within 100 feet of any of the significant archaeological sites identified within and adjacent to the project area, the location of the fences to be constructed around them shall be determined through on-site consultation among the CAL FIRE Archaeologist, the project Registered Professional Forester (RPF), the project proponent's archaeological consultant and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee.

- 1. There is a possibility that prehistoric or historical cultural materials may be uncovered during operations. Should this occur, operations within 100 feet of the discovery shall stop, the CAL FIRE archaeologist notified, and the other provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented.*
- 2. No collection of artifacts or cultural materials by project personnel is allowed.*
- 3. The RPF of record shall communicate the above recommendations to the Licensed Timber Operator (LTO) prior to the start of operations.*

In keeping with applicable CEQA and Section 106 regulations, if archaeological site indicators are encountered during project implementation, work at the place of discovery shall be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds (14 CCR §15064.5 [f] and 36CFR60.4). Prehistoric archaeological site indicators include but are not limited to: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements (e.g., slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles); bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; and locally darkened midden soils. Midden soils may contain a combination of any of the previously listed items with the possible addition of bone and shell remains, and fire affected stones. Historic period archaeological site indicators generally include, but are not necessarily limited to: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps). When historic period archaeological site indicators are encountered ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the discovery location shall be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the find(s) (14 CCR §15064.5 [f]).

- 3.5-2(b) *In the event that human remains are found during vineyard development activities, the steps required by 14 CCR Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be carried out. All excavation or disturbance of the location and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall cease. The Sonoma County Coroner shall be immediately contacted. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American applicable law and regulation require the coroner ~~is then required~~ to contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. ~~The~~ Subsequently the Native American Heritage Commission is mandated to ~~shall~~ identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, regarding the treatment ~~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. A note requiring compliance with this measure shall be indicated on construction drawings and in construction contracts for the review and approval of the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits.*

- 3.5-2(c) A. Pursuant to 14 CCR § 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if/when the CAL FIRE Archaeologist, the consulting archaeologist, and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO (or his designee) agree that data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation for an archaeological site(s) discovered during project implementation, a data recovery

plan (DRP) that makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically important information from and about the site shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. The DRP shall, at a minimum, include:

1. A thorough description and current assessment of the condition of each site where data recovery is proposed.
2. A description of the project with the areas of direct impact identified and the relationship of these areas of direct impact to the known archaeological site(s) clearly stated.
3. A summary of the California Forest Practice Rules and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance situation and the management goals of the study, including, but not limited to, defining the areal extent of the site(s), describing the depth, range and characteristics of cultural material and natural strata present, and listing all cultural deposits sampled and/or excavated to date, to determine whether the cultural deposits possess the integrity and potential data to address questions important in prehistory or history, and to provide information necessary to establish what effect project implementation may have on these sites.
4. Identification and description of the portion of each site where data recovery is to be undertaken.
5. Identification and description of the portion of each site that will be destroyed without data recovery.
6. Pertinent background information on the environment, paleoenvironment, ethnography, archaeology and history, as appropriate, to demonstrate familiarity with the project area and type(s) of site(s) under study, and to provide a context for the discussion of relevant regional research topics.
7. The research questions/research topics relevant to the sites with an explanation of their importance to regional prehistory and/or history.
8. The expected data categories, how they relate to each topic and the sample size necessary to provide adequate cultural material for analysis.
9. Field and analysis methods to be used, with an explanation of their relevance to the research domains.
10. Methods for evaluating and treating newly identified values. [Note: because situations may arise or data be encountered which were not anticipated in the research design, adequate provision shall be made therein for modification of the program to address unforeseen discoveries and/or other unexpected circumstances.]
11. Archaeological sites found to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with applicable provisions of

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and through consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO (see also Mitigation Measure 3.5-2(b)).

12. Proposed disposition of recovered materials and records. Acceptable curation arrangements may include, but not necessarily be limited to:
 - a. Return to the landowner in accordance with State private property rights if that is the landowner's expressed desire, AFTER description, study, and analysis in accordance with the DRP/research design are complete;
 - b. Curation at a regional research center or appropriate public or private repository meeting the standards set forth in **Guidelines for the Curation of Archeological Collections** (State Historical Resources Commission 1993), provided reasonable access is guaranteed for future study]—following consultation about curation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO.
13. Consideration of non-archaeological concerns (e.g., cultural concerns expressed by the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO, the interests of the private property owner in maintaining the integrity of their property rights, any paleontological, geological, or related values that may be present in the site deposit(s); and/or the environmental integrity of the sites).

B. Before data recovery operations (and/or any subsurface archaeological treatment measures) are carried out, submit a draft of the DRP to the CAL FIRE Northern Region-Coast Area Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO and provide them a reasonable opportunity to review and comment. The DRP shall then be revised accordingly and a copy of the final DRP provided to the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO.

C. The CAL FIRE Archaeologist shall be notified a minimum of five (5) business days prior to beginning work under the terms of the approved DRP.

D. Once the DRP has been implemented, a final, confidential written archaeological report shall be prepared that contains, at a minimum, the reasons for the project, the data recovery plan, the methods employed in both field work and analysis, the data recovered, observations made, insights gained, conclusions reached, and a presentation of pertinent data. This report shall take into account the applicable recommendations set forth in **Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 4(a), Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended**

Contents and Format (Office of Historic Preservation, 1989). A draft of this report shall be submitted to the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO who shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon the draft report. Following this review, the final report shall be revised accordingly and two (2) copies provided to the CAL FIRE Archaeologist. In addition, copies shall be provided to the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO and the Native American Heritage Commission if either party so requests.

~~3.5-2(e) — As recommended in the NCRM Cultural Resources Assessment, during project development and operation, the applicant shall restrict use of the seasonal road located to the immediate northwest of Artesa Site-01 to ingress and egress. Mechanical grading or widening of the road, parking, and turning around in this area shall not be permitted. Segments of the seasonal roadway within 100 feet of the site shall be fenced with highly visible and/or other appropriate measure(s). Measures shall be implemented prior to the beginning of logging operations. A note requiring compliance with this measure shall be indicated on construction drawings and in construction contracts for the review and approval of the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits.~~

~~3.5-2(d) — In consultation with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Region Headquarters Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO (or his designee) the applicant shall establish a conservation easement protecting Artesa Site(s) 01, 02, 04, and 05 prior to timber harvesting. Measures shall be taken by the project foreman throughout the process to ensure that construction and vineyard operation activities do not degrade the cultural significance of the site(s). Measures to be taken include: the placement of protective fencing prior to any activity within 100 feet of an archaeological site, and the education of all on-site workers. Preservation plans shall be submitted to the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits.~~

3.5-2(d) — Artesa Site-01

- 1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. The site shall be clearly marked with highly visible fencing by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee(s) - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee - prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development activities. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100*

feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Although re-use of the existing seasonal road located approximately 150-200 feet to the northwest of the site is permitted, such use is restricted to ingress and egress – there shall be no mechanical grading or widening of the road.
3. A minimum 4-inch thick layer of gravel or other similar, suitable road rock material shall be placed (and maintained at that thickness throughout operations) on the 500-foot long segment of existing dirt road near Artesa Site-01.
4. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

Artesa Site-02:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. The site shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development activities. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the

identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

Artesa Site-04:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. The site shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.
2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 shall be implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

Artesa Site-05:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. The site shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development activities. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 shall be implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

3.5-2(e) Artesa Parking Site:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. The site shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the

identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

Baling Wire Site:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. Site boundaries shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development activities. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.
2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

Artesa Crossing Site:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. Site boundaries shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development activities. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).

End of the Day Site:

1. No project or ground disturbing activities or impacts of any kind shall take place within the site boundaries. Site boundaries shall be clearly marked by the consulting archaeologist and/or his qualified designee - in consultation with the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee – with highly visible fencing prior to and during all ground disturbing timber harvesting and vineyard development. This fencing shall be maintained as necessary throughout ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the site boundary. This location shall be clearly plotted on the project maps with specific and clear notations that this area is NOT to be encroached upon. In so doing, however, this location shall NOT be specifically labeled or identified as an archaeological site on the project maps in order to keep the

identity and location of the site confidential and thus protect the site from damage by artifact hunters or vandals.

2. Ground disturbing activities taking place within 100 feet of the site shall be monitored by a professional consulting archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee(s). Prior to beginning operations, the scope of the monitoring shall be determined in consultation with the CAL FIRE Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO. When artifacts and/or other site indicators are encountered during operations, ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted, and the provisions of 14 CCR 929.3 implemented (which include promptly notifying the CAL FIRE Archaeologist about the find).
3. All trees within 100 feet of the site boundary that are to be harvested shall be felled and skidded away.
4. If management of the trees within the site boundaries to minimize shading of the future surrounding vineyard is necessary, specific measures to prevent damage to the site shall be proposed by the RPF as an amendment to the THP.

Mendocino Redwood Company Property Site:

1. Ground disturbing activities within 100 feet of the property corner near where this site was found shall be monitored by a professional archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO or his designee.
2. The scope of the monitoring operations shall be included in the Monitoring Plan prescribed in Mitigation Measure 3.5-3(a).
3. Whenever a previously unidentified prehistoric or historic archaeological site is found during operations, ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find shall stop, the Department Archaeologist shall be immediately notified and the other provisions prescribed in 14 CCR 929.3 [949.3, 969.3] implemented.

3.5-3 Impacts to historic resources.

The Northwest Information Center record search requested by NCRM indicated that the project site has a moderate likelihood of containing historic resources. Maximillian Neri of NCRM contacted the Annapolis Historical Society regarding historical uses of the

project site. The Historical Society responded to the Neri's request for historical information with an initial letter dated August 12, 2000. The letter described a brief history of the property and a discussion of some of the known historical resources within the project vicinity. The letter noted the presence of two historical sawmills, the Horicon School, and the Annapolis Cemetery.

Neri subsequently contacted the Historical Society to ascertain whether the locations of the two sawmills were specifically known and received a second response dated October 4, 2000. The second letter indicated that the two historic sawmills were present within the project area. Neri met with local landowner and historical society member Gary Craig to further discuss the presence of the two mills; however, the exact location of only one of the mills sites is known.

The NCRM archaeological investigation of the project site resulted in the discovery of one historic site, which is the sawmill referenced above. This mill is identified as Artesa Site-06H and probably dates to the mid-1940s. All that remains of the site is an extremely decomposed foundation consisting of large redwood beams, with some of the main floor joists still visible as well. Surrounding the foundation is extensive evidence of landscaping and grading, and the entire area adjacent to the mill has clearly been leveled as evidenced by large push piles of soils and some trash present, mostly to the southwest of the mill. In addition, various historical refuse items are present, many in the above mentioned push piles. The items include iron pipe sections, clear and colored glass fragments, miscellaneous machinery and cable fragments, automotive parts, and various food tin fragments.

The Neri report discusses four noted historical finds on the project site. The discoveries are predominantly related to the practices of agriculture and timber harvest, economic activities that continue to this day in the Annapolis area. The noted finds include:

- A collapsed structure, probably a warehouse or storage facility, appearing to date from a period not earlier than 1950;
- The remains of a small logging/woods camp, comprised of a large pile of split redwood fencing remnants of various length and widths and a square arrangement of three large redwood logs which probably formed the foundation for a cabin or tent structure;
- A broad scattering of historic logging debris in the bottom of a seasonal drainage ditch, associated with split rail and fencing production; and
- A large wooden cross and two wooden benches almost certainly associated with the Starcross community. This site probably served as a secluded location for reflection and prayer. Although the possibility exists that the cross marks a grave, the site does not appear over 30 years in age and evidence of a burial, such as a mound or bordered area, is not present; therefore, this possibility is considered extremely slight.

Subsequent to the Neri report, Tom Origer & Associates conducted field research to further assess the integrity of the site and to investigate the potential for other resources to be located on the project site.

Artesa Site-06H

Artesa Site-06H is a lumber mill dating approximately from the 1940s. The site is associated with a historically important activity (Criterion A[1]); however, the mill building has collapsed and is unable to convey this historical association. Furthermore, the mill is not associated with important individuals (Criterion B [2]), does not have extant architecture or designed elements (Criterion C [3]), and is relatively young (dating only to the mid-20th century). This last characteristic suggests that the mill site does not hold information that would not be available through historical research (Criterion D [4]). Therefore, as the site does meet any of the criteria, the mill is not eligible for listing on the NRHP and the CRHR.

Logging Camps-Lumber Mill Workers Residential Area

The Neri report states that the other sawmill noted by Gary Craig was likely located just to the north of Artesa Site-06H. According to the *Report on Supplemental Studies for the Artesa-Fairfax Project, Annapolis, Sonoma County* prepared by Origer & Associates, May 5, 2008, the 1943 USGS topographic map of the project area shows up to nine probable house locations that are within the project area; however, three of those are outside of areas where vineyard development is planned.

The three house locations that do not appear to be vulnerable to vineyard development are within the boundaries of Artesa Site-05, a prehistoric Native American site that is planned to be protected so that it remains in its current condition. Because those three sites are within the boundaries of Artesa Site-05, investigation of any historic deposits there would cause disturbance to prehistoric site deposits.

The 1943 USGS topographic map shows up to six houses that appear to be outside the boundaries of Artesa Site-05, but within the project area and in close proximity to the known lumber mill operations. The portion of the lumber mill site where associated residences appeared to be situated was subjected to a thorough surface examination by Origer & Associates in April 2008 in a search for historical remains associated with the mill workers' residences. In addition, a metal detector, probe, and pick and shovel were used to search for buried archaeological phenomena (e.g., artifact filled privy pits, trash deposits).

As a result of this work, two types of historic archaeological deposits were found that could satisfy criteria for inclusion on the NHRP and CRHR in that they could yield information about the area's history. One type of deposit consists of "sheet refuse" which is often a relatively dispersed scatter of archaeological materials that accumulates at building (in this case, residential) locations. The second type of deposit is marked by

concentrations of archaeological specimens. This second type of phenomenon is best described as a “dump” or place where people deliberately discarded items.

The types of archaeological specimens found in sheet refuse scatters and dumps include fragments of flat (window) glass, fragments of glass containers (bottles and jars), fragments of ceramic items (i.e., plates, cups, saucers), ferrous nails (wire shanks), amorphous pieces of metal, and milled boards. A primary distinction made between sheet refuse and dumps is that sheet refuse often presents itself as a thin deposit at and near the ground surface, while, in contrast, dumps can be marked by an accumulation of archaeological materials with substantial depth to the deposit.

Conclusion

Most of the noted historic finds are not considered to be significant enough to warrant protective measures because they do not meet the criteria for historical significance noted in Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852. According to Section 15064.5(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the finds must be associated with significant historical events or persons; represent distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of a creative individual; or be likely to yield important historic or prehistoric information. Most of the finds listed above do not meet these criteria. Although Artesa Site-06H, the former sawmill site, would be removed with implementation of the proposed project after on-site excavation conducted for Site-06H by Origer & Associates, the site was identified as being ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP or the CRHR, due to the advanced deterioration of the sole feature remaining, the mill foundation, and due to the fact that this resource type is extremely common throughout Mendocino County and Northern California. Furthermore, the location of the ~~logging camps~~ lumber mill workers residential area, and associated deposits, have been excluded from the vineyard development area. However, as historically significant resources have been identified in the project area the potential exists that unidentified historical resources may be discovered during project implementation. As a result, the proposed project would result in ***potentially significant*** impacts to historic resources.

Mitigation Measure(s)

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce project impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

- 3.5-3(a) *Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall hire a qualified archeologist to prepare an archaeological monitoring plan for the review and approval ~~of the County Permit and Resource Management Department. by the CAL FIRE Northern Region-Coast Area Archaeologist and the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO (or his representative).~~ At a minimum the plan shall cover the Neri “Noted Find” locations and all areas within 100 feet of previously identified archaeological sites, including those sites. The plan shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following measures:*

- ~~Any location with prehistoric Native American material shall require both a Native American monitor(s) (representing the Stewarts Point Rancheria tribe and designated by the Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO) and an archaeological monitor(s) shall be present during earth-moving activities associated with the proposed project.~~
- Historical features shall be considered historically significant if the feature is a discrete deposit identifiable to the period of significance for the two mills, or if the deposit relates to substantially earlier occupation and the agricultural activities on the project site.
- Prehistoric Native American deposits shall be considered an archaeological site if three or more cultural items are found within an area measuring roughly ten feet on a side.
- Archaeological deposits that retain a strong focus, that is the ability to clearly represent the activities that created the deposit, shall be considered to have sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register.
- Identified sites shall be avoided by establishing construction fencing around the perimeter of ~~the~~ each site designated for this type of protection to prevent damage from vineyard development activities. Vineyard workers shall be trained regarding the importance of cultural materials.
- ~~If the resources cannot remain in situ, a program of investigation appropriate to the resource shall be developed. To the extent feasible, existing research designs shall be incorporated into investigation programs. Mitigation Measure 3.5-2(c) shall be implemented (i.e., Data Recovery Plan).~~

~~The Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians has provided general information regarding the Kashia needs for monitoring and treatment of human remains. It is recommended that the project applicant enter into an agreed treatment plan with the tribe prior to beginning any ground disturbing activities in the project area.~~

- 3.5-3(b) ~~Prior to the issuance of grading permits, an archeological monitor shall be hired by the applicant and approved by the County Permit & Resource Management Department the CAL FIRE Northern Region-Coast Area Archaeologist to train the construction grading crew prior to commencement of ground disturbing activities logging and grading activity in regard to the types of artifacts that they ~~are likely to~~ may find (including, but not limited to, ceramics/pottery, glass and/or metal artifacts and fragments, building foundations, linear features such as railroad grades, wells, privies, trash pits). In the event that an artifact is~~

~~discovered, all work shall cease within 50¹⁰⁰ feet of the discovery until the archaeological monitor(s) has evaluated the find. The archaeological monitor(s) shall promptly consult with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection CAL FIRE Northern Region Headquarters Archaeologist. Work shall not occur within 50 feet of the find until a decision about how to proceed has been made through consultation among the consulting archaeologist and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Northern Region Headquarters Archaeologist, in coordination with the appropriate County representative. Appropriate treatment measures may include recording the resource with the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Inventory System database, and/or complete avoidance of the sites that have outstanding cultural or historic significance. A note requiring compliance with this measure shall be indicated on construction drawings and in construction contracts for the review and approval of the County Permit & Resource Management Department prior to issuance of grading permits. If the resources cannot remain in situ, Mitigation Measure 3.5-2(c) shall be implemented (i.e., Data Recovery Plan).~~

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources are analyzed in Impact Statement 4-6 of Chapter 4, *Cumulative Impacts*.

Endnotes

- ¹ *Sonoma County General Plan*, March 1989.
- ² *Sonoma County General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report*, December 1986.
- ³ *Paleontological Sensitivity and Monitoring Report, Artesa Conversion/THP Project, Annapolis, California*, James R. Allen, Paleontologist, March 25, 2001.
- ⁴ *Confidential Archaeological Addendum for Timber Operations on Non-federal Lands in California*, Maximillian A. Neri, North Coast Resource Management, April 16, 2001. Revised March 11, 2004.
- ⁵ *Archaeological Investigations at Three Prehistoric Native American Sites and Archival Research of One Lumber Mill Site on the Artesa Vineyards Property near Annapolis, Sonoma County, California*, Tom M. Origer, M.A., October 3, 2006.
- ⁶ *Report on Supplemental Studies for the Artesa-Fairfax Project, Annapolis, Sonoma County, California*, Tom Origer & Associates, May 5, 2008, Revised June 23, 2008.
- ⁷ Gifford, Edward W. and A. L. Kroeber. 1939. *Culture Element Distributions, II*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 37(2):117-254 qtd. in *Confidential Archaeological Addendum for Timber Operations on Non-federal Lands in California*, Maximillian A. Neri, North Coast Resource Management, April 16, 2001. Revised March 11, 2004., p. 2
- ⁸ *An Archaeological Survey Report for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Harvesting Plan, Origer & Associates, dated August 6, 2009 and revised May 6, 2010.*
- ⁹ Personal communication with Mr. Richard Hilton, Sierra College, Rocklin, California. December 7, 2004.
- ¹⁰ State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *CEQA and Archaeological Resources*, 1994.
- ¹¹ California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.98 *et seq.*
- ¹² *A Supplemental Cultural Resources Survey for the Artesa/Fairfax Timber Conversion, Sonoma County, CA, Origer & Associates, December 15, 2010.*