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ABSTRACT

PURPOSE OF THESIS: The aims of this thesis are to provide Sonoma Land Trust with a cultural resources management plan that will fit neatly both into any regulatory framework that may become pertinent and with Sonoma Land Trust's mission and future plans for the Little Black Mountain property. Additionally, this document outlines the resources present on the property and discusses potential impacts to them while recommending ways to preserve them. The purpose of a cultural resources inventory and management plan is often in fulfillment of regulatory compliance with the aim of protecting cultural resources. In this case, Sonoma Land Trust is not under any legal mandate to create a plan, but due to a number of known and unexpected cultural resources discoveries on the Little Black Mountain property, the necessity for a management tool that would aid in the preservation of these resources came to light.

METHODS: A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center in order to determine (1) if the property or portions of the property were surveyed before and (2) the types of resources that were located on or adjacent to the property. Additionally, background research into the prehistory and history of the Little Black Mountain property and vicinity was conducted for the purpose of predicting where cultural resources are likely to occur and what types of resources might be encountered. Several field studies were conducted from fall 2008 to summer 2009. The surveys utilized a mixed-strategy approach. All of the resources located were recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms, which were submitted to the Northwest Information Center. Additionally, previously identified sites were recorded and these records were submitted to the Northwest Information Center.

A review of cultural resource legislation is presented in order to provide a model for decision-making and management and to outline frameworks that may be required should different project types or funding sources become available for the Little Black Mountain property.

In order to determine the best management strategies, literature produced by three agencies that have experience in the management of cultural resources was consulted. A summary of these agencies' conclusions is located in the recommendation section. These recommendations are incorporated as general management recommendations in this cultural resources management plan.

FINDINGS: A total of 19 sites/petroglyphs and one isolated artifact was located and recorded. These cultural resources range from the remains of a historic-era home, to
petroglyphs to lithic debitage and tool concentrations. Some of these resources may be impacted by activities that are proposed by the Sonoma Land Trust.

The literature provided by the three agencies with abundant management experience assert similar characteristics that are required in order for a management plan to be effective, reactive and proactive: inventory (existing conditions), monitoring, stakeholder/community involvement, defined boundaries, a multi-disciplinary/holistic approach, and buffer zones and sensitivity zones.

CONCLUSIONS: Establishment of a cultural resources monitoring program is recommended. This recommendation is facilitated by the inclusion of a Cultural Resources Monitoring Checklist (Appendix D). A system of formal project review in tandem with formal site assessment is recommended in scenarios where construction or ground-disturbing activities are proposed. Stakeholder and community involvement in management/planning decisions and activities should be ongoing. The supervision of ground-disturbing activities in designated sites, buffer zones and sensitive areas by a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative is recommended. Finally, should unanticipated discoveries be encountered, the Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan should be followed (Appendix C).
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Dr. Adrian Praetzellis of the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University was approached by Michael Hogan, an active member and representative of Sonoma Land Trust (SLT), regarding the Little Black Mountain property (LBM). After much consideration that took into account the property and the preservation goals for the property, it was determined that a cultural resources management plan and inventory would be the most effective and proactive tool to manage the cultural resources located on LBM. This thesis consists of a cultural resources inventory and management plan (CRMP) for SLT’s LBM. The goal of this CRMP is to complement the existing general management plan, to coincide with the mission of SLT and to facilitate responsible management of cultural resources while accommodating plans SLT has for LBM.

OVERVIEW OF PROPERTY AND CURRENT OWNERSHIP

Sonoma Land Trust

A variety of mechanisms exist to promote the preservation of myriad resource types. These methods range from legislation, to the formation of preservation societies, to education and interpretation. Of these preservation strategies, land trusts have been found to be particularly effective. This is evidenced by the amount of land that has been preserved and continues to be conserved by land trusts. The numbers grow every year: “From 1995 to 2000, land trusts managed to protect, on average, an additional 340,000 acres each year; from 2000 to 2005, they were able to protect an annual average of an additional 1.2 million acres” (Blum 2006:14). Currently, nearly 12 million acres in the United States are protected under land trusts. Land trusts have existed in the United
States since 1891 and the numbers have increased to more than 1700 such organizations throughout the United States (Alanen 2000:124, Blum 2006:12).

The mission statement of SLT is “to protect the land forever” (www.sonomalandtrust.org/AboutSLT/default.html#). SLT, like many other trusts, focuses on preservation of land and the accompanying resources. The primary mechanisms for protection include conservation easements (i.e., the purchase of development rights or the transfer of development rights), often followed by the subsequent transfer of the property to a government agency. Other methods involve development of long-term land protection strategies and promotion of private and public funding for land conservation and acquisition. SLT has defined stewardship as a specific management objective (www.sonomalandtrust.org/AboutSLT/default.html#). This includes the restoration of conservation properties and the promotion of a sense of place and a land ethic through activities, education and outreach. Like other land trusts, SLT is admittedly not frequently in the position of landscape manager so much as landscape preservationist or conservator. With the standardized practice of donating properties to state or national parks for management under those entities, management of the landscape and associated resources is to some degree outside the realm of experience for SLT. However, SLT has taken steps toward changing this by focusing on the management of specific aspects within a few select properties. The Trust has engaged in active management by way of habitat restoration, trail creation/maintenance and erosion control. This CRMP provides a framework for the pioneering action of a land trust delving into the pragmatic practice of cultural resource management and preservation.
SLT began in 1976 as a volunteer organization that focused solely on the Sonoma Valley (www.sonomalandtrust.org/AboutSLT/History.html 2009b). Gradually, given impetus by numerous donations, the focus expanded to Sonoma County. The Trust is a local, non-governmental, non-profit organization that is funded primarily through membership contributions. As of the beginning of 2009, SLT is protecting over 19,000 acres that comprise over 60 properties with an array of resources and resource issues. SLT has 2312 members and over 250 active volunteers (SLT 2008:9-16).

The Little Black Mountain Property

SLT owns LBM. The approximately 550-acre LBM is located near Cazadero, Sonoma County, California. Ultimately, the variety of parcels now making up LBM was unified into its current size and shape in the 1950s and donated to SLT by the mid-1980s. The story that is told not only by the archival history and regional history but also through archaeology that is present illustrates the evolution of the west in a microcosm. From the Native Californians inhabiting the land to the contemporary era, LBM gives a glimpse into the changing nature of the area over time and the varying forces influencing the property. LBM provides an illustration of the nature of cultural change: from rituals in Native American culture to the scars of intensive logging, from the simple joys of living in a peaceful, natural setting to a well-known San Francisco family’s loss of their home to the catastrophic Creighton Ridge Fire of 1978.

DEFINITIONS

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources consist of archaeological sites, the built environment or artifacts that are created by and associated with human culture. They are “physical
evidences of past human activity” (NPS n.d.:1). Cultural resources are any resource that “...is of cultural character. Examples are social institutions, historic places, artifacts and documents” (King 2004:361). Essentially, cultural resources are any form of cultural manifestation, possessing either physical or cognitive aspects or both. The term connotes an interaction between humans and their environment, thus bringing into focus the reciprocity between nature and culture (40 CFR 1508.14). Additionally, cultural resources possess cultural value to a sociocultural group (King 2004:12). In other words, cultural resources express and reflect intangible values and beliefs while also providing tangible information about the past. One example of a cultural resource that reflects intangible values is a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). A TCP is a location that possesses cultural significance because it reflects the “beliefs, customs and practices of a living community” (King 1998:1), and this property is rooted either in a community’s cultural practices or beliefs or it is important in “continuing cultural identity of the community” (King 1998:1).

**Cultural Resources Management Plan**

Generally, even a CRMP written for legal/regulatory compliance should function as a tool for effective and thoughtful cultural resources management. The creation of a CRMP before the inception of any development project can help avoid damage to resources. A CRMP is created in order to provide standard operating procedures as well as a foundation for management decisions that relate to cultural resources and a property as a whole, and which relate to the mission of the person or organization responsible for that property. Generally, the most pressing reason to create a CRMP is to achieve compliance with legal requirements. This last reason is not what initiated this CRMP
however. Despite no legal mandates, this CRMP derives from a necessity expressed by the SLT’s mission and by employees’ desire to deal with cultural resources in the most responsible way, a way that provides for on-going preservation of the cultural resources situated on the property. A CRMP generally contains tools for planning, controlling, identifying, evaluating, conserving, monitoring, treating and protecting cultural resources (McManamon 2005:1228). A CRMP offers a multiplicity of treatments for a variety of resource types and resource issues. Each cultural resource necessitates a different treatment or method of evaluation; there is no formulaic answer to the protection and preservation of a specific cultural resource.

Cultural Landscape

Because of the landscape focus inherent in SLT’s mission, the cultural landscape approach to a CRMP created for one of SLT’s properties is a perfect union. The resulting benefit of utilizing the cultural landscape approach is the accompanying framework for management that this evolving concept brings with the examination of both natural and cultural resources together. The United States National Park Service (NPS) defines a cultural landscape as “...a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values (Birnbaum n.d.:1).

In addition to the recognition of the cultural landscape concept within the United States, internationally the approach has obtained influence with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO has defined a cultural landscape as

combined works of nature and man...[t]hey are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence
of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal" (UNESCO 2008:14).

A cultural landscape can be of any size, shape or affiliation and must carry with it or exhibit cultural or aesthetic meaning and value.

Cultural landscapes include battlefields such as Gettysburg and Antietam; the homes and designed estate grounds of dignitaries, inventors, and writers; the sites held sacred by native peoples from prehistoric times to the present; and the valleys where our ancestors settled and farmed. Many cultural landscapes have maintained a continuity of land use into the present (Slaiby et al. 2003:7).

In sum, the combination of natural and cultural resources in addition to dynamic use over a long period which associates a place with meaning and value defines a location as a cultural landscape; landscapes with an associated human past are considered cultural landscapes.

CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROCESS

The fundamental and integral steps that form the basic process of cultural resource management (CRM) are dictated by numerous laws and regulations. These steps are: inventory/identification, evaluation, assessment of effect, and treatment.

Prior to completing an inventory/identification, background information on the property is obtained. This information includes but is not limited to ethnographic accounts, historic-era maps, a record search to determine if there were previous cultural resource studies or recorded resources on the property and the surrounding area. Research into property owners and regional history is conducted prior to a field visit(s) in order to develop a predictive model of the resources that are likely to be encountered and where they might be encountered. Generally, basic survey incorporates a variety of techniques
that involve traversing an area while scanning the ground surface for cultural resources. The purpose of this action is to identify and map cultural resources.

Second, the resources are evaluated and recorded. Evaluation entails recording resources on Department of Parks and Recreation forms (DPR 523) and offering up an assessment on the potential eligibility of a resource. The purpose of this step is to determine if a cultural resource that was identified in the course of survey satisfies the criteria to be eligible for listing on either the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Chapter IV discusses these criteria in detail. In the context of National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), a separate nomination form is submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) with an argument for or against a resource’s potential to meet the criteria for listing. The SHPO is the individual responsible for making a determination regarding a cultural resource’s eligibility. Working within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) nexus, the argument is submitted to the lead agency (i.e., this is the city or county that is responsible for determining what actions will be required for a specific project and ensuring all applicable laws are adhered to). This lead agency will ultimately make the decision as to whether or not the cultural resource meets the criteria for eligibility.

Third, it is then determined if the proposed activity will affect the values contained in the resource. These values are determined by the argument for CRHR or NRHP eligibility. A description of what is defined as an affect is discussed in the next section. Finally, appropriate treatment actions must be devised. Not all resources are or will be determined to be eligible for one of the registers (i.e., not all resources are considered important or significant). If the resource(s) is/are determined not to be
significant or important, no treatment action is required. The project may continue as planned, without avoidance or mitigation. If the resource is determined eligible/significant/important, treatment is designed that avoids or lessens the project’s impacts.

MAJOR LAWS THAT MAY AFFECT SONOMA LAND TRUST’S MANAGEMENT

For the two primary laws that govern the protection and preservation of cultural resources, the NHPA, which is under the umbrella of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), determinations of significance are made in terms of specific criteria that are discussed in Chapter IV. As mentioned above, if it is concluded that a cultural resource is significant, potential project impacts to the resource must either be avoided, minimized or mitigated (16 USC 470u, CCR 15064.5).

National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act and the National Register of Historic Places

Projects that fall under NHPA, more specifically Section 106, are those that are undertaken by the federal government, a federal agency, are proposed on federal land, in a federal jurisdiction, are receiving federal funding or require a permit from the federal government. NHPA requires “Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties…” (36 CFR 800.1[a]). An undertaking is as any project under federal jurisdiction, receiving federal funds, requiring a federal permit or completed for the federal government (36 CFR 800.16[y]). A historic property is defined as “…any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or
eligible for inclusion on the National Register, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource” (16 USC 470w). These historic properties are considered significant if they are listed on the NRHP or are deemed eligible for listing on the NRHP. To be listed or to be eligible for listing, historic properties must possess specific characteristics plus exhibit integrity, qualities that are discussed specifically in Chapter IV.

Some of the proposed projects on LBM have the potential to affect or “impact” cultural resources/historic properties. Impacts to historic properties are defined by NEPA and are dealt with specifically under NHPA. Per Section 106 of the NHPA, an “adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register…” (36 CFR 800.5[1]). Examples of adverse effects include the following:

(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property; (ii) Alteration of the property...; (iii) Removal of the property from its historic location; (iv) Change in the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting...; (v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features; (vi) Neglect that causes deterioration... (36 CFR 800.5[1]).

The California Environmental Quality Act and the California Register of Historical Resources

The overall goal of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is to identify, avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects of a project or undertaking. Cultural resources, in terms of CEQA, are considered a portion of the environment. The aim of CEQA is to reduce or diminish impacts to cultural resources that are considered significant or important.
The purpose of CEQA is to evaluate whether a proposed project may have an adverse effect on the environment and, if so, if that effect can be reduced or eliminated by pursuing an alternative course of action or through mitigation (OHP n.d.:2).

The California Code of Regulations (Title 18 Section 15268) gives local agencies authority to decide what constitutes a ministerial project within their jurisdiction. CEQA does not apply to ministerial actions regardless of whether they may affect a historical resource since, by definition, the action is exempt. CEQA only applies to discretionary actions. Discretionary permits are required for discretionary projects. A discretionary project is defined as

...a project which requires the exercise of judgment or deliberation when the public agency or body decides to approve or disapprove a particular activity, as distinguished from situations where the public agency or body merely has to determine whether there has been conformity with applicable statutes, ordinances, or regulations (CCR 15357).

The public agency that SLT would refer to in order to determine if there is a permit requirement for a proposed project is the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department.

In addition to projects requiring a discretionary permit, a project that would require compliance with CEQA is defined by the effects it will have, the agency in charge or the agency having jurisdiction over the project. An activity that can be categorized as a project is specifically

...an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following:

(a) An activity directly undertaken by any public agency.

(b) An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies.
(c) An activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies (PRC 21065).

A historical resource as something that is listed or is eligible for listing on the CRHP, NRHP or any local historic resource inventory (CCR 15064.5). Additionally, once an item is listed on the NRHP it is also included on the CRHR (CCR 15064.5). Both of these mechanisms are intended to safeguard the preservation of cultural resources that are considered significant from adverse impacts. Specific criteria for listing on the CRHR are outlined in Chapter IV. Impacts can occur when a resource is demolished, relocated or altered, and in turn, the resource's ability to convey its significance is then impaired. Specifically, an adverse impact can be defined as a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource...[the] physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (PRC 15064.5).

**Summary of NHPA and CEQA**

Essentially, if the proposed project fits the category of either a NHPA or CEQA project, a cultural resource will be protected under the law if it is considered significant. This protection mandates that any adverse effect to a significant/NRHP-eligible/CRHR-eligible cultural resource is either avoided or mitigated. This is why formal evaluation through the application of significance criteria is integral to the process of good management and effective preservation. Despite a lack of currently proposed projects that are subject to federal or local agency review, these standards and regulations are viewed as a viable form of management. "[C]ompliance and good management are essentially the same" (King 2004:15). The laws pertaining to cultural resources/historic properties/historical resources are mentioned because they create a means of establishing
significance. Although not currently mandated by law, these same considerations are recommended as a foundation for SLT's management decisions relating to the LBM, as formal assessment and evaluation of a site is the only solution if a proposed project possesses the potential to negatively impact a cultural resource.

**CONTENTS OF THIS THESIS**

Chapter II summarizes the environmental setting and provides an overview of the prehistory and the history of the region, the property and the people who lived on LBM. This knowledge will guide SLT by illustrating the way in which LBM is situated in the prehistory and the history of the region and in the identification of specific areas that need to be carefully managed. This information also lays a foundation for understanding why cultural resources are present and who is potentially responsible for depositing them on LBM.

Chapter III summarizes the findings of the literature and maps search while also providing a detailed inventory of the cultural resources that are located on LBM. In the course of the survey of the property, a total of 17 sites/petroglyphs and one isolated artifact that had not been located before was recorded. It is highly probable that more exist. Additionally, the items that were noted in a previous survey (Foster 1983) were formally recorded and documented. A total of 19 cultural resources was identified and recorded.

The final chapter, Chapter IV, culminates with a CRMP. First, the chapter provides a detailed review of the legal and regulatory frameworks that aids assessment and evaluation and, therefore, facilitates thoughtful and effective management decisions about cultural resources. It then provides a preliminary evaluation of each resource in
terms of eligibility for inclusion on either the NRHP or CRHR. Outlined next is an overview of recent scholarship regarding the best tactics, using the cultural landscape approach, for managing cultural resources. Gleaned from this theoretical framework are general recommendations for LBM CRM. Next, through consultation and communication with the Native Americans, the Kashaya Pomo, who ethnographers in addition to primary and secondary historical sources, describe as residing in the territory surrounding LBM during the contact period and before and who currently reside in the vicinity provide recommendations and considerations. The CRMP closes with impact-specific recommendations, site-specific recommendations and a conclusion.

Two of the appendices that are included in this thesis are designed to supplement the CRMP. Appendix C is composed of an Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan. As the name implies, this plan lays out the steps that should be taken if unexpected human remains or unrecorded or undocumented cultural resources are encountered. Appendix D consists of a Cultural Resources Monitoring Checklist. This form has been designed to facilitate careful stewardship of the cultural resources on LBM by providing a tool that will help document existing conditions and provide a way of assessing management issues and considerations of impacts that may or may not be related to development projects or to SLT activities.
CHAPTER II: CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the environmental setting while providing an overview of the prehistory and the history of the region, the property and the people who lived on Sonoma Land Trust’s (SLT) Little Black Mountain property (LBM). This information is presented to foster an appreciation of and an understanding for the cultural resources that are present and are potentially present. The chapter first outlines the geology and soils as well as the flora and fauna. Next, an ethnographic and archaeological overview is presented that describes the Native Americans who lived and continue to live in the region. A summary of pertinent cultural periods and associated cultural resources is provided. This is followed by a historic overview of LBM. The overview first provides a general history of the region and proceeds to narrow in focus to the property’s vicinity and finally outlines both the ownership history of the parcel as well as the history of its former owners and residents. This knowledge will guide SLT by illustrating the way in which LBM is situated in the prehistory and the history of the region and in the identification of specific areas that need to be carefully managed. This information also lays a foundation for understanding why cultural resources are present and who is potentially responsible for depositing them on LBM.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

LBM is situated within the North Coast Ranges. It is located 2 miles west of Cazadero, Sonoma County, California (see Figure 1) and is within Township 8 North and Ranges 11 and 12 West on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute Fort Ross and Cazadero quadrangles (see Figure 2). LBM is approximately 6 miles inland as
FIGURE 1: Regional Location

Note: Not to scale
FIGURE 2: Location and Approximate Property Boundaries of the Little Black Mountain Property

1978 USGS 7.5 Minute Cazadero and Fort Ross Quadrangles
the crow flies from the Sonoma coast. It is approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the Austin Creek State Recreation Area. Vehicle access to the property is by Pole Mountain Road, an unimproved road located off Austin Creek Road. The boundaries of the approximately 500-acre property form the shape of a rectilinear polygon with 12 sides. Elevations range from 700 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 1973 feet amsl at the top of Little Black Mountain (Appleton 2002:3). The property is located at the headwaters of three perennial creeks: Pole Mountain Creek, St. Elmo Creek and Kidd Creek, all of which drain into Austin Creek, which flows into the Russian River (Appleton 2002:3). In addition to these creeks, several perennial springs are present on the property.

The geologic setting of the area continues to be a source of study and fascination for a number of scholars and geologists. From 1963 to the present, LBM and the surrounding area have been the focus of a number of studies (Coleman and Lee 1963, Erickson 1975, Stuart 1992). Since 1963, over 25 studies of the area have been conducted (Erickson 1975:1). There is a geological fault running approximately northwest-southeast through the property. This fault bisects the property diagonally, and due to tectonic shifts, it has exposed the rock formations within the plates that are of interest to geologists and scholars (Stuart 1992:128). Little Black Mountain is a meta-trachyte to meta-rhyolite unit within the Central belt of the Franciscan Complex. The Franciscan Complex in the California Coast Ranges is generally thought of as a late Mesozoic to Cenozoic accretionary prism (Stuart 1992:129). Recent data show that the Franciscan Complex represents a highly elaborate assemblage of rocks accreted by a late Mesozoic oblique subduction and mid- to late-Cenozoic faulting (Stuart 1992:130). Within this complex, many scholars consider the area unique due to the presence of rocks that were originally
deposited as alkaline lavas, meta-trachyte and meta-rhyolite; meta-trachyte is exposed on
the western side of the fault and meta-rhyolite is apparent on the eastern side (Stuart
1992:130). Within the Franciscan complex around the Cazadero area, a number of
differentiable units have been identified: Kings Ridge Road mélange, Cazadero phyllite
mélange, greenstone, and serpentinite (Erickson 1975:2-7). Figure 3 presents some of the
geology of LBM and identifies the major units exposed within the area.

Seventy-nine percent of the soils within the property are Hugo very gravelly
loam. These soils are considered beneficial for timber production and grazing (Appleton
Rock land, as the name would imply, includes stony steep slopes and is utilized primarily
for watershed wherein minimal vegetation is evident or capable of growing to a
maximum potential (Miller 1972:73). Seven percent of the property is comprised of
Laughlin loam (Appleton 2002:15), which is primarily useful for rangeland/grazing
(Miller 1972:57). Sobrante loam accounts for 4% of the soil type evident on LBM. The
traditional function of this soil type is rangeland (Miller 1972:78).

The unique environment evident at LBM supports a variety of flora and fauna. It
is important to note that since the 1978 Creighton Ridge fire, which decimated the
property and surrounding area, a number of planting plans have been carried out. A 2002
botanical survey of the property elaborated upon in the Little Black Mountain
Stewardship Plan (2002) recounts the presence of six broad plant communities or habitats
within the property: riparian, annual/perennial grassland, mixed chaparral, redwood,
Douglas fir and coastal oak woodland (Appleton 2002:22-24). Riparian communities are
composed of the following: an understory, which consists of ferns, sedges, rushes and
FIGURE 3: Geology of Little Black Mountain

QIs Landslide deposits; largely bedrock deposits

KJfs Franciscan Complex (Central Belt) Sheared shale and sandstone that contains generally resistant masses of chert, “high grade” metamorphic rock, variably shattered sandstone and greenstone, metagreenstone, and generally less resistant serpentinite. Masses range in length from less than one foot to greater than 5 miles, and constitute a variable, generally unknown proportion of the unit.

gs Greenstone, including pillow lava, tuff, minor intrusive varieties, and minor fossiliferous limestone, and metagreenstone, ranging from roc containing incipient blueschist minerals to completely reconstituted blueschist.

sp Foliated metabasalt

Serpentinite, including relatively fresh ultramafic masses. Occurs as lenses, sheets, and irregularly shaped masses, largely within and along boundaries of KJfs.

“High grade” metamorphic rock, chiefly gneissic, including glaucophane schist, eclogite, and amphibolite, most occurring in blocks less than 100 feet long.

Adapted from Blake, M.C., J.T. Smith, C.M. Wentworth and R.H. Wright. 1984 USGS Open File report 71-44, Preliminary Geologic Map of Western Sonoma County and Northernmost Marin County, California.
mosses; a middle level filled with poison oak, monkey flower, toyon, rose, elderberry and elk clover; and the overstory which contains California bay, maple, buckeye and a few willow (Appleton 2002:22). The annual/perennial grassland community contains several native (e.g., purple needle grass and California fescue) and non-native grasses (e.g., harding grass and ripgut brome). The community designated as chaparral includes scrub oak, ceanothus, tanoak, toyon and buckeye (Appleton 2002:23). The redwood habitat has only a slight presence not only because of the 1978 fire, but due to previous logging operations on the property, as evidenced by cut and burned stumps. The Douglas fir habitat was “once dominant in the overstory canopy of the property” (Appleton 2002:23). This fact is evident due to large dead, standing fir trees present throughout this habitat on the property. And this is further reinforced by the fact that in the 1950s, previous owners of the property issued a permit to a lumber company, essentially selling off the timber, to cut down Douglas fir trees on their property for two years (Official Record 1316:591-594). Currently the Douglas firs are having minimal success in their fight to come back. Not helping this effort is the fact that in the years after the 1978 fire, pines not native to the property were planted and which continue to squeeze the already minimal Douglas fir population (Appleton 2002:23). Lastly, the coastal oak woodland consists of live oak, Oregon oak, black oak, tan oak, bay-laurel (pepperwood), madrone and a few Douglas firs (Appleton 2002:24), The density of these tree clusters ranges from dense to open woodland.

This varied and abundant vegetation plays host to a number of faunal species on the property. At least 24 bird species have been sighted on the property (e.g., golden eagle, Northern harrier, American kestrel, quail) (Appleton 2002:26). Mammals that have
been observed on the property include bobcat, coyote, mule deer, red fox, feral pig and woodrat (Appleton 2002:26). Additionally numerous reptiles and amphibians have been noted on the subject property, with at least eight species of reptiles and at least four species of amphibians (Appleton 2002:27).

ARCHEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

Linguistic, Ethnographic and Ethnobotanical Context

In the interest of providing a background for the importance of creating a cultural resources management plan for LBM, this chapter will provide an overview of the prehistoric and historic context of the area. It begins by providing an overview of the linguistic, ethnographic, ethnobotanical and prehistoric context of the region and the Native Americans, the Porno, and specifically the Southwestern/Kashaya Porno, who lived (and currently live) in that area. Archaeologists and anthropologists organize prehistory with three guiding principles: (1) people, and the languages they spoke; (2) places, or the environment within which people lived and (3) time, which is defined by periods and which is often delineated by way of archaeological evidence. These categories will serve as the framework for this section.

Native American languages in California are divided into six primary families: Algic, Athabaskan, Hokan, Penutian, Uto-Aztecan and the Unaffiliated languages. Of these families, the Porno are categorized under the umbrella of the Hokan family (Golla 2007, Kroeber 1976, Moratto 1984) (Figure 4). These divisions are associated with geographic regions that correspond to areas that contain similar cultures and vaguely similar languages. The Porno are described as having seven distinct languages: Southwestern Porno (Kashaya), Southern Porno, Central Porno, Northern Porno,
FIGURE 4: Six Primary California Language Families

Northeastern Pomo, Eastern Pomo, and Southeastern Pomo (Kroeber 1976:222, McLendon and Oswalt 1978:274). The north coast, California territory of the Pomo extended along the coast and inland from slightly north of Fort Bragg, over the forested Coast Ranges to Clear Lake and continued south encompassing Healdsburg, Santa Rosa, Duncan's Point and the mouth of the Russian River (Kroeber 1976, plate 36) (see Figure 5). When the Kashaya Pomo arrived in the North Coast region cannot be determined exactly, but based on linguistic evidence, it is believed that they arrived in the region around 1000 BC (Moratto 1984:557).

Each of the Pomo groups held defined territories that were organized by smaller communities called "tribelets" (McLendon and Oswalt 1978:275). Each of these tribelets, whose population numbers differed considerably, possessed their own territory or area, and each maintained a primary settlement, which usually had satellite villages. A single chief resided in the primary village, while the satellite villages were governed by subchiefs (Kroeber 1976:250). It is unclear if chiefly rule was determined by heredity. In some instances, it appears to have been and in others it seems to have been an elected position (Kroeber 1976:259). These defined tribelet territories were utilized for hunting and gathering as well as settlement. It is recounted by ethnographic informants that during the winter people concentrated together and in summer months they dispersed over the tribelet's lands (Kroeber 1976:241). The borders of these tribelet boundaries were clearly delineated, yet some groups and not others were allowed to access areas freely, or in tough times one group may have been given permission to utilize the resources of another tribelet's area.
FIGURE 5: Location of Kashaya Pomo in Relation to other Pomo Groups

The Pomo had different house types depending on the climate of each region or the season. For those who lived on the immediate coast and in the adjacent belt of heavy timber the living house was made out of slabs of redwood bark leaned together to a cone 10 to 15 feet in diameter. The Russian River Pomo erected a framework of poles, bent together at the top, and thatched with bundles of grass (Kroeber 1976:240-241).

It is likely that during the winter the coasts were not as populated as in the summer months. During the windy, cold and foggy winter months the Pomo would move to “semi-permanent villages inland to the second or third ridge to the east of the coast” (Huffman 1995:35). In addition to the dwelling, the building always present in a community was a sweathouse. The sweathouse was the men’s realm; whereas, the “living house” was considered the realm of women and children (Kroeber 1976:242).

The men only were concerned with this house, and therefore built it entirely themselves. Women were permitted in it for short periods of time during the day only, but men and boys spent much of their time there... (Barrett 1916:44).

Some of the primary villages would also have a dance or ceremony house where important meetings or ceremonies were held. Dancing was an important part of the ceremony and ritual in Pomo culture (Figure 6). The shaman had an important role in Pomo ritual. Shamans wielded power that could have been both benevolent and malevolent, depending upon the individual. An interesting linguistic note is that two separate labels that distinguished the two polarities of a medicine man or shaman, one being translated as “poison man or bewitcher” and the other as “one who cures” (Kroeber 1976:259). Additional means of social organization were accepted modes of relations between sexes. Marriage and divorce were a part of life
FIGURE 6: Pomo Dancer in Big Head Costume

in the Pomo community, as was polygamy. Descent was unilineal, either matrilineal or patrilineal, depending on the group (Bean 1976:105).

Not only did the Pomo exhibit a complex social structure, but they were/are also craft specialists. Specifically, the Pomo are renowned for their skills in basket making. The Pomo are the “only people in California to employ lattice twining…and [except in a few cases] they are the only ones to make use of wickerwork” (Kroeber 1976:244).

Although there are many techniques, coiling and twining are the two broad terms under which the techniques can be categorized (Barrett 1905:29). Great diversity can be seen in form. The same can be said about decorative style. Feather decoration is very common and highly prized by collectors. The feathers are woven into the baskets at intervals, and the feathers and other ornamentation such as beads create design elements that also range in variety. Each of these named motifs is recognized by other Kashaya (Barrett 1905:29-33). Pomo baskets are not simply prized for their aesthetic and artistic value; they had practical purposes also. In addition to being well-made and attractive specimens, some baskets were so fine that they could hold water. Other basket types were used for cooking and storage purposes.

Of particular interest to this thesis are the Southwestern Pomo or the Kashaya Pomo. The Kashaya Pomo territory spanned the coastline of Sonoma County. As part of a series of interviews conducted by Omar Stewart in the 1930s, Kashaya Tribal Chairperson Robert Smith placed the Kashaya territorial boundaries at Duncan’s Landing, roughly 4 miles south of the mouth of the Russian River, at its southern end and the Gualala River at the northern end (Stewart 1943:49). According to McLendon and Oswalt the name, Kashaya, means either expert and nimble, lightweight or expert
By many Kashaya, the latter is believed to be correct (Reno Franklin, personal communication 2008).

Barrett and other scholars (Kniffen 1939, Kroeber 1976, McLendon and Oswalt 1978) describe LBM as being in the Kashaya Porno territory (see Figure 7). Within this region, a number of villages and campsites are defined. In relation to LBM, there is one proximal location of interest. This location is referred to as an old campsite named kabe'batel, which Barrett states that he was unable to locate exactly but was able to surmise that it was “at or near Cazadero” (Barrett 1908:238).

The subsistence practices of the Kashaya were cyclical and depended on seasonality and availability, i.e., they participated in what is referred to as a seasonal round. Additionally, the Kashaya Porno and other Native Americans actively cultivated plant resources. They are commonly referred to as proto-agriculturists (Anderson 2005) or pyro-diversity collectors (Lightfoot and Parrish 2008). These terms are meant to convey the active involvement that Native Americans had in cultivating the environment. California was not a cornucopia without the help and the management practices of the native peoples who inhabited these lands. The plant resources were pruned, burned and aerated to ensure the bounty of the next season’s crop.

In the summer, they would all gather seaweed, collect salt, and exploit maritime and littoral fauna. The women would use their digging sticks to gather roots such as wild celery, wild onion and wild potato. Fresh clover was eaten in vast quantities as were “cakes of pepperwood balls” (Kniffen 1939:387). By mid-June, the groups moved inland to collect crops of wild oats in addition to gathering manzanita berries, huckleberries and
FIGURE 7: Location of Cazadero/Old Kashaya Pomo Campsite; the Little Black Mountain Property is Situated Approximately Two Miles to the West

blackberries. By late summer or early fall, it was quail hunting and salmon fishing season. Well-known ethnographer, Fred Kniffen, recounts that the greatest harvest of the year was the gathering of acorns. He tells that for the Kashaya Pomo “[t]his called for a trip back to the high ridges which overlie Austin Creek, for it is on the bald hills of the highest part of the plateau that tan oaks were formerly found in abundance” (Kniffen 1939:388).

Plants and the natural environment surrounding the Kashaya influenced almost every aspect of their lives. Giving additional proof for the value of plants in the lives of the Pomo are the studies that evolved out of the construction of the Warm Springs Dam, which created the Lake Sonoma area within the area traditionally inhabited by the Southern Pomo. In the course of these studies, the gathering areas associated with specific species were determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places as a Traditional Cultural Property due to their significance and importance within Pomo culture (Peri et al. 1983:6). According to ethnographic accounts, the gathering of plants affected the Pomo social schedule:

...celebrations were held for five resources: clover in the spring, Indian potatoes later in the spring; wild tobacco in the summer; acorns in the fall; and buckeye in the early winter. Occupants of other villages were invited to these observances and feasts, thus reinforcing reciprocity and interdependence with groups (McCarthy 1991:41).

Some of the most culturally significant plant resources are the roots of a species of sedge that are used to make the world-renowned baskets (Peri et al. 1983:6-8). Another resource highly prized by the Kashaya is angelica. Angelica has a practical and spiritual application and is considered a talisman (Anderson 2005:54). Many of the plants mentioned previously and others that were utilized for medicinal, spiritual or other
practical purposes are present on the LBM today: from tan oak, buckeye, pine, madrone, bay laurel, manzanita, blackberry, four spot flower, red ribbon flower, clover, chain fern, poppy, Douglas iris, monkey flower and many others (Appleton 2002:17).

In addition to the ethnobotanical resources found at the LBM, what are referred to as cupule rocks can be found. Cupule rocks, which are considered a form of rock art, are boulders that are covered with relatively shallow cupules or cup-shaped depressions that have been ground into the surface of a rock. Cupule depressions are generally defined as less than 10 centimeters in diameter and less than 4 centimeters in depth (Gilreath 2007:282, Price 1999:3 from Parkman 1986:255).

Interpretations regarding the cupule rocks vary. Most commonly, these petroglyphs are interpreted as having been incorporated into fertility rituals. One ethnographer tells of the ritual four day fast associated with a woman’s clandestine visit to a baby rock, the grinding of the cupule and incised lines and the placement of the resulting powder on the body, all with the aim of becoming pregnant (Loeb 1926:246-248). Other ethnographic accounts associate the creation of cupules with other purposes: “weather control to women’s fertility, as trail markers, tests of boys’ strengths and paint cups” (Gilreath 2007:282). Another ethnographic account posits that the “rocks looked like the kind of rocks that poisoners used to grind various ingredients” (Price 1999:39). Yet another interpretation is that the cupule rocks were believed to encapsulate power; therefore, grinding these rocks provided a means of accessing that power (Whitley 2000:98). Placing the cupule rocks within a temporal framework is as ambiguous as their interpretations and problematic at best. Scientific dating techniques are questionable.
(Gilreath 2007:282, Price 1999:4), and more often than not, no artifacts are found around these rocks that provide any temporally diagnostic information.

Pomo cosmology incorporates an appreciation of the opposition between polar opposites while attempting to achieve a balance between the two. For example, many ceremonies “sought to integrate Human and Nature, Natural and Supernatural and Community and Wilderness” (Parkman 1994:22). This effort at achieving balance is integral to many rituals and taboos that are explained in ethnographic accounts and are still practiced today. In the case of a woman who is menstruating, a condition called !tela by the Kashaya, she and her husband/partner are forbidden to partake in certain activities. Ethnographic accounts tell that she could not eat meat, and her husband/partner could not hunt. She was not allowed to cook or gather food, and quite often, she was cloistered in a menstrual hut (Kennedy 1955:21, Kroeber 1976:254). Many of these observances and variations upon them are made today by the Kashaya and by others respecting these practices. The process of menstruation challenges the balance between the Natural and the Supernatural; therefore, maintenance of ritual taboos is essential to cosmic stability. These taboos are enforced because it is believed that while a woman is menstruating she holds a dangerous power that can only be controlled and kept in balance through observance of these taboos (Kennedy 1955:21).

Prehistoric Context

Many scholars caution the use of ethnographic information by itself, highlighting that it can be biased, inaccurate and at times misleading. In order to fill in the gaps or to buttress ethnographic accounts, oftentimes archaeology is a tool that can illuminate the corridors of time, and most frequently, archaeology alone can be used to discern
information about the past. For example, ethnographies provide little to no information regarding exchange relations among Native Americans, but artifacts can partially fill this gap. In this case, obsidian studies on artifacts have aided archaeologists in determining the boundaries between tribelets and helped determine what caused specific social organization patterns (Fredrickson 1996:25). The varying types of obsidian that are evident at LBM, e.g., Napa and Annadel, provide evidence that exchange relations had potentially formed with outside tribes, as LBM does not possess a source of this volcanic glass.

**Taxonomic Framework for the North Coast Region**

In addition to yielding information regarding exchange relations, artifacts are utilized by archaeologists to determine lifeways of groups in the past. For example, they are a means of discerning subsistence strategies and to categorize different levels of cultural complexity. The Central California Taxonomic System is a well-known, three-phase sequence that was specifically created to define attributes of a cultural sequence that offers a "temporal framework for cross-dating of archaeological sites" within the lower Sacramento Valley and the San Joaquin River and Sacramento River Delta regions (Fredrickson 1974a:41). This chronological sequence later incorporated the San Francisco Bay region. Sprouting from the Central California Taxonomic System and from ideas put forth by Clement W. Meighan (1955), David Fredrickson created a seminal sequence to categorize the archaeology of the early cultures in the North Coast Ranges (Fredrickson 1973, 1974a). The North Coast Ranges in California refers to the area extending from Sonoma County to the Oregon border, along the coast. Fredrickson's work arose out of the revelation that artifact assemblages in more remote localities tend
to deviate from the neatly compartmentalized groupings and lists created with the inception of the Central California Taxonomic System (Fredrickson 1973:23). Most importantly, the practical application of these groupings led to the conflation of traits and temporal sequences, meaning that particular artifacts can sometimes be associated with time and sometimes associated with cultural characteristics and sometimes, but not necessarily, both simultaneously (Fredrickson 1973:23). The information that follows outlines the main points of this system, the taxonomic framework for the North Coast Region.

Fredrickson (1973, 1974a) has divided time and cultural characteristics ranging from approximately 8000 BC to AD 1800 into three major periods (see Figure 8). Fredrickson begins with the Paleoindian period, approximately 8000-6000 BC. This period corresponds to the end of the Ice Age, and there is little concrete information about the environment or culture available for these dates. Due to a lack of millingstone implements that have been located from this period, milling is not believed to have occurred or to have been in an incipient phase. It is hypothesized hunting and gathering were the means of subsistence in this period (Fredrickson 1984:497). Following the Paleoindian period is the Archaic period, which is split into three different spans: lower, middle and upper. The Lower Archaic period extends from 6000-3000 BC. This period is linked to climate change associated with an antithermal, a period of high temperatures and minimal precipitation. During this period, there was an emphasis on seed collecting and processing, yet there is no evidence of acorn processing. The Middle Archaic period, beginning about 3000-2500 BC, is marked by the presence of acorn processing artifacts:
FIGURE 8: Fredrickson's Hypothesized Characteristics of Cultural Periods in California

**HYPOTHEZIZED CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURAL PERIODS IN CALIFORNIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1800</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bow and arrow introduced, replace dart and atlatl; south coast maritime adaptation flowers. Territorial boundaries well established. Evidence of distinctions in social status linked to wealth increasingly common. Regularized exchanges between groups continue with more material put into the network of exchanges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic Period</td>
<td>Growth of sociopolitical complexity; development of status distinctions based on wealth. Shell beads gain importance, possibly indicators of both exchange and status. Emergence of group-oriented religious organizations; possible origins of Kuksu religious system at end of period. Greater complexity of exchange systems; evidence of regular, sustained exchanges between groups; territorial boundaries not firmly established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate more benign during this interval. Mortars and pestles and inferred acorn economy introduced. Hunting important. Diversification of economy; sedentism begins to develop, accompanied by population growth and expansion. Technological and environmental factors provide dominant themes. Changes in exchange or in social relations appear to have little impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient lakes dry up as a result of climatic changes; milling stones found in abundance; plant food emphasis, little hunting. Most artifacts manufactured of local materials; exchange similar to previous period. Little emphasis on wealth. Social unit remains the extended family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleolntian Period</td>
<td>First demonstrated entry and spread of humans into California; lakeside sites with a probable but not clearly demonstrated hunting emphasis. No evidence for a developed milling technology although cultures with such technology may exist in state at this time depth. Exchange probably ad hoc on one-to-one basis. Social unit (the extended family) not heavily dependent on exchange; resources acquired by changing habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the mortar and the pestle. It is believed that this period saw the end of the antithermal and
the beginning of the medithermal, or slight cooling of climate conditions, which is the
climate that is experienced today. The Middle Archaic period persisted until about 1000-
500 BC. In this period, hunting increased in importance and the prevalence of marine and
littoral faunal remains becomes apparent. Fredrickson postulated that this period and the
new technologies evident within it (e.g., the concave base projectile point and the mortar
and pestle) are the product of population shifts. Following the Middle Archaic period is
the Upper Archaic period, which occurred from approximately 1000 BC or 500 BC-AD
1000. This period shows an increase in social complexity, which is demonstrated by way
of status distinctions that are evident in burials and seemingly more complex networks of
trade (Fredrickson 1974a:46-48). The Emergent period is split into two spans: Lower
(AD 1000-AD 1500) and Upper (AD 1500-AD 1800). The Lower Emergent period is
marked by a growing body of evidence that Native Americans carefully sculpted and
tended to the environment in order to make it more productive. Additionally, “Food
storage and exchange relations served to equalize the distribution of resources”
(Fredrickson 1974a:48). In the Upper Emergent period, evidence such as clam disk
money (wealth items) and increased evidence of inter-group exchange is present that
indicates social, religious and organization patterns were becoming more complex.

Placed within these periods are “patterns” or categories of artifacts that are found
in relation to each other. A pattern is defined as “a generalized cultural configuration,
usually encompassing one or more regions” (Fredrickson 1973:102).

A pattern is characterized by (a) similar technological skills and devices
(specific cultural items); (b) similar economic modes (production,
distribution, consumption)... and (c) similar mortuary practices
(Fredrickson 1973:118).
The patterns are defined further with the use of aspects. An aspect is defined as “a sequence of phases within a single district” (Fredrickson 1973:102), meaning that a pattern can be associated with even smaller areas of land, which can be defined by even more specificity in regard to artifact differentiation. Based on Fredrickson’s framework, six basic patterns are currently recognized: Post, Borax Lake, Berkeley, Mendocino, Gunther and Augustine. Additionally, it should be noted that although a temporal scheme is provided with these patterns, that scheme varies from region to region and should not be considered as a concrete reference point. The North Coast region that includes LBM is referred to as the Russian River subregion. There are two other subregions, the Eel River subregion and the Northwest Coast subregion, but only information that pertains to the Russian River subregion will be presented in this chapter.

Little is known about the Post Pattern or Paleoindian period due to limited archaeological sites that can be concretely dated to this period (Hildebrandt 2007:87, Rondeau et al. 2007). It is unknown if milling occurred, but it is hypothesized hunting and gathering were the means of subsistence in this period (Fredrickson 1984:497). The artifact most closely associated with this period is the fluted or Clovis-like point. These points “imply the use of a dart or atlatl” (Fredrickson 1984:497). In addition to the Clovis-like points, other artifacts affiliated with this period are crescents (see Figure 9).

The next pattern, the Borax Lake Pattern, is associated with wide-stemmed projectile points and millingstones and handstones (Fredrickson 1974a:42). The assemblage also includes stemless points, including non-fluted concave base projectile points, occasional mortars and a burin industry (Fredrickson 1974a:44). The southern representation of this pattern is represented by assemblages that are made entirely of
FIGURE 9: Artifacts Representative of the Post Pattern

A, C = Obsidian crescent-shaped projectile point or tool
B = Obsidian Fluted, concave-base projectile point fragment

flaked stone, including “large, wide-stemmed points (square bases with some fluting), ovoid flake tools and thin bladelet flakes” (Hildebrandt 2007:89). One source of evidence for lifeways comes from a site at Duncan’s Landing dating as far back as approximately 6000 BC (Schwaderer 1992:59 and Hildebrandt 2007:90). This site is situated in a rock arch cave, and it yielded a contracting stem projectile point and multiple evidence of subsistence from marine fauna among rich shell midden. The isotope dating of shellfish at this site indicated that the cave was occupied only during winter and fall, leading to the conclusion that settlements at this time were mobile (Hildebrandt 2007:90) (see Figure 10).

What used to be known as the late Borax Lake Pattern (Fredrickson 1973, 1974a, 1984) is now known as the Mendocino Pattern (Hildebrandt 2007:91). This pattern arises about 3000 BC in the Russian River areas (Hildebrandt 2007:91). Among the artifacts characteristic of the Mendocino Pattern are “small, concave-based, projectile points; lozenge-shaped points; large, stemmed points; and...crystals, known locally as Lake County diamonds” (Fredrickson 1973:196). Commonly found lithic tools include side-notched, corner-notched and concave-base dart points (Hildebrandt 2007:91). “McKee unifaces and often leaf-shaped dart points occur in the southern portion of Sonoma County. The assemblage found in northwestern California differs from that found further south; therefore, some have assigned the Mendocino Aspect to the more northerly occurrences and the Hultman Aspect farther south” (Hildebrandt 2007:91). Milling stone implements were also evident; Fredrickson asserts a co-occurrence of bowl mortars and pestles with milling stones and manos (Fredrickson 1984:521). It is believed that tribelets during this phase were mobile hunters and gatherers, moving communities and settlements to areas that would provide the most optimal foraging, depending on seasonality and availability (see Figure 11).
FIGURE 10: Artifacts Representative of the Borax Lake Pattern

A = Chert wide-stem projectile point with bifurcated base
B = Obsidian wide-stem projectile point
C = Millingstone and mano

FIGURE 11: Artifacts Representative of the Mendocino Pattern

A = Chert corner-notched projectile point
B = Chert side-notched projectile point
C = Bowl mortar and pestle
D = Millingstone and mano

The Berkeley Pattern first appears in 6500 BC and proceeds to hibernate in 4300 BC, only to reemerge in about 1200 BC lasting until AD 800 (see Figure 12). There are three recognized phases in this pattern: Creager, 1200-600 BC, Houx 600 BC-AD 100 and Redbud AD 100-800.

Artifact assemblages are elaborate and include leaf-shaped (Excelsior) and stemmed projectile points, a highly developed bone tool industry, many fishing-related implements, baked clay objects, and a relatively high frequency of mortars and pestles. Site structure can be linked to higher degrees of sedentism as well as increases in utilization of fish resources and intergroup exchange (Hildebrandt 2007:93).

The Gunther Pattern (post AD 500) has not been located any further south than Fort Bragg. Therefore, the characteristics of this phase will not be outlined, as they are not relevant to LBM.

The Augustine Pattern (post AD 500) is associated with the rattlesnake corner-notched projectile points and hopper mortars (Fredrickson 1984:498, Stewart 1985:39, Hildebrandt 2007:93). Additionally, in some localities clamshell disks and magnesite beads and disk and whole-shell Olivella beads have been found, indicating trade (Fredrickson 1984:498, Hildebrandt 2007:93). This period is marked by a growing body of evidence that Native Americans carefully sculpted the environment in order to make it more productive. Additionally, “Food storage and exchange relations served to equalize the distribution of resources” (Fredrickson 1974a:48). Evidence is also present that indicates that social, religious and organization patterns were becoming more complex. Within this period, there was a large degree of variability throughout the region. Some areas display a renewed focus on mobility; whereas, others retain a sedentary style (see Figure 13).
FIGURE 12: Artifacts Representative of the Berkeley Pattern (Houx Aspect)

A,B = Obsidian shouldered, lanceolate projectile points
C = Obsidian contracting-stem projectile point
D = Bowl mortar and pestle

FIGURE 13: Artifacts Representative of the Augustine Pattern

A-D = Obsidian corner-notched projectile points
E = Magnesite cylinder
F = Clamshell disk
G = Spire-lopped Olivella bead
H = Olivella saddle bead
I = Perforated charmstone
J = Hopper mortar and pestle
K, L = Haliotis ornaments

The Warm Springs Dam project clarified artifact seriation and phases of cultural complexity around the Lake Sonoma Area. Mark E. Basgall and Paul D. Bouey (1991) formulated three phases based on the findings in the area. In their creation of this temporal and stylistic framework, they revised Fredrickson's taxonomy. They omitted the Post Pattern and the Early Borax Lake Pattern due to a paucity of evidence for these patterns in the area, and they inserted newly named phases in the existing temporal framework. The three phases are as follows: Smith (AD 1300-AD 1800), Dry Creek (500 BC-AD 1300) and Skaggs (3000 BC-500 BC). As is the case with Fredrickson's established periods and cultural characteristics, this model cannot be interpreted as fixed. There are overlaps and anomalies (Basgall and Bouey 1991:47 and Stewart 1985:38) (see Figure 14).

The Skaggs Phase corresponds loosely with Fredrickson's late Lake Borax/Mendocino Pattern. Hand stones and milling stones were prevalent, and large quantities of projectile points were located, indicating mobile hunting camps. Projectile points were large and suggest the use of spears and atlatls. Projectile points were Willits side-notched and Mendocino concave base points, and the majority of points were chert (Stewart 1985:38).

The Dry Creek Phase compares with Fredrickson's Berkeley Pattern. Mortar and pestle were present at this time, yet the milling slab and handstone were also still in use. Acorn processing becomes apparent. Most projectile points were fashioned out of obsidian, which indicates growing trade networks. Projectile points most commonly associated with this phase are referred to as the Excelsior, which is a leaf-shaped form. Additionally, the atlatl appeared to still be in use.
FIGURE 14: Artifacts Representative of the Lake Sonoma Area

The Smith Phase compares to Fredrickson's late Augustine Phase. The bow and arrow appear during this phase; this is indicated by the presence of small rattlesnake points. In addition to the presence of the hopper mortar, clam disc beads appear, which are symbols of status and wealth and indicate further trade.

**HISTORIC OVERVIEW**

As can be discerned from the information presented in the previous pages, ever-present change was continuing to take place throughout the prehistoric period not only in terms of the artifacts but also in terms of social complexity. Some of the largest and most poignant changes that are most evident in the archaeological and historical record are the influences of contact with European culture that occurred during what are referred to as the proto-historic and historic periods. Not only were new diseases spread to the new world, causing sickness and plague (e.g., syphilis, small pox, tuberculosis; see Kennedy 1955:59), but additionally the presence of most western or European culture primarily meant domination and subjugation. Moreover, even when this was not the case, inevitably social structures, values and lifeways were altered due to culture contact.

The European presence began on the North Coast with the brief visits of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo in 1542, Sir Francis Drake in 1579, Sebastian Rodriguez Cermeno in 1595 and Sebastian Viscaino in 1603. Kent Lightfoot points out that well-known ethnographer S.A. Barrett made the conclusion based on stylistic descriptions of baskets that either the Kashaya Pomo or the Southern Pomo visited or greeted Sir Francis Drake and his men when they made landfall along the coast (Lightfoot 1991:8 from Barrett 1908:36-37). Many scholars debate the influence these brief sojourns on the California coast may have had upon the Native Americans. These debates include the impacts of

The hegemonic history of the region traditionally inhabited by the Kashaya Pomo can be divided into the following periods: Russian (A.D. 1812-1841), Mexican (A.D. 1841-1846) and American (A.D. 1846-present) (Ballard 1997:117, Lightfoot et al. 1991:21).

**Russian Period**

The historic fate of the Kashaya Pomo was much different than that of the Native Americans to the south. The influence of either the Mission Dolores in San Francisco or the Mission San Francisco de Solano in Sonoma, the northernmost establishment of the Spanish stronghold, did not cast a net of domination over Kashaya territory as they had done to other tribes living closer to these settlements. Yet, it must be noted that periodic raids into the more northern California territories (places like Cazadero and Fort Ross) by missionaries and others seeking laborers and converts did affect the populations in this area (see Kennedy 1955:78-79, Silliman 2004, Vallejo 1833:3). In general, the Kashaya did not encounter the often forced conversion to Catholicism and enslavement that many tribes to the south experienced under the Spanish padres. Instead of the Spanish, the Russians were the first European power to come into formal contact with the Kashaya. The Russians established Fort Ross in 1812 as a fur-hunting outpost. Fort Ross is the location of a previous Kashaya village or district, *Metini* (Kroeber 1976: Plate 36 and Huffman 1995:21). Fort Ross is located approximately 6 miles due west of LBM; therefore, LBM can be considered to be in the Fort Ross region. The Russians settled the
area in the name of their employer, the Russian American Company, in which the tsar and his family owned stock. The company charters specified that “native workers were to be treated equitably as Russian subjects, compensated fairly for their work and provided educational opportunities at the expense of the company”1 (Lightfoot 1991:14 from Dmytryshyn et al. 1989:xxxvi). The region that was settled by the Russians included ports, ranches and farms which ranged across an area that extended approximately 55 miles south of the fort and extended out to the Farallon Islands (Lightfoot 1991:12, Lightfoot 2005:5) (see Figure 15). Unlike the Spanish, the purpose of the Russian presence was not to save the souls of the aborigines or to “civilize” them and, in turn, create a new citizen base. Instead, the Russian American Company was in California solely for economic reasons. The goal was to bring back to the Motherland trade goods of otter pelts and to provide food to Russia’s forts in Alaska that could not sustain themselves due to hostile environmental conditions. In general, at Fort Ross, the Kashaya Pomo and a variety of other native laborers from Alaska and Hawaii were employed as hunters, agricultural laborers, in shipbuilding and aiding the Russians with a variety of chores around the fort and within the fort’s residences (Ballard 1997:123, Lightfoot et al. 1991:3-5, 15-18, Lightfoot 2005).

---

1 Interestingly, most accounts contrast the treatment of Native Americans by the Spanish with that of the Russians, highlighting the peacable and fair relations (Kennedy 1955:40, Lightfoot 1991:11-28, Von Kotzebue 1830:123-124). Other accounts point to Russian corruption and abuse of Native Americans (Lightfoot 2005:8). For example, Mariano Vallejo (1833) recounts “The treatment they give the gentiles or Indians is excellent when they invite them to help harvest the wheat. Apart from that they are very harsh with them” (Vallejo 1833:15). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to determine the nature of Russian treatment of and interaction with the Kashaya Pomo.
FIGURE 15: Location of Russian Settlements and Their Relation to the Little Black Mountain Property and Northern Franciscan Missions

Note: Not to scale

**Mexican Period**

In the mid- to late-19th century the fort changed hands a number of times, and the Kashaya Pomo were affected immeasurably by the changes in ownership of the region (Lightfoot et al. 1991:121). Largely due to poor profits, the fort was sold to John Sutter in 1841 (Lightfoot et al. 1991:16). The region, which was newly labeled as the Rancho Muniz, passed to the hands of William Benitz. The largest Kashaya Rancheria was on Benitz's land, and while residing there many of the Kashaya were paid in kind for their labor (Lightfoot et al. 1991:122). During this period, a number of ranches in the area employed a small population of Native Americans (Lightfoot et al. 1991:121). During the Mexican period, when William Benitz resided and ranched in the Fort Ross region, "the Indians learned to make flour tortillas, which are still a major item in the present diet....The Indians continued to consume their favorite foods such as acorns, shellfish, seagrass and kelp" (Kennedy 1955:77-78). Yet, ringing throughout this period's accounts are fearful tales of native woman being accosted and raped by Mexican cowboys employed at the ranchos. In addition to the fear and anger accompanying rape, the overwhelming fear of kidnapping of adults and children, both male and female for the purposes of both lust and labor loomed forebodingly for many Native Americans (Castañeda 1998:230-259, Kennedy 1955:79).

The Russian, Mexican and American influences are reflected most clearly within ethnohistorical and ethnographic accounts. One of the most comprehensive compilations of these accounts is provided by Mary Jean Kennedy (1955), who scoured primary source literature, lived at the Kashaya reservation in the 1940s, and devoted her dissertation research to the topic of Kashaya Pomo acculturation. In general, the numerous historic
accounts given of the Russian period reiterate the redundant observations describing how
the Native Americans, in general, retained their traditional housing, religion and dress
and were more open and kind to white men than were Native Americans farther south.

**American Period**

With the arrival of the Americans, the overall belief in the inferiority of the native peoples becomes the cause of much discrimination and justification for domination, as had been the case further south in the Spanish period and in both localities during the Mexican period. With the passage of the Homestead Act in 1862, Americans were claiming the majority of the territory once inhabited by the Kashaya Pomo and many other native inhabitants. The ability or opportunity to hide off in the hills was no longer an option. The Fort Ross region was sold in 1867 to Charles Fairfax and James Dixon, who forced the Kashaya off the lands. At this time, many of the Kashaya families moved to Haupt Ranch, known to the Kashaya as *Potol* (Huffman 1995:29). Haupt Ranch is located a few miles north and a few miles east from the settlement of Fort Ross, i.e., it is still in the region that was traditionally inhabited by the Kashaya. Charles Haupt was married to a Kashaya woman, and they welcomed the Kashaya people on their land. While at Haupt Ranch, the Kashaya residents seemed to have been free to retain their culture. Mary J. Huffman (1995) recounts a visit that S.A. Barrett made to the ranch where he recorded eight to ten classic Pomo houses and an underground dance house (Huffman 1995:22). Huffman also describes the notes of other ethnographers who visited the ranch: Edward Gifford and A.L. Kroeber observed freedom of religion and its accompanying expressions (Huffman 1995:22-27).
Upon Charles Haupt’s death in 1903, strained relations on Haupt’s Ranch both between Charles Haupt’s relatives and family residing at the ranch and the Kashaya forced the Kashaya to consider relocating (Huffman 1995:52-54). At the suggestion of a Kashaya dreamer (spiritual leader), Annie Jarvis, and through efforts of local villagers, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was persuaded to purchase land near Stewarts Point (Huffman 1995:53). In 1920, the community performed their last ceremony on the Haupt Ranch and moved to the Stewarts Point site that is still occupied by their descendents (Huffman 1995:53). Stewarts Point is located slightly north of Fort Ross. The arrival of the American period reduced availability of land and therefore resources (Kennedy 1955:161-162). In turn, this increased wage work performed by the Kashaya and increased consumption of non-traditional items. Additionally, increased participation by individual Kashaya in “white society” brought about a dissolution of the traditional religion and in turn facilitated an acceptance of Christian theology which altered cultural values (Kennedy 1955:169). Currently, the Kashaya are a Federally-recognized tribe that is governed by tribal council. The federation is called the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria.

LBM is even closer to Cazadero than Fort Ross. As a crow flies, LBM is approximately 2 miles west from the town of Cazadero. By the end of the 19th century, Cazadero’s population had swollen. Nearly the entire area was settled by 1897, and by 1908, there was barely an acre of land that had not been claimed (see Figure 16). The majority of early American-period inhabitants of Cazadero were European immigrants. Most engaged in either farming, ranching or logging, yet a variety of other trends and trades have altered the fabric of the area (e.g., the tourist industry). Cazadero was
FIGURE 16: Land Ownership in 1897 and 1908

Approximate location of Little Black Mountain property boundaries

McIntire and Lewis
1908 Official Map of the County of Sonoma, California. Sonoma, California.

Reynolds and Proctor
1897 Illustrated Atlas of Sonoma County. Reynolds and Proctor, Santa Rosa, California.
originally called Austin when a post office was established in 1881 (Bell and Heymens 1888, Daniels 2002:9). Many of the first inhabitants were immigrant ranchers, raising sheep, cattle and hogs (Daniels 2002:9). This trend continued throughout the history of the town. For example, the Sonoma County Register of Voters from 1924-1930 provides a glimpse into the people who inhabited the environs of Cazadero; one page lists 68 individuals who resided in Cazadero, with occupations listed as follows: 23 housewives, 14 farmers, six laborers and three ranchers, in addition to single listings such as teacher, blacksmith or carpenter (Sonoma County Register of Voters 1924-1930). Close to 40% of the individuals employed outside of the home were involved in ranching and farming activities. The 1930 US Population Census illustrates the variety of European immigrants who came to Cazadero and the vicinity: of the 43 adults listed on a single page that enumerates the individuals in Cazadero, 20 individuals were from European countries.

By 1886, the North Coast Pacific Railroad had established the town as its northern-most terminus with a spur running along Austin Creek from Duncan’s Mills just south (Wilson 1999:42). This presence is indicative of another important factor in Cazadero’s development: the lumber industry. This rail line made accessible vast tracts of timberland owned by some of the railroad directors (Wilson 1999:42). The lumber industry was expanding during this period with large, tree-laden parcels of land in and around the town of Cazadero being owned by Alexander Duncan and Company (Thompson 1877). After being hauled by train from Cazadero, lumber would arrive at Duncan’s Mills and be floated down the Russian River to Duncan’s Landing where it would have been loaded onto boats headed toward San Francisco (Wilson 1999:98).
With the presence of the railroad, this relatively inaccessible, yet wooded and scenic location came within reach of people living in the Bay Area. In the early 1880s, Silas D. Ingram established a resort and a two-story hotel that became a bustling business (Daniels 2002:9). Around 1886 the name of the town was changed from Austin to Ingram’s after Ingram’s Resort. In 1888, the town and the resort were purchased by George S. Montgomery who renamed it Cazadero, Spanish for “the hunting place” (Rogers 2004:5 and Daniels 2002:9). More resorts and lodges sprung up at this time, such as the Trosper House, which was constructed in 1898. This lodge was a large, two-story building that contained 20 bedrooms, and additionally boasted cottages and tents on the banks of nearby creeks to accommodate yet more guests (Daniels 2002:10).

The Cazadero rail line was abandoned in 1933, and on July 31 of that year, the last train left Cazadero for Sausalito with a funeral wreath adorning its headlight (Rodgers 2004:4). This final train departure signaled the decline of tourism in the area. With the onset of the Depression, few people came to picnic and vacation in Cazadero. In the 1940s, a lumber mill was established in the center of Cazadero by Loren Berry (Russian River News 1983:1 and 7), a descendent of George S. Montgomery (Jane Barry, personal communication 2009), and that mill flourished in Cazadero until the 1980s when it was moved out of town. The region continues to be a heavily logged area, yet it is still a beautiful, down to earth and scenic environment to visit.

**History of the Little Black Mountain Property**

The exact origin of the name Little Black Mountain is unclear. Local and regional histories do not discuss this locality. Additionally neighbors who live in the area and whose families have lived in the area assert that the name was not used until the early
1940s when the area was resurveyed by the USGS (John Bei, personal communication 2009; Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). The name first appears on the 1943 USGS 7.5 minute Cazadero quadrangle. Presumably, the mountain derived its name not only due to the color of the rock outcrops crowning the mountain, but also from its proximity to other land forms that are also named with reference to the color black in the area such as Black Mountain. Black Mountain is approximately 3 miles to the southwest of LBM. Interestingly, another mountain, also named Little Black Mountain is located only a few miles southwest of the property on the 1978 USGS 7.5 minute Arched Rock quadrangle.

The ownership history of LBM is convoluted and dramatic. The property changed hands a vast number of times. Ultimately, it was unified into its current size and shape in the 1950s and donated to SLT in parcels in the late 1970s and mid-1980s. In the course of researching the property, a number of documentary records were consulted: census records, land patent books, official public records, deeds, historic maps, newspapers and voter registrations records. Unfortunately, the tax assessment records for the periods outlined below are not available. Only those parcels of land on LBM that were occupied by individuals who left evidence of their presence on the property will be discussed in this overview.

LBM can be divided into five parcels that were eventually unified into its present size and shape (see Figure 17). Buildings are present in the third parcel, the southern half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of Section 30. Not only did people live on this section, but this section has been the source of great drama throughout its American history. The earliest available documentary record of this section’s ownership
is an 1885 application to appropriate timber rights by James H. Knowles (National Archives, Land Entry File #Bx 955). The property is sold by James H. Knowles to Charles Rule in 1905 (Book of Deeds 216:422). In 1910, the property was sold to J.B. Bartlett and B.C. Mayo (Book of Deeds 263:189, 485). Bartlett and Mayo created what is now referred to as a “wildcat” subdivision, a parcel or a number of parcels of land that on paper have been divided into neat and tidy planned communities. Each of these parcels is split into smaller parcels. These parcels are then sold/traded/given to individuals and families. The problem with these communities is that building them would not have been feasible due to poor or impossible building conditions resulting from existing topography. These wildcat subdivisions were often a scheme designed to dupe people out of money and for which buildout was never realized. A large part of the northern half of Section 30 of LBM had formal plans for development as the Cazadero Redwoods, the subdivision created by Bartlett and Mayo. In the course of researching the property, it was found that from 1910-1916 approximately 900 deeds were located wherein lots of this pseudo subdivision were sold to individuals and couples in amounts ranging from $7 to $40 (Book of Deeds 308:1-394 and Book of Deeds 286:1-498); there are likely more. In several instances, the same lot was sold two or three times. Individuals who lived on the property or are neighbors of LBM tell stories of individuals coming up their driveway with a Cazadero Redwoods deed in their hands asking where their property was located and saying they found it in their grandparent’s or parent’s dresser drawer (John Bei, personal communication 2009; Jane Hedlund, personal communication 2009).
FIGURE 17: Five Parcels Making Up Sonoma Land Trust's Little Black Mountain Property

1978 USGS 7.5 Minute Cazadero and Fort Ross Quadrangles
Ownership issues and dramas resulting from this scheme lasted into the 1980s. During the 1960s, in two areas of this parcel of LBM there were two different owners of the same plot of land. The property was deeded to Sonoma Land Trust by Nion Robert Thieriot in 1986 (Official Record Instrument 1986190140), and it was also deeded to Sonoma Land Trust in 2005 by two other separate individuals (Official Records Instrument 2005122146, Instrument 2005012956). The most recent owners lived there from about 1966 until the mid 1980s. Only one of these buildings is still standing today; yet, the date of construction for neither building is documented.

One area of the third portion of the property that has been the subject of ownership disputes is the Hedlund Cabin (see Figure 17). Jane Hedlund was deeded the property in the late 1960s by her parents, and the cabin on that property was occupied by Jane Hedlund until the 1980s; it is still standing today. In addition to having an unclear construction date, the cabin was severely damaged in 1966 when a large tree fell on it, and the Hedlunds rebuilt it almost completely (Jane Hedlund, personal communication 2009). In regard to the ownership issues that existed on this portion of the property, Jane Hedlund was constantly feuding with other land occupants such as Thieriot and previous owners. Hedlund tells a story that in about 1970 she came home to find that all of the trees around her house had been chopped down by an individual who also claimed the property (Jane Hedlund, personal communication 2009).

Soon after establishing their wildcat subdivision, Bartlett and Mayo sold the property to Theresa Foster who retained the property until 1937 when she sold it to William and Judith Bahls (Book of Deeds 286:230, Book of Deeds 438:488). The Bahls quickly flipped the property in that same year to Jack X. and Verlie C. Branstetter. In
1965, Branstetter sold the property to Joe F. and Margaret Key (Official Record 2101:187) who turned the property, less than a year later to Roy and Sarah Jane Hedlund (Official Record 2281:683-684). Neighbors assert that Branstetter was the first person to come to this portion of the property regularly, visiting on occasional weekends and summers (Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). Documentary records indicate that Branstetter also resided in Sacramento (Official Record 2273:847), and his death certificate indicates a similar story, although he had apparently remarried before the time of his death (Official Record 2728:848). A native of Missouri, Branstetter was able to make a living as salesman for Pillsbury (Official Record 2728:848). Branstetter died on February 10, 1967 in Sacramento from injuries resulting from a car accident. It is believed that Branstetter was responsible for building the Hedlund Cabin. Upon moving in Hedlund tells that there was a wooden plaque above the door that was engraved with the phrase "the house that Jack built" (Jane Hedlund, personal communication 2009). Branstetter established a small concrete dam and water conveyance system on an unnamed drainage/spring. While it is unclear if he set up this water works for the purpose of making money, it is clear from his 1939 application to the California Division of Water Resources that one purpose was to service the water needs of two cabins located proximally to the creek (the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 30). At the time of establishing his water rights, Branstetter was not permanently living on the property, but rather in Sacramento, as his address on the application shows (Division of Water Resources 1939, Application 9774). Additionally, in the application it is clear that Branstetter did not own the land from which he was appropriating the water. It was adjacent to his parcel. The application asserts that he was "trying to locate the owner" of
the property. Upon the sale of Branstetter's property, the rights were transferred to the
Keys and then to the Hedlunds and Davises. Currently, neighbors of the property, Captain
and Mrs. Blum, have an easement allowing them to use this water (Nancy Blum, personal
communication 2009).

Another area of the third portion of the property that has been the subject of
ownership disputes is referred to as the Davis Cabin (see Figure 17). It has not been
involved in as much drama, yet is still included in ownership disputes. In fact, the legal
description of the property places it in section 29, a section due east of where the building
is located, which is section 30 (Official Record 2230:229). This house was demolished in
December 2008 because of the structural and health issues associated with it. Dale and
Doris Davis purchased the property in 1966 from the same people who sold a property to
Jane Hedlund, the Keys (Official Record 2239:33-34). This couple purchased the
property from the Masonic Homes of California (Official Record 2230:229). This parcel
was deeded to Masonic Homes of California in 1956 by Charles Hartman (Official
Record 1448:29). According to John Bei, a long-time resident and neighbor of the
property, Charles Hartman was an old woodsman who lived on the property for as long as
Bei and his predecessors could remember (John Bei, personal communication 2009). In
1932, Hartman bought the property from Max Dettman (Book of Deeds 324:458).
Dettman bought the property in 1924 from Julius Schroeder (Book of Deeds 231:247)
who bought the property from the conniving duo, Bartlett and Mayo in 1916 (Book of
Deeds 308:366). Julius Schroeder was a German immigrant who appears in the 1930
Census as still living in Cazadero, despite no longer owning this parcel on LBM. Like the
Hedlund property, Bartlett and Mayo were not the original owners. In 1905, the property

It is unclear who built the buildings, now demolished, on this portion of the property. A residential building record from 1952 and 1969 asserts that in 1952 the condition of the property was 70% in fair condition and by 1969 it was assessed as having no value. Present on this portion of the property was an “old log cabin” in addition to a house and a garage all of which were assessed as having no value by the assessor in 1969 (Residential Building Record for APN#107-240-019:3). The Davises made a few additions to the home and added an elaborate hot tub/pool on this parcel, yet the assessor notes in 1969 that few improvements had been made by the Davises (Residential Building Record for APN#107-240-019:3).

Further intrigue and confusion is added to this portion of the property by the fact that the 1943 USGS 7.5 minute Cazadero quadrangle illustrates seven homes where the other information shows only two. Neighbors who have been in the area for generations and who are familiar with the area account for this fact by explaining that many hunting cabins did not possess concrete foundations and instead utilized wooden post foundations (John Bei, personal communication 2009). When the Creighton Ridge fire of 1978 blazed through the property, these buildings were reduced to ash.

The fourth parcel, the eastern half of the northeast quarter of Section 25, and the fifth parcel, the eastern half of the southwestern quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 25, were first recorded in land ownership files with the Homestead application of James N. Beckett in 1877 (National Archives, Land Entry File #Bx 938). Unfortunately, the original application was not located and only a duplicate from 1884 was found, which
contained limited information regarding the activities of James N. Beckett on the property. By 1899, the property was sold by Alexander, Duncan and Julia McNee to James Baker (Book of Deeds 192:238). In 1911, the property was purchased by Roman Alexander (Book of Deeds 279:465). By many accounts, Alexander resided on the property until 1921 when he sold the property (James Berry, personal communication 2009; Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). Alexander was an immigrant from Finland who was by profession a carpenter (US Population Census 1910). A written account by a now deceased, but long time resident of Cazadero tells the story of how Alexander created walls in their home so that it was no longer possible to “peep” over at other family members (Strath-Gilbert n.d.). This same account describes how one day, after completing some carpentry for the family, Alexander demanded payment. Unfortunately, the man of the house did not have any money to offer at that moment. In turn, Alexander grabbed the lady of the house and asserted that he would take her as payment. It all worked out in the end, and after being told that this sort of reaction was actually a compliment in Alexander’s native county of Finland, the lady of the house allowed him to come back to make more improvements.

Alexander excelled at making saunas. With this skill, he rode the coattails of the success of the other resorts in the town at this time and opened a resort named Roman’s Resort in the town of Cazadero around 1912-1915 (James Berry, personal communication 2009). It is unclear exactly when Alexander left Cazadero or sold this business, yet by January of 1921, Bernhard E. and Ellen A. Peterson had purchased his parcels and began building a ranch. This ranch, inclusive of a house and accompanying farm buildings and structures, first appears on the 1921 Army Corps of Engineers 15 minute Skaggs
quadrangle. The Petersons were both from Sweden (US Population Census 1910). Ellen’s arrival in 1900 preceded Bernard by a year (US Population Census 1910). Initially, the Petersons lived in Oakland with Bernhard working as a “motorman” on street cars (US Population Census 1910 and 1920). The Petersons had a son, Arthur. By 1921 when they purchased this portion of the property, Arthur was 13. Arthur attended school in the town of Cazadero (John Bei, personal communication 2009). Of the portions of the house that are still in existence, most prominent is the large stone fireplace. The son of one of Arthur’s schoolmates tells that everyday upon walking home from school Arthur would collect medium sized rocks that were aesthetically pleasing. These stones eventually came to form the multi-colored fireplace that can be seen today (John Bei, personal communication 2009).

In 1922, Bernhard is listed in the voter registration records as a Republican farmer living in Cazadero (Sonoma County Voter Registration 1914-1930). The 1930 Census lists Bernhard and his son as residents of Cazadero, yet strangely his wife Ellen is absent from the record (US Population Census 1930). Additionally, Bernhard and his son are recorded as both being automobile mechanics. Apparently, Bernhard owned and operated a repair shop in Cazadero (John Bei, personal communication 2009). Most importantly, the 1930s census also tells that Bernhard owned his own house, worth $3000. Voter registration records indicate that at least until 1944, after which the records are no longer available for research, Bernhard lived in Cazadero. His occupation is listed as being a carpenter (Sonoma County Voter Registration 1932-1944). Bernhard was an entrepreneurial spirit, and in addition to working as a mechanic, he operated his own carpentry business (John Bei, personal communication 2009). The 1943 USGS 7.5
minute Cazadero quadrangle presented in Figure 18 illustrates the location of the home built by the Petersons and specifically designates the area as "Peterson's Ranch." The Petersons resided at this location until the early 1940s, and in 1945, they sold the property (Official Record 667:344). Upon the sale of the property, it appears that the Petersons relocated to the Santa Rosa area. Bernard died April 5, 1960. The obituary states that he was the "dearly beloved husband of Ellen A. Peterson" (Press Democrat 1960:14). Ellen remained living in Santa Rosa until 1972 when the "loving mother of Arthur" died on May 27 (Press Democrat 1972:11).

By 1952, Dr. William H. and Mrs. Rose A. Hatch had acquired the five parcels and unified them into one property, which is the shape, form and size of LBM currently owned by Sonoma Land Trust (Official Record 1171:558). It is clear that during this period portions of the property were leased to others for the purposes of logging (Official Record 1316:591-594). Accounts of neighbors and residents who have generations of family in the area, suggest that the Hatches did not utilize LBM as a primary residence, but rather they would visit occasionally in the summer and for hunting weekends (John Bei, personal communication 2009; Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). The Hatches also possessed a residence in Santa Rosa beginning in 1957 (Sonoma County Telephone Directory 1957:57). In 1964, the Hatches sold LBM (Official Record 2049:970). Dr. Hatch died on March 21, 1967 in Santa Rosa (Press Democrat 1967:8 and California Death Index 1940-1997). Mrs. Hatch continued to reside at their Santa Rosa residence until her death in 2003 (Social Security Death Index 2009 and Sonoma County Telephone Directory 1957-2004). After the Hatches sold the property in 1964, the property passed through the hands of a number of individuals and couples who
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In 1974, the property was purchased by Nion Robert Thieriot, great-grandson of *San Francisco Chronicle* co-founder, Michael H. de Young (*San Francisco Chronicle* 1989). To some extent, Thieriot was considered a black sheep of sorts by his family (Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). Although he had the means to live a high-society and relatively luxurious lifestyle, he and his family opted for a simple and more natural life. For a brief period, LBM provided an ideal environment to do this. Many individuals claim that Thieriot led an almost cursed life likening him to the biblical character, Job (Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009, Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). He was orphaned when he was nine years old, both of his parents dying in the fateful sinking of the Italian ocean liner *Andrea Doria*. He was raised in the Bay Area by his aunt and uncle (*San Francisco Chronicle* 1999:A.16). Thieriot with his wife Peggy and two children, Janet and William, lived at what used to be Peterson’s house for four years (John Bei, personal communication 2009; Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). While some accounts assert the Thieriots worked at restoring the heavily-logged land at LBM (*Community News* 1978:33), neighbors of the Thieriots insist that they carried on additional logging activities (John Bei, personal communication 2009; Jane Hedlund, personal communication 2009). While other neighbors claim he utilized the trees for carpentry pursuits, yet not to the level of a logging operation (Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). While living at LBM, Thieriot also ran a vegetable farm on the property (*San Francisco Chronicle* 1999:A.16), and he attempted to ranch cattle (Nancy Blum, personal communication 2009). In 1978, LBM and the Cazadero area were
decimated by the Creighton Ridge fire. In the course of the fire, nearly 12,000 acres, including LBM, were blackened and burned (Barnett 1978:1A). After this catastrophe, Thieriot no longer would or could reside on LBM; the denuded landscape in addition to the loss of their home was depressing for him and his family (Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). He then began slowly deeding portions of the property to SLT while continuing efforts at revitalizing the land and facilitating recovery. These parcels were deeded in their entirety to SLT by 1986 (Official Record: Instrument 1986190140).

In the mid-1980s, Mrs. and Mr. Thieriot divorced (San Francisco Chronicle 1999:A.16). Importantly, Thieriot is one of the first benefactors to SLT, deeding to SLT their first parcels of land (Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). After moving from LBM to Massachusetts, he spearheaded major conservation efforts, working intensely with the Berkshire Natural Resources Council and preserving over 4500 acres in Berkshire County (Stanford Newsletter 1999). Interestingly, both LBM and the property in Berkshire County have stringent logging restrictions, while still allowing for preservation (San Francisco Chronicle 1999:A.16). Unfortunately, his ranch in Massachusetts also burned down when it was struck by lightning (Joan Vilm, personal communication 2008). Thieriot died on December 31, 1998 in Massachusetts. Peggy and her son William are still alive today. Thieriot’s appreciation for LBM is continued today under the careful stewardship of SLT.
CHAPTER III: CULTURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY

INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that many authors do not always concur on the best management practices for cultural resources, most agree that effective management first involves identification and recording of the resource(s) (McManamon 2005:1231). In order for a resource to be managed, it must be located, identified, and mapped. The majority of this chapter is devoted to describing the cultural resources that were located on the Little Black Mountain property (LBM) during surveys conducted from fall 2008 to summer 2009. In the course of the surveys, cultural resources were sought out, observed, identified and formally recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms. These forms were submitted to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), which is essentially a repository and research source for records of cultural resource locations and types. The encyclopedic holdings of the NWIC contain cultural resources information relevant to 16 counties in California.

This chapter starts by outlining the results of a literature and records search as well as a review of historic-era maps, which defines the sensitivity of the area and vicinity. Next, it discusses efforts at contacting local historical societies and Native American groups potentially possessing knowledge of the cultural resources situated on LBM. It then summarizes the outcome of previous surveys on and adjacent to LBM, and it closes with an explanation of survey methods and survey results.

---

2 Due to the highly sensitive nature of many of the sites located on LBM, locational information presented in this public document is purposely vague.
RECORDS AND LITERATURE SEARCH

Prior to surveying LBM, research was conducted at the NWIC. The information regarding LBM and an area one half mile in radius outside it was researched for any previously recorded or reported resources. Only one study (Foster 1983) has been conducted in a portion of LBM. Within the half-mile radius outside of LBM, a total of 12 surveys and recorded resources was reported on the NWIC maps.

In addition to examining the previously recorded resources and surveys conducted on and adjacent to LBM, the following literature was reviewed: California Inventory of Historical Resources (California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976), the California Office of Historic Preservation’s Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California (CA-OHP 1988), California Historical Landmarks (CA-OHP 1993), California Points of Historical Interest (CA-OHP 1992), and the Historic Properties Directory Listing (CA-OHP 2009). The Historic Properties Directory includes the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources, as well as the most recent listings (through 10 November 2008) of the California Historical Landmarks and California Points of Historical Interest. The review found no cultural resources within the study area listed in these inventories.

In addition the following maps were reviewed: General Land Office Plat (1877), Map of Sonoma County (Bowers 1867, Thompson 1877, Bell and Heymans 1888, Peugh 1934), Illustrated Atlas of Sonoma County (Reynolds and Proctor 1897), Official Map of the County of Sonoma (McIntire and Lewis 1908), 1921 Army Corps of Engineers 15 Minute Skaggs and 1943 USGS 7.5 Minute Cazadero quadrangle. The review found that although there were not any listed historic resources within LBM, a ranch and
accompanying structures was present on the property, evident from a 1921 map (1921 Army Corps of Engineers 15 Minute Skaggs quadrangle). Additionally, the 1943 USGS 7.5 Minute Cazadero quadrangle illustrates seven structures in the eastern half of the property.

A number of organizations were contacted in order to conduct a thorough review of existing databases that are not accessible to the public. First, a request was made of the Native American Heritage Commission to review the Sacred Lands file for Traditional Cultural Properties. The response, dated February 17, 2009, indicated that although the sacred lands files failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources, other individuals should be contacted for more information. In turn, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Kashaya Pomo, Reno Franklin, was contacted. Franklin indicated that the area was considered sacred in a ritual context but did offer any cultural resource-specific information (Reno Franklin, personal communication 2009). Next both the Sonoma County Historical Society and the Russian River Historical Society were contacted. The Russian River Historical Society did not have any information concerning the property, yet suggested that James Berry, a local historian, be contacted (Jane Barry, personal communication 2009). James Berry was contacted, and although he did not express any concerns about resources on LBM, information provided by this conversation was used to weave a cohesive picture of the history and lives that were associated with the property (James Berry, personal communication 2009). The Sonoma County Historical Society did not have any information about LBM, but deferred to Jane Berry, the President of the Russian River Historical Society for specific information (see Appendix A for copies of written correspondence).
Additionally, pertinent ethnographic literature was reviewed (Kroeber 1976, Barrett 1908, McLendon and Oswalt 1978, among others). This information is provided in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

### Previously Surveyed Areas and Recorded Resources

Thirty-seven of the approximately 550 acres comprising LBM had been surveyed (Foster 1983) and two archaeological sites were identified: a petroglyph and a lithicdebitage (i.e., lithic debris and discards from tool manufacture) and tool concentration.

Within a half-mile radius outside of LBM, seven survey reports and five formally reported resources are recorded on the NWIC maps. From these survey reports and reported resources, 30 sites were located.

One of the seven surveys that were conducted within a half-mile radius of the property reported finding sites or cultural constituents. Study S-111, conducted for the Navarro Ranch Land Development in preparation for a land development project, located 18 petroglyphs in addition to six sites and several isolated artifacts (King 1974).

Approximately 2078 acres directly adjacent to LBM were surveyed. The survey extended along the northern and western property boundaries of LBM and beyond, along Pole Mountain Creek and Ward Creek. In addition to the petroglyphs, most of the sites found during this survey were comprised of prehistoric obsidian and chert debitage concentrations accompanied by pestles.

The remaining five records that report the discovery of archaeological resources are all formally recorded sites. P-49-1900 overlaps with S-111 in that it formally records a site located in King's 1974 survey (Foster 1987). It consists of a prehistoric lithic concentration accompanied by mortars and pestles. This site is located approximately 300
meters west of the western property boundary. P-49-1927 is an isolated bowl mortar (Foster 1990). This isolated artifact was located approximately 150 meters west of LBM’s western property boundary. Foster was visiting each of these locations for the purpose of survey before execution of a Timber Harvest Plan. P-49-1974 is a site measuring 86 meters (north-south) by 45 meters (east-west) (Kent 1996). It is made up of a prehistoric lithic concentration accompanied by complete tools of obsidian and brown and green chert. This site was discovered during a survey for a Timber Harvest Plan and is approximately 150 meters east of LBM. Additionally, CA-SON-2010 is recorded as a site possessing the following artifacts: a lithic debitage concentration, lithic tools and a pestle (Berry 1992a). Finally, CA-SON-2011 is recorded as containing two adjacent bedrock mortars or cupule rocks. These two sites are located less than 5 meters northeast of LBM (Berry 1992b). See Table 1 for a review of records, studies and survey reports.

CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY

Methods

Leslie Smirnoff, Tom Origer, Michelle De Long and other students of the Santa Rosa Junior College Field School (Fall 2008 and Spring 2009) in addition to Bryan Much, Kate Erickson, Rut Ballesteros and Naomi Scher of the Anthropological Studies Center, Sonoma State University, conducted cultural resources surveys throughout LBM from October 2008 through June 2009. The surveys were carried out using a mixed-strategy approach. A complete survey was infeasible due to topography and vegetative cover. Areas of greatest sensitivity were surveyed, and areas of low sensitivity were sampled. In general, areas that were too steep in slope or covered by dense brush or poison oak were not inspected, except in areas that have a high potential for human
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Number/Primary Number</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Description/Constituents</th>
<th>Within LBM</th>
<th>Within 1/2 mile of LBM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  S-50</td>
<td>Fredrickson</td>
<td>1974b</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Nothing located</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2  S-111                    | King        | 1974  | Prehistoric | - Six sites  
- 18 petroglyphs  
- several isolated artifacts                                                | NO         | YES, and beyond          |
| 3  P-49-1900                | Foster      | 1987  | Prehistoric Site | Lithic debitage concentration and mortar and pestle                     | NO         | YES                    |
| 4  P-49-1927                | Foster      | 1990  | Prehistoric Isolated Artifact | Bowl mortar                                                              | NO         | YES                    |
| 5  P-49-1974                | Kent        | 1996  | Prehistoric Site | Lithic debitage concentration; obsidian, brown and green chert           | NO         | YES                    |
| 6  CA-SON-2010              | Berry       | 1992a | Prehistoric Site | Lithic concentration and lithic tools; pestle                            | NO         | YES                    |
| 7  CA-SON-2011              | Berry       | 1992b | Prehistoric Site | Two BRMs/petroglyphs                                                    | NO         | YES                    |
| 8  S-2433                   | Quinn       | 1981  | NA        | Nothing located                                                        | NO         | YES                    |
| 9  S-5830                   | Foster      | 1983  | Prehistoric sites | Camp site, cupule rock and lithic debitage concentration              | YES        | NO                     |
| 10 S-6028                   | Foster      | 1983  | NA        | Nothing located                                                        | NO         | YES                    |
| 11 S-6038                   | Foster      | 1983  | NA        | Nothing located                                                        | NO         | YES                    |
| 12 S-13770                  | Berry       | 1992c | NA        | Nothing located                                                        | NO         | YES                    |
| 13 S-28772                  | Rich, Weber and Roscoe | 2003 | NA        | Nothing located                                                        | NO         | YES                    |
activity or occupation, e.g., the rocky outcrops at the pinnacle of the property were surveyed due to the possibility of a rock shelter or the presence of rock art. Rocky outcrops and terraces along drainages were also given attention, in addition to other areas such as saddles between hills that bear the potential for accommodating human activity comfortably. Where possible, a survey of the ground surface was carried out by walking transects ranging from 20 to 50 meters apart, following the contours of the terrain. At regular intervals the ground surface was scraped in order to remove leaf litter or other visual obstructions. Ground visibility was generally poor due to duff or vegetation cover.

For each archaeological resource located in the course of the survey, at a minimum a Primary Record form (DPR 523a) was completed (see Appendix B). No artifacts were collected in the course of the surveys. See Figure 19 for an illustration of areas surveyed.

Findings

Resulting from these surveys, a total of 17 sites/petroglyphs and one isolated artifact that had not been located before was observed and recorded. While much of LBM has been surveyed for archaeological resources, the areas that have not been surveyed are locations that are difficult to reach due to physical limitations such as steep slopes or dense vegetation cover. There is a high probability that additional, resources do exist in some of these locations. Additionally, the items that were already noted in the previous survey were formally recorded and documented (FOSTER-1 and FOSTER-2). A total of 19 cultural resources was identified and recorded. Resources that were located were designated in the field as LBM-1 through LBM-17. Table 2 presents a summary of the cultural resources located on LBM.
LBM-1 is also referred to as the Peterson Ranch or the Thieriot Ranch after the families that once resided in this location. This site, which is located in the western portion of LBM, consists of the remains of a historic-era ranch house that was almost continuously occupied from at least 1921 until 1978 (Book of Deeds 391:478 Book of Deeds 400:422, Sonoma County Voter Registration 1914-1944). The entire site measures approximately 1000 feet in length (east-west) by 400 feet in width (north-south).

Comprising this site are a number of features: Feature A1, the concrete foundation of the house; Feature A2, the large, still-standing, natural stone and cement chimney; Feature B, garden area/work area/debris scatter and possible dump area with associated remnants of a water tank; Feature C1, the wooden post and concrete pier animal corral/pen; Feature C2, the wooden loading chute; Feature D, the remnants of an apple tree orchard; and Feature E, the remains of a walnut orchard.

LBM-2 is a cupule rock that is located near LBM's eastern boundary and on a north-facing slope that is to the south of St. Elmo Creek. The site consists of a single cupule rock, comprised of a schist boulder upon which five cupules are visible on the southern side of the boulder. It is likely that more cupules exist, but due to heavy moss coverage on the rock, the entire surface was not cleared. The rock measures 6.4 meters in length (east-west) and 4.5 meters in width (north-south). The height of the boulder at its highest point is 2.5 meters. It is situated on a complex slope that is angled in two different directions: there is an 18-degree north-facing slope in addition to a 12-degree east-facing slope. Most of the cupules are approximately 1 meter from ground surface. The sizes range in diameter from 8 centimeters to 2 centimeters and in depth from 3 centimeters to 1 centimeter.
LBM-3 is also a cupule rock. It is situated to the southeast of St. Elmo Creek, and it has been split, likely by a felled or fallen tree. Ten cupules plus two incipient cupules are visible on the northwest side of the boulder. It is likely that more cupules exist, but due to heavy moss coverage on the rock, the entire surface was not cleared. The rock measures 2.9 meters in length (northeast-southwest) and 1.2 meters in width (northwest-southeast). The height of the boulder at its highest point is 0.5 meters. The sizes of the cupules range in diameter from 6.5 centimeters to 3.5 centimeters and in depth from 1 centimeter to 0.5 centimeter.

LBM-4 is a cupule rock. This schist boulder exhibits 36 cupules, some of which are oval, most are circular, and a series of incised lines. All cultural modifications to the rock are located on the top of this boulder. The incised lines run east to west (ranging from about 5-15 centimeters in length). The table-like rock measures 3.5 meters in length (north-south) and 3.3 meters in width (east-west). The height of the boulder varies. At its highest point it measures 1 meter, yet the western portion of the rock is almost flush with the ground. The sizes of the cupules range in diameter from 7 centimeters to 1.5 centimeters and in depth from 3 centimeters to 0.25 centimeter.

LBM-5 is a cupule rock. It is located south of St. Elmo Creek and on the edge of a mid-slope terrace. This schist boulder exhibits seven cupules on its eastern face. The rock measures 1.8 meters in length (north-south) and 1.2 meters in width (east-west). The height of the boulder is 0.8 meters, and the top is level. The sizes of the cupules range in diameter from 7 centimeters to 3.5 centimeters and in depth from 2.5 centimeters to 0.25 centimeter.
LBM-6 is a cupule rock. It is located north of St. Elmo Creek proximal to LBM's northeastern boundary. It is situated 39 meters southeast of LBM-4. This schist boulder has been carved with six visible cupules. All vegetation was not cleared from this rock; therefore, it is likely there are more cupules that were not discerned. The range of the cupule diameter is 7 centimeters to 3 centimeters, and depth ranged from 2 centimeters to 0.5 centimeter. The rock measures 3.5 meters in length (east-west) and 5.5 meters in width (north-south). It is 2.7 meters tall at its highest point.

LBM-7 is another cupule rock. It is located north of St. Elmo Creek, proximal to the northeastern property boundary, across St. Elmo Creek from LBM-2 and adjacent to LBM-8. This 2.9 meters in length (east-west) by 2.1 meters in width (north-south) schist boulder has been carved with 22 cupules in addition to 10 incipient cupules. The majority of these petroglyphs are located on the northeastern and top portions of the rock. All vegetation was not cleared from this rock; therefore, it is likely more cupules are present that were not discerned. The diameter of the cupules ranged from 9 centimeters to 2 centimeters, and the depth ranged from 2 centimeters to 0.5 centimeter. The rock is 0.4 meter tall at its highest point. Interestingly, in the northeastern corner of the boulder a small portion of the rock surface has been broken off, and two cupules are present on this surface.

LBM-8 is also a cupule rock. This boulder is located north of St. Elmo Creek. This 2.3 meters in length (north-south) by 1.5 meters in width (east-west) schist boulder has been carved with nine cupules. The majority of the petroglyphs are located on the southeastern and top portions of the rock. All vegetation was not cleared from this rock; therefore, it is likely there are more cupules that were not discerned. The diameter of the
cupules ranged from 7 centimeters to 3 centimeters, and the depth ranged from 1.5 centimeters to 0.25 centimeter. It is 0.4 meter tall at its highest point.

LBM-9 is an isolated artifact. This artifact is a projectile point made of Napa obsidian that measures 4 centimeters in height and 2 centimeters in width at its widest point. This point can be characterized as either an Excelsior Series point, which is affiliated with the Dry Creek Phase (Basgall and Bouey 1991:47) or a lanceolate or leaf-shaped point that can be associated with the Houx Aspect of the Berkeley Pattern, which is a characteristic of the Upper Archaic Period (Fredrickson 1984:485 and 501 and Hildebrandt 2007:93). Taken together these categorizations date the artifact to an approximate range of 1000 BC to AD 500.

LBM-10 is a site that is located in the eastern portion of LBM and on the south side of the main dirt road. It is situated on a terrace along St. Elmo Creek. The site measures 53 meters (east-west) by 29 meters (north-south) and is roughly oval-shaped. It consists of a chert and obsidian concentration (eight flakes total), two chert scrapers/unifaces, 10 pestles and pestles fragments (six were incomplete) and one fragment of a Hopper mortar. The Hopper mortar is indicative of a relatively recent date, 500 AD to 1850 AD (Fredrickson 1984:498).

LBM-11 is comprised of historic-period water works and an isolated projectile point. The portion of LBM-11 that consists of a historic-era, concrete dam/spring box and associated water conveyance was constructed between 1939 and 1940. The application to appropriate water rights, dated November 27, 1939, asserts that construction was to begin within three months of the application date (Division of Water Resources, Application 9774). The system begins at the base of a 30-degree slope that leads up to the main dirt
road. Thirty-five feet downslope from the dirt road lays a concrete water conveyance beam that is 16 inches in width and which stretches (in a roughly northeast-southwest direction) 27 feet to the beginning of the spring box/dam. Approximately 14 feet from the start of the spring box/dam is a supplement to the water conveyance system consisting of an additional concrete beam that is angled 45 degrees on a southwesterly direction and which extends for approximately 16 feet where it terminates into a spring that spouts from the earthen slope extending up to the dirt road. The conveyance beam is 16 inches wide and utilizes an inset central portion that is surrounded by an elevated gutter of approximately 3 inches on either side and which serves to contain the flow of water into the spring box. The spring box measures 9 feet in length (north-south) 6 feet in width (east-west) and is 2.5 feet in height. Additionally, LBM-11 is comprised of a projectile point that was located 3 feet upslope from the water conveyance beam. This obsidian point measures 2-1/2 centimeters in length 1.75 centimeters in width, and it was visually sourced as Annadel obsidian. The projectile can be characterized as either a Rattlesnake Series point, characteristic of the Smith Phase (Basgall and Bouey 1991:47) or a corner-notched point affiliated with the Augustine Pattern (Fredrickson 1984:485 and 497). The stylistic analysis of this point dates to an approximate range of AD 500 or AD 1850, the Emergent Period.

Just a few meters to the west of this spring is a 68-meter (north-south) x 32-meter (east-west) oval-shaped site that was labeled LBM-12. Located within this site were one whole blue-green schist Hopper mortar and two blue-green schist Hopper mortar fragments (the whole one measuring 45 centimeters x 40 centimeters and the first fragment measuring 30 centimeters x 30 centimeters and the second fragment measuring
16 centimeters x 16 centimeters), 23 obsidian flakes (including one tertiary cortical flake), a total of 88 chert flakes (nine green chert, 35 red chert, one yellow chert, 17 red and green chert, 20 blue-green chert, and six black chert flakes, for a total of 111 flakes. An additional find on this site consists of what appears to be a tool, but the potential use is unclear. This blue schist artifact, which measures 10 centimeters x 6 centimeters, has a smooth appearance and bears the marks of use as a mortar. A fragment of a pestle was also found, as were one large red chert assay fragment (4 centimeters x 2 centimeters) and a green chert assay fragment (5 centimeters x 3 centimeters) plus a large fragment of obsidian (4 centimeters x 2 centimeters). Also located were three projectile points. The first is a Napa obsidian projectile point, which measures 2 centimeters in length and 1.5 centimeters in width. This projectile can be characterized as either a Rattlesnake Series point, characteristic of the Smith Phase (Basgall and Bouey 1991:47) or a corner-notched point affiliated with the Augustine Pattern (Fredrickson 1984:485 and 497). The stylistic analysis of this point dates to an approximate range of AD 500 to AD 1850, the Emergent Period. The second projectile point, also fashioned out of Napa obsidian measures 2.5 centimeters in length and 2.8 centimeters in width, recalls the form of a diamond-shaped point that is associated with the Excelsior Series (Basgall and Bouey 1991:218 and Fredrickson 1974a:47). Fredrickson (1974a) places this point temporally within both the Middle Archaic Period (3000 BC to 1000 BC) and Upper Archaic Period (1000 BC to AD 500); whereas, Basgall and Bouey (1991) associate the point with the Dry Creek Period, which is placed on a timeline between 500 BC to AD 1300. Evidently, the date range for this type of point is fairly broad. The third projectile point is made of green chert and measures 4 centimeters in length and 2 centimeters in width. The shape of this
point is referred to by Basgall and Bouey (1991) as a Willits Series point, considered part of the Dry Creek Phase with a bit of overlap in the Skaggs Phase. The Willits Series point, which is a spear or dart point, indicates an earlier occupation and is designated within the Lower Archaic Period (6000 BC to 3000 BC) to Middle Archaic Period, dating to approximately 3000 BC to AD 500. In contrast, Fredrickson (1984) categorizes this point under the umbrella of the Berkeley Pattern and would further designate it under the Houx Aspect. This determination places this piece into the Upper Archaic Period (500 BC to AD 1000).

LBM-13 is an 80-meter (north-south) by 55-meter (east-west), oval-shaped prehistoric site. Three bifaces were located at this site in addition to an abundance of lithic debitage concentration. These projectile points can be characterized as either an Excelsior Series point, which is affiliated with the Dry Creek Phase (Basgall and Bouey 1991:47) or a lanceolate or leaf-shaped point that can be associated with the Houx Aspect of the Berkeley Pattern, which is a characteristic of the Upper Archaic Period (Fredrickson 1984:485 and 501 and Hildebrandt 2007:93). Taken together these categorizations date the artifact to an approximate range of 1000 BC to AD 500. The first biface measures 3 centimeters in length and 1.75 centimeters in width. It is composed of Annadel obsidian and exhibits the diamond shape that is characteristic of an Excelsior Series point. The second biface is constructed out of dark gray chert and shows signs of fragmentation on an entire half. It measures 4 centimeters in length and 3 centimeters in width. The third measures 3.2 centimeters in length and 2 centimeters in width. It is composed of reddish-brown chert and is in an incomplete or fragmented state, as one edge displays finer knapping and appears to be more finished than the other. Culturally
modified materials are both chert and obsidian. A total of 85 flakes was identified: 57 chert flakes and 28 obsidian flakes. Chert colors vary from dark gray, green and red. Obsidian was visually sourced to be from both Napa and Annadel.

LBM-14 is also a cupule rock. This boulder is located south of the main dirt road/trail within the eastern portion of LBM and situated along St. Elmo Creek on an 15-20 degree, north-facing slope. This table-like schist boulder exhibits seven cupules on its flat top. The rock measures 2.2 meters in length (north-south) and 2.1 meters in width (east-west). The height of the boulder is 2.2 meters. The sizes of the cupules range in diameter from 6.5 centimeters to 4 centimeters and in depth from 2.5 centimeters to 0.75 centimeter.

LBM-15 is an oval-shaped prehistoric site situated along St. Elmo Creek that measures 19 meters (north-south) x 7 meters (east-west). Four artifacts were located at this site: three flakes of Napa obsidian and a single red chert flake. This site is located approximately 29 meters down slope from LBM-14.

Located approximately 40 meters down slope from LBM-15 along St. Elmo Creek is LBM-16. This oval-shaped prehistoric site is 27 meters (north-south) x 8.5 meters (east-west). Identified within this site is lithic debitage and stone milling implements. Five artifacts were located at this site: one dark gray chert flake, one metamorphic rock hammerstone, one quartz hammerstone, one possible metamorphic rock hammerstone and one pestle.

Situated 25 meters at a bearing of 360 degrees from the caretaker’s cabin and along St. Elmo Creek, LBM-17 is another oval-shaped site that is 16 meters (north-south)
x 30 meters (east-west). Six artifacts were located at this site: three red chert flakes, two
dark gray chert flakes and a red chert scraper.

As mentioned previously, in 1983, a 37-acre portion of LBM was surveyed. In the
course of this survey, two sites were located, yet not formally recorded. These sites are
labeled FOSTER-1 and FOSTER-2 and were recorded in the process of this survey.

FOSTER-1 is a cupule rock that exhibits 90 cupules on the west face of a schist
boulder. The rock measures 2.5 meters in length (north-south) and while it tapers at the
top to a narrow ridge, it extends 1.5 meters in width (east-west) at its widest point. It is 1
meter tall at its highest point. The sizes of the cupules range in diameter from 10
centimeters to 1 centimeter and in depth from 4.25 centimeters to 0.5 centimeter.

Proximal to FOSTER-1 is a large multi-component site labeled FOSTER-2. This
is a 240-meter (north-south) x 100-meter (east-west) site that consists of a lithic debitage
and tool concentration. It is situated on a bench along the southern bank of St. Elmo
Creek that has been built over with a cabin (Hedlund Cabin) and associated structures. A
total of 147 flakes of Napa and Annadel obsidian and a variety of colors of chert was
found at this location. In addition to debitage, a portable sandstone millingstone or cupule
rock panel was located. This triangular-shaped fragment measures 40 centimeters in
length and 17 centimeters at its widest point. It exhibits three cupule or cupule-like
depressions that vary in diameter from 7 centimeters to 4.5 centimeters and in depth from
4 centimeters to 2 centimeters. Two bifaces were located at this location. These bifaces
are identified as Excelsior Series points, which are placed in a broad time range within
both the Middle Archaic Period (3000 BC to 1000 BC) and Upper Archaic Period (1000
BC to AD 500) (Fredrickson 1974a); whereas, Basgall and Bouey (1991) associate the
Dry Creek Period, which is placed on a timeline between 500 BC to AD 1300. Both bifaces measure 5.5 centimeters in length and 2 centimeters in width. Biface #1 is a reddish-white chert biface. Biface #2 is a dark reddish-brown chert biface. The historic component of this site consists of a 1930s-era hunting cabin (Hedlund Cabin) that has been altered since its original build date, as evidenced by the variety of lumber utilized in additions and alterations. The cabin is of platform-framed construction. It is side-gabled, single-story, and rectangular. It measures 37 feet in length (north-south) and 21.5 feet in width (east-west).

Table 2. Summary of the Cultural Resources on the Little Black Mountain Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resource</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBM-1</td>
<td>Historic-era Peterson Ranch; c. 1900s Ranch Remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-3</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-4</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-5</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-6</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-7</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-8</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-9</td>
<td>Prehistoric Isolated Artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-10</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-11</td>
<td>Historic-era Water Works and Prehistoric Isolated Artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-12</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-13</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-14</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-15</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-16</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-17</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-1</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic-era Component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Despite the tentative dates provided by the lithic cross-dating of temporally diagnostic projectile points, the dating of petroglyph sites is problematic at best. What can be discerned is that there was a considerable amount of tool making, as evidenced by the abundance of debitage/lithic concentrations. Additionally, with the presence of mortars and pestles it becomes clear that a fair amount of food processing was occurring on LBM. It can be reasonably concluded that this area was used seasonally for food collecting and processing. It is also likely that due to the abundance of water sources and abundance of oaks, the area or the vicinity was the site of seasonal habitation. Most importantly, the presence of the numerous cupule rocks indicates that LBM not only potentially had practical value but also ritual and spiritual importance and functionality to the Native Americans living on or near this locality.

Additionally, LBM retains the reminders of individuals who resided on it during the American era. A well-preserved example of these remains is the chimney that is still standing, which is located within the remains of the Peterson Ranch (LBM-1).

Reinforcing the historic, ethnographic and linguistic prehistory of the area, the material record remaining on LBM illustrates the progression of uses that it was able to support and the dynamic meaning and function that LBM held for the people who were active on it. The conservation, preservation and protection of cultural resources present on LBM affords the opportunity to spare a slice of a regional history that spans a long duration.
CHAPTER IV: CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins by providing a detailed review of the legal and regulatory frameworks that aid the assessment and evaluation of cultural resources. This overview will facilitate thoughtful and effective management decisions about cultural resources. It then provides a preliminary evaluation of each resource in terms of eligibility for inclusion on either the NRHP or CRHR. Then follows a review of recent scholarship regarding the best tactics, using the cultural landscape approach, for managing cultural resources. Gleaned from this theoretical framework are general recommendations for LBM cultural resources management. Next, through consultation with the Kashaya Pomo, who are described in ethnographic literature as residing in the territory surrounding LBM during the prehistoric and protohistoric periods and who currently reside in the vicinity, recommendations and considerations are provided. The CRMP closes with site-specific recommendations and a conclusion.

LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This section has two goals: (1) to provide an overview of legal requirements that may apply in the course of managing LBM and (2) to guide decision making. One step within the management process for a resource involves evaluation.

The importance or value of a resource must be evaluated to develop the proper approach to its management. Deciding how to care for resources requires that you know why they should be preserved (McManamon 2005:1231).

Evaluation not only determines why or how a resource should be preserved but also if a resource should be preserved. Not all resources are considered important. The cultural
resource laws establish a standardized means of evaluating cultural resources through criteria that are put forth by the framework provided by NHPA, as amended, and CEQA.

The purpose of evaluating a cultural resource is to determine whether or not there will be an adverse impact by a project upon a significant or important resource. If a cultural resource does not meet the criteria defined by either CEQA or NHPA, by definition there simply is no adverse impact to cultural resources. Therefore, the project can proceed as planned. There is no need for alteration of plans or mitigation.

National Historic Preservation Act

There is a series of laws that applies to cultural resources. Jurisdiction of applicable federal laws is dependent on a number of variables including project funding, permitting and approval. Of these, the most important in terms of cultural resources is the NHPA. According to Section 106 of NHPA, should SLT involve any federal agency, say in the course of the permitting process, or begin to receive funding from the federal government, compliance with NHPA is required (16 USC 470f). This law is triggered when an undertaking is proposed. As discussed in Chapter 1, an undertaking is any project under federal jurisdiction, receiving federal funds, requiring a federal permit or completed for the federal government (36 CFR 800.16[y]). The NHPA requires federal agencies or those within federal jurisdiction to sponsor stewardship and consideration of the cultural resources under their control and that may be affected by their actions.

The National Register of Historic Places

Background

In 1935, the Historic Sites Act (16 USC 461-467) authorized the identification and recognition of properties of significance in United States history and archeology.
With its inception in 1966, the NHPA expanded this listing to "properties of local and State significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture, and worthy of preservation" (NPS 1997:i). NRHP is the authorized list of these approved properties. Once a property is on this list, it is "considered for protection from destruction or impairment" (36 CFR 60.2).

Overview

The Section 106 process requires a determination as to whether or not an undertaking will affect a district, site, building, structure or object that is listed on NRHP or is eligible for listing on the NRHP (16 USC 470f). If the undertaking has the potential to affect a NRHP-listed or a NRHP-eligible resource then the effects must be treated. The process that involves determining a property as eligible for listing on the NRHP is termed the Section 106 process. Once a property is eligible for listing on the NRHP, it is afforded a level of consideration under the law that other resources are not given. NHPA determines the significance through the application of the following four criteria plus the additional consideration, integrity:

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, materials, workmanship, feeling, 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 distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic value, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
(d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory (36 CFR 60.4).

The SHPO receives the report for or against a cultural resource's eligibility. Ultimately, the SHPO determines eligibility. If it is decided that the resource is eligible, appropriate treatment actions must be designed and implemented.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

Should the activities prescribed for effective management of LBM require a county permit those activities will fall under the purview of CEQA. Every lead agency is required to adopt its own set of guidelines to determine a threshold for CEQA involvement and proper processing of environmental documentation (CCR15022).

CEQA is the state of California's means of assessing the impacts of a project on the environment (PRC 21000 et seq.). The tools for interpretation and implementation of CEQA are the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 CCR 15000 et seq.) and CEQA Statute (PRC 21000 et seq.). As described in Chapter I, CEQA will only be applicable if SLT contemplates an action that is determined to be a discretionary action by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. A discretionary project is defined as

...a project which requires the exercise of judgment or deliberation when the public agency or body decides to approve or disapprove a particular activity, as distinguished from situations where the public agency or body merely has to determine whether there has been conformity with applicable statutes, ordinances, or regulations (CCR 15357).

If the nexus of CEQA is applicable, the next step in the process is determining if there are any cultural resources (i.e., historical resources or archaeological sites, etc.) that will be affected. In addition, it must be decided if the resources present are important through the process of evaluation. "Historical resources are recognized as part of the
environment under CEQA” (PRC 21002(b), 21083.2 and 21084.1). CEQA defines a “historical resource” as

...any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, or cultural annals of California (CCR 15064.5).

A resource will be eligible for consideration under CEQA if it meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR, as determined by the lead agency (CCR 15064.5). This means that the resource is important and, therefore, is afforded additional consideration and treatment through mitigation of project impacts. CEQA is slightly ambiguous in its direction regarding the evaluation and treatment of archaeological sites. An effort at resolving this problem has been made with the assertion that the first step in this process should be the determination if the site is a historical resource (PRC 21084.1 and 21083.5[1]).

If it is not deemed as a historical resource, it can gain protection if it meets the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” (PRC 21083.2). A unique archaeological resource is defined as

an archaeological artifact, object or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

(1) Contains information needed to answer an important scientific research question and there is demonstrable public interest in that information.

(2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric event or person (PRC 21083.2).
California Register of Historical Resources

One of the mechanisms used by CEQA to determine a project's impacts or effects is the CRHR. Like the NRHP, the CRHR is a list of those properties that are to be protected, under CEQA, from adverse change or impacts that are proposed as a result of project planning. The register was established by PRC 5024, which mandated the creation and maintenance of a master list of resources that have been reviewed for eligibility for inclusion on this list. The following criteria must be met in order for a cultural resource to be listed in CRHR:

(1) The survey has been or will be included in the State Historic Resources Inventory.

(2) The survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with office procedures and requirements.

(3) The resource is evaluated and determined by the office [of Historic Preservation] to have a significance rating of Category 1 to 5 on DPR Form 523.

(4) If the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the California Registry, the survey is updated to identify historical resources which have become eligible or ineligible due to changed circumstances or further documentation and those which have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource (CCR 15064.5).

Unless already determined eligible, evaluation of cultural resources is defined by four different criteria which determine importance. These criteria determine if the resource

(1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(3) 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

(4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (CCR 15064.5).

In addition to meeting the four criteria listed above, the resource must also possess integrity in order to be determined significant. “Integrity is a property’s historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics from the property’s historic and prehistoric period” (Birnbaum n.d.:9). Like the NRHP, integrity can be quantified with the resource’s retention of seven basic principles: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association (CCR 4852c).

California Code

There are a number of codes that comprise California law. These codes include a range of topics from business, labor, vehicle, water, etc. The codes that are most pertinent to cultural resources management are the California Health and Safety Code and the Public Resources Code.

*California Health and Safety Code*

California Health and Safety Code administers public health. Statutes governing the protection of the public health are incorporated into this code. California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 provides legal repercussions for individuals who knowingly and willfully disturb human remains.

Every person who knowingly mutilates or disinteres, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law is guilty of a misdemeanor, except as provided in Section 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5[a]).
With this, 7050.5(b) and (c), go on to state explicitly that should any human remains 
"other than a dedicated cemetery" be discovered in the course of excavation of the area 
and the vicinity all activities shall cease until the coroner of the county in which the 
remains are discovered has made a determination about the remains. In the event that the 
remains are determined to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native 
American Heritage Commission.

**California Public Resources Code**

California Public Resources Code (PRC) administers many resources that are 
located on and within public and private land. It also manages resources that are utilized 
for public purpose. California PRC 5097.9 regulates the treatment of Native American 
religious and ritual/ceremonial objects and sites on public property. It protects these 
objects and sites from damage as well as for freedom of use. In addition, it provides legal 
protection for Native American human burials. This code provides for the protection 
from "severe or irreparable damage...[to]...any Native American sanctified cemetery, 
place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public 
property..." (PRC 5097.9). Additionally, California PRC 5097.993 outlines jail time and 
fines that are to be imposed upon any individual who unlawfully mutilates or excavates 
any prehistoric or historic site on public or private property that has been deemed as 
eligible to or listed on the CRHR.

**PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES ON LBM**

The evaluations offered on the following pages are preliminary in nature. If there 
is the potential for any adverse impact to the cultural resources on LBM, depending on 
the nature of the project, either one of the frameworks for evaluation outlined above may
be considered, and a qualified archaeologist or architectural historian should be retained in order to formally assess the significance and importance of sites, buildings or structures.

In consideration of preliminary evaluation criteria under both NRHP and CRHR, it must be noted that if a resource is considered eligible or ineligible under one of the registers it will also be a viable argument in terms of the other register. Therefore, the language used by the NRHP will be utilized in this discussion in order to minimize gratuitous repetition. LBM may be eligible for either the NRHP or CRHR under two of the aforementioned criteria: (a) and (d). Criterion (a) resources are those “that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history” (36 CFR 60.4). Criterion (d) resources are ones “that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory” (36 CFR 60.4).

Criterion (a) is applicable because the petroglyphs that are located on LBM carry with them cultural value and significance to the Kashaya Pomo. These resources can be defined as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) and are eligible for the NRHP under criterion (a). The importance of petroglyphs is known through the writings of ethnographers and archaeologists, as discussed in Chapter II, and has been expressed by the Kashaya Pomo tribe (Reno Franklin, personal communication, 2009). Thomas F. King succinctly explains how this criterion of a significant event relates to a nomination as a TCP: “‘Events’ can include specific moments in history [or] a series of events reflecting a broad pattern or theme. For example, the ongoing participation of an ethnic or social group in an area’s history…” (King 1998:12-13). As described in Chapter II, at Warm Springs Dam, areas associated with traditional gathering areas were nominated to
the NRHP due to their significance and importance within Pomo culture (Peri et al. 1983:6). Likewise, the proliferation of petroglyph boulders indicates ritual importance that the area had for the Kashaya Pomo. Because of this value, not only from an archaeological point of view, but from a cultural perspective, it is recommended that the portion of LBM that contains the petroglyphs be nominated to the NRHP as a TCP. Criterion (d) is applicable because there are undoubtedly archaeological deposits that have the potential to yield information on LBM. For example, it is more than likely a privy is in the vicinity of the ranch, as in many rural areas plumbing was not available until later than the arrival of the first American-period settlers. These remains have the potential to provide insights into the daily lives of individuals and families living in the early 20th century. "Historical archaeologists have long recognized that sealed features on domestic sites often contain refuse deposits that are well suited for analysis of household consumer behavior" (Decker 1994:345). Not only do privies provide insight into consumer behavior, they have sometimes provided a glimpse into the economic status and personal behavior patterns of individuals (e.g., discard patterns). Additionally, privies offer concrete dating opportunities that are not available with surface artifacts and which is evident through the site formation process. The analysis of a privy provides the opportunity to partake in scholarly discourse as to whether or not the household is a viable unit of analysis (Decker 1994:345).

Criterion (d) is also applicable to the majority of the other resources that have been located on the property. The number of sites and petroglyphs when taken together as a district can yield insights into the patterns of existence and ritual practices associated with the Kashaya Pomo. Questions could be answered regarding habitation or seasonal
migration patterns. First, are the sites indicative of smaller habitation sites spread out over an area or is it simply a large centralized camping or village site? Additionally, the number of sites could potentially provide a baseline from which other sites in the vicinity might be either contrasted or compared. Also, the proliferation of located projectile points provides a potential opportunity to streamline projectile point typologies. For example, some scholars complain of the vagueness associated with the Willits series points, which have been located on LBM (Justice 2003:231). See Table 3 for preliminary evaluation eligibility criteria.

Table 3. Preliminary Evaluation Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resource</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Preliminary Evaluation Eligibility Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBM-1</td>
<td>Historic-era Peterson Ranch; c. 1900s Ranch Remains</td>
<td>Eligible under criterion D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-3</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-4</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-5</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-6</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-7</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-8</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Eligible under criteria A and D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-9</td>
<td>Prehistoric Isolate</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-10</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Eligible under criterion D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-11</td>
<td>Historic-era Water Works and Prehistoric Isolate</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-12</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Eligible under criterion D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-13</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Eligible under criterion D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the Importance of Formal Site Assessment and Evaluation

Should SLT undertake any project that has the potential to affect any of the cultural resources on the LBM, formal site assessment and evaluation is recommended.

Should ground-disturbing activities or any other similar activity occur on an archaeological site that has not been formally evaluated, SLT will be jeopardizing chances of receiving federal funding for proposed projects on the property. Section 110(k) of the NHPA states the following:

Each Federal agency shall insure that the agency will not grant a loan, loan guarantee, permit, license or other assistance to an applicant who, with intent to avoid the requirements of section 106, has intentionally significantly adversely affected a historic property to which the grant would relate (16 USC 470h-2[kl]).

The purpose of evaluation is to determine a cultural resource’s significance or lack of significance. Despite the fact that evaluation is not mandated by law for any of the currently proposed projects on the property, this action is effective, responsible cultural resource management and stewardship, which is in keeping with SLT’s mission statement. Additionally, this legal framework provides an effective foundation for

---

3 As explained in Chapter I of this thesis, a historic property is defined as “...any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on the National Register, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource” (16 USC 470w).
management decisions. It is inappropriate for either information contained within a cultural resource to be lost or for the cultural value of a resource to be disregarded solely because of poor management practices. Therefore, whenever a ground-disturbing activity is proposed within an archaeological site, that site is recommended to undergo formal site assessment and evaluation to determine whether an adverse impact will be affecting a "significant" resource. This approach provides for creative management as well as the most effective management possible for each scenario and resource.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Cultural Landscape Definitions

Because of the landscape focus inherent in the SLT's mission, the cultural landscape approach to a CRMP created for one of SLT's properties is a perfect union. The resulting benefit of utilizing the cultural landscape approach is the accompanying framework for management that this evolving concept brings with the examination of both natural and cultural resources together. The United States National Park Service (NPS) defines a cultural landscape as "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values" (Birnbaum n.d.:1).

In addition to the recognition of the cultural landscape concept within the United States, internationally the approach has obtained influence with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UNESCO has defined a cultural landscape as

...combined works of nature and man...[t]hey are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence
of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal (UNESCO 2008:14).

A cultural landscape can be of any size, shape or affiliation and must carry with it or exhibit cultural or aesthetic meaning and value.

Cultural landscapes include battlefields such as Gettysburg and Antietam; the homes and designed estate grounds of dignitaries, inventors, and writers; the sites held sacred by native peoples from prehistoric times to the present; and the valleys where our ancestors settled and farmed. Many cultural landscapes have maintained a continuity of land use into the present (Slaiby et al. 2003:7).

In sum, the combination of natural and cultural resources in addition to dynamic use over a long period which associates a place with meaning and value defines a location as a cultural landscape; landscapes with an associated human past are considered cultural landscapes.

**Why Cultural Landscape as a Management Model?**

Understanding the resources present on LBM within the conceptual framework of a cultural landscape facilitates the understanding of landscape as storyteller, providing a glimpse into different periods and different cultures wherein there is not simply one period of significance. What is important and unique about LBM is its ability to tell a story and provide a historical and an archaeological record for various times and different people all within the same place. The landscape approach provides an integral link by providing a bridge between the prehistoric-period and the historic-period resources present on LBM.

Developing and implementing the most effective management policies and models for the cultural resources present on LBM necessitates attention to a resource’s location within the natural environment; the cultural landscape approach furthers this
realization. The cultural resources are, of course, not islands in and of themselves; they are situated within a landscape. This appreciation in addition to knowledge regarding the progressive stages of occupation and utilization of resources on the property further reinforces the consideration of the LBM as a cultural landscape and the landscape-level approach that this consideration entails. The benefit of understanding LBM as a cultural landscape is the accompanying framework for management that this evolving concept brings with the examination of both natural and cultural resources together. This section analyzes issues related to the management of cultural landscapes and cultural resources in general and highlights effective management practices while simultaneously outlining the qualities of the property that point to its consideration and conceptualization as a cultural landscape.

**Why Should LBM be Conceived of as a Cultural Landscape?**

The material record remaining on LBM illustrates the progression of uses that this property was able to support and the dynamic meaning and function that this property held for the people who were active on it. The management of LBM affords the opportunity to preserve a small chunk of a regional history that spans a long duration. LBM fits the definition of a cultural landscape. The resources present on LBM allow a visitor to travel through a number of different periods within history by only having to change location slightly on the landscape—there is no need for a time machine. Successive generations resided on and conducted activities on this property. The many layers of these activities are evident within the archaeological record that is located on LBM.
The Native American component of the cultural resources present on LBM includes petroglyph boulders and lithic debitage and tool concentrations. Interpretation as a cultural landscape is in keeping with a larger on-going project that involves the consideration of a portion of the coastal Kashaya Pomo territory as a cultural landscape. This project, spearheaded by Caltrans archaeologist Katherine Dowdall and Kashaya Pomo tribal scholar, Otis Parrish, is a seminal body of work that is still in progress, and which incorporates the study of place names and how this nomenclature and accompanying narratives reflect the meaning of a locality and overall sacredness (Dowdall and Parrish 2003).

As has been discussed, the term cultural landscape defines not only cultural resources but also the spaces between those resources. In the same vein, the Kashaya Pomo do not simply value the archaeological site, but also place importance on the spaces between. The land itself is sacred, according to Kashaya cosmology, everything that now exists was at a single time one entity. Once all the different things in existence were separated, the earth provided means of communication, and that communication is the land, the structure of the landscape and the sacred fruits of the landscape (e.g., medicinal plants and gathering areas) (Dowdall and Parrish 2003).

In terms of the historic resources on LBM, among the most interesting are the remains of a ranch that was in almost continuous use from at least the 1920s until 1978. As was outlined in Chapter III, there are also historic-period water works and the remains of a house that was built in the 1930s. The historic period also left evidence of economic pursuits that are indicative of the region, from ranching, logging, to the presence of European immigrant entrepreneurs and vacationers; all of these people and activities had
a role in the formation of the region. When taken together, the presence of all these varying cultural resources reflects the continuous occupation of the land from the prehistoric to modern times while simultaneously situating the presence of LBM within the regional history. This is all in keeping with the definition of a cultural landscape.

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the aims of this chapter is to define cultural resource and cultural landscape management models and suggestions found to be effective and proactive. The three notable sources of considerations and recommendations utilized in this CRMP are founded upon a multitude of experience: NPS, UNESCO and the European Landscape Convention. These organizations assert similar characteristics that are required in order for a management plan to be effective, reactive and proactive: inventory (existing conditions), monitoring, stakeholder/community involvement, defined boundaries, a multi-disciplinary/holistic approach, and buffer zones and sensitivity zones. These management suggestions are incorporated into this CRMP.

Notable Recommendations

National Park Service

Since its establishment in 1916, the NPS’s responsibility has grown to include the management of almost 400 properties and the natural and cultural resources within them (United States Department of the Interior 2009:13). Because of this breadth of experience and concerted efforts at effective management of resources, the NPS was determined to be a viable source of pragmatic and theoretical knowledge regarding sound management models. For the purpose of cultural resource/landscape management, the NPS advocates the development of a preservation and treatment plan to successfully manage a location
or property that is acknowledged to contain cultural resources. In order to ascertain the proper course of action concerning treatment, the following determinations should be developed:

...relative historic value of the property, the level of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, its historic significance and integrity, historic and proposed use (e.g., educational, interpretive, passive/active public, institutional or private), long- and short-term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g. accessibility, fire, security) and costs for anticipated capital improvement, staffing and maintenance (Birnbaum n.d.:9).

The Secretary of the Interior has created standards and guidelines that inform the management policies and approaches of the NPS. The four primary treatments identified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (1995) are preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction (Weeks and Grimmer 1995). The primary objective of preservation is retention of existing form and integrity. Rehabilitation is the act of repairing the property in order to maintain as much accuracy to its original form as possible. Restoration focuses on the accurate depiction of “the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period or time by means of removal...and reconstruction of missing features” (Birnbaum n.d.:10), and reconstruction, like restoration, involves the construction of features and forms in order to replicate a property’s appearance at a particular period. Any one of these options or any combination of these options may be a feasible and responsible mode of effectively managing a property.

The NPS asserts that a cultural landscape inventory and monitoring plan is integral to informing the decision-making process (Birnbaum n.d.:12-14). This inventory outlines the existing conditions of the landscape and the resources within the landscape.
For each resource, a form is produced that describes and visually documents existing issues and conditions as well as providing space for future assessments. It is the foundation for ascertaining what portions of the property are affected by damage, decay or wear. And in turn, it provides a means of managing these issues from a system-wide approach. To provide effective management, this inventory will require updates with information gathered during periodic monitoring of cultural resources. With this, it is critical to record treatments and alterations. In addition, the NPS advocates dividing the property into discreet management zones (Birnbaum n.d.: 13).

**United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization**

UNESCO is the creator of standards and guidelines for the treatment of many types of resources. Much like the publications of the NPS, UNESCO's World List Operational Guidelines (2008) (guidelines) outlines protection and management practices for heritage resources (i.e., cultural and natural resources). After an area or resource has been assessed in terms of its universal value and its integrity or authenticity, the resource or resource area must have adequate protection under the law. These laws are clarified with regulations that outline how to put laws into action, these are the guidelines. Through the establishment of defined and delineated boundaries it becomes clear what needs to be managed. The guidelines also assert the necessity for buffer zones (i.e., a defined boundary that delineates and cordons a resource to ensure inadvertent project effects are reduced or eliminated) around resources or particularly sensitive areas. The idea of these zones is to neutralize any potential detrimental impacts to a resource. The guidelines also outline foundation elements that culminate in effective management plans:
(a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders; (b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback; (c) the involvement of partners and stakeholders; (d) allocation of necessary resources; (e) capacity building; and (f) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions (UNESCO 2008:27).

Adding to this, the importance of short-term and long-term activities that should be designed in order to protect the resources is highlighted. Most importantly, a plan of action is required for instances wherein activities threaten or have the potential to threaten a resource.

**European Landscape Convention**

The European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000) (convention), which has been signed by 25 countries (Fairclough 2006:179), provides a foundation or guide for the formulation of a management plan for heritage landscapes. The convention defines a landscape and the role that landscapes have in conceptions of identity and in the formation of local culture. The convention asserts that the following specific measures should be applied to landscape management: (a) awareness-raising, which is the overall goal of increasing appreciation of the value of landscapes; (b) training and education, entailing multidisciplinary programs; (c) identification and assessment, including a documentation of existing conditions, threats, changes and value; (d) establishing objectives, but only after public consultation; (e) implementation. Lastly, the convention advocates a multi-disciplinary approach that conceives of the landscape in terms of its connections to the surrounding region (Council of Europe 2000).
OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STEWARDSHIP PLAN AND FUTURE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES AND GOALS AND RELATED IMPACTS

In order to determine the extent and the nature of future projects to be initiated on LBM three specific sources were consulted: (1) the Sonoma Land Trust Little Black Mountain Stewardship Plan (Appleton 2002), which outlines recommendations for future projects on the property, (2) SLT management staff and (3) conditions stipulated in the deed that granted property rights of LBM to SLT.

The Sonoma Land Trust Little Black Mountain Stewardship Plan (Appleton 2002) and SLT management staff identified the following issues and priority activities: fire control and management; emergency preparedness; non-native/invasive species control, while also enhancing native species; erosion control; and interpretive and educational opportunities. The list that follows outlines stipulated conditions in the deed that granted property rights of LBM to SLT that are pertinent to land and cultural resource management: (1) allow the use of the property for educational purposes, (2) allow logging solely within the St. Elmo Creek watershed, the rest of the property is to remain undisturbed, (3) allow recreational hiking, (4) defend against encroachment by trespassers and (5) keep structures (i.e., roads, trails, fences, water systems) in good repair.

The following paragraphs describe how proposed activities and projects that are recommended by the consulted sources listed above may adversely impact cultural resources on the property. Additionally, Table 4 presents a listing of each resource and potential impacts on it.
**Maintenance of Property Boundaries, Trespass and Caretaking**

- Fence maintenance entails pounding or the digging of post-holes. Any type of soil or ground disturbance may affect buried cultural resources.

- Unauthorized access may adversely impact cultural resources not only with the ground disturbance caused by off-trail vehicle use but also through the casual collection of artifacts and by vandalism.

- Uncontrolled access by cows may negatively impact artifacts through trampling, which contributes to erosion and site deterioration.

- Caretakers acknowledge collecting artifacts from their *in situ* locations. Additionally artifacts have been noted in some of the buildings occupied or utilized by caretakers. This activity not only may hinder site recognition, but it might damage a site's integrity and compromise the research and interpretive potential.

- Trail creation and maintenance may disturb buried archaeological deposits, affecting integrity and identification of archaeological sites.

- Maintaining the caretaker's cabin may involve ground-disturbing activities (e.g., replacement of underground piping, replacement of foundation posts, etc.). These activities may harm buried or exposed cultural resources.

- Home gardening activities around the caretaker’s cabin may expose or disturb artifacts.

**Invasive Species and Sudden Oak Death Control**

- With the prescribed removal of yellow-star thistle, broom and non-native pine, the potential to disturb archaeological sites and expose artifacts to the surface is high.
This process is likely to churn up soil and expose archaeological deposits, thus contributing to site deterioration.

- With the evidence of sudden oak death, the “area may become eligible for government cost-share funding to thin trees and reduce fire risk” (Appleton 2002:32). This alternative source of funding may affect management practice.

- Implementation of an ethnobotanical/native vegetation planting plan may affect cultural resources by way of ground-disturbing activities or through burn piles of non-native vegetation. Fire is known to affect the hydration bands utilized to obtain data (i.e., approximate use dates) in the obsidian hydration process. Additionally, fire may cause thermal fracturing and spalling, soil destabilization, and it may increase the potential of fire-weakened trees and limbs falling on cultural resources.

- Hunting of feral pigs on the property, which may affect cultural resources, as the damage caused by a bullet impact will irreparably alter or destroy a petroglyph, should be weighed against the damage these animals cause to archaeological resources.

**Fire Control and Management**

- Timber stand improvement, refers to thinning, pruning and removal of trees that are either disease ridden or appear to be a fire hazard. It may adversely impact cultural resources through crushing by falling trees or large equipment and also by exposing or disturbing them.

- Ground-disturbing activities associated with the alteration of existing streams and springs are likely to impact sites due to the frequency of sites located adjacent to a water source.
• Construction of a pond for water storage has the potential to affect cultural resources due to ground-disturbing activities related to this task.

• Construction of water tanks on archaeological sites will damage the site causing data loss and affecting integrity.

• Road alterations and the recontouring of slopes may adversely affect archaeological resources due to the potential for damage.

**Timber Harvesting**

• The felling of trees and the large equipment necessary for harvesting trees may affect cultural resources. These effects might include limbs or trees falling on resources as well as potentially crushing resources under the weight of heavy machinery.

**Erosion Control**

• The installation of “waterbreaks/waterbars” has been called for on dirt roads (Appleton 2002). This activity may expose or damage buried cultural deposits.

• Naturally occurring erosion of hillsides due to water flow and the natural slumping of landforms has affected and will affect a number of the sites situated on the property. This process can result in exposure and loss of artifacts and, in the long term, loss of the context of the site. This susceptibility also potentially contributes to casual collecting.

### Table 4. Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resource</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBM-1</td>
<td>Historic-era Peterson Ranch; c. 1900s Ranch Remains</td>
<td>Invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control, erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-3</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-4</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-5</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-6</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-7</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-8</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-9</td>
<td>Prehistoric Isolate</td>
<td>Obscure from sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-10</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-11</td>
<td>Historic-era Water Works and Prehistoric Isolate</td>
<td>Erosion, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-12</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-13</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-14</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-15</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-16</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-17</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Caretaker, visitor or trespass activities; ground-disturbing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-1</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fuel load control, erosion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The purpose of the creation of a CRMP is to aid an agency or organization in accomplishing their goals while simultaneously being consistent with laws and promoting cultural and environmental stewardship. In order to create a cultural resources management plan that is effective, realistic and practical it is important to incorporate this mission as well as the mission of the sponsoring agency into the plan. As mentioned in Chapter I, the mission statement of SLT is “to protect the land forever” (www.sonomalandtrust.org/AboutSLT/default.html 2009a). Management objectives include the following:

- developing long-term land protection strategies,

- promoting private and public funding for land conservation, acquiring land and conservation easements, stewardship including the restoration of conservation properties, and

- promoting a sense of place and a land ethic through activities, education and outreach.

SLT is a member of the California Council of Land Trusts and subscribes to the Standards and Practices of the Land Trust Alliance (www.sonomalandtrust.org/AboutSLT/default.html 2009a). These standards and practices form a core value system that assists in the operations of a land trust. These standards include the development of a mission that serves a public interest, maintenance of regulatory compliance and accountability, establishment of focus areas (e.g., natural or cultural resources), etc.
Subscription to these standards and practices is required for membership in the Land Trust Alliance (Land Trust Alliance 2004:n.p.). Membership in the alliance offers a guarantee of credibility and trust for potential public and private funders.

**General Management Recommendations**

Because a cultural resources management plan is usually created in compliance with a particular regulatory framework, most plans provide mandated treatments under CEQA or NHPA. In this case, LBM is not required by any law to create a management plan. Additionally, SLT does not have any master plan or specific plan governing its planning actions. The suggested management practices that follow stem from recommendations made by the *Sonoma Land Trust Little Black Mountain Stewardship Plan* (Appleton 2002), deed restrictions, overall goals and objectives, the guidelines put forth by the Standards and Practices of the Land Trust Alliance (Land Trust Alliance 2004), through input of the Kashaya Pomo tribe and finally with the incorporation of management practices that have been defined by organizations with experience in cultural resource/landscape management. The following recommendations include general recommendations in addition to impact-specific and site-specific policies and practices for effective and feasible cultural resources management.

**Recommendation #1: Initiate a Project Review System**

A formal system of project review should be initiated. Project review should be initiated with public agency involvement in planning activities. The basis of the project review system should be the Sonoma County environmental review and permitting process which establishes a threshold for agency involvement. For any project that is proposed on LBM, the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
should be contacted. This communication will determine both the level of permitting that is required, if any, as well as the potential for any legal framework to which the project may have to adhere.

The most effective force for preservation of archaeological sites—and for all other kinds of historic properties for that matter—is the local ordinance. True preservation comes from the local level as a result of ordinances, zoning, and environmental review and permitting processes (Sebastian 2004:15).

While this communication will ensure compliance with laws, codes and ordinances the other purpose of this recommendation is that all projects proposed within the property are considered in terms of their effects on cultural resources, whether identified or not. Additionally, by setting up this planning process, a variety of resources can be considered in tandem before a project is in its design phase so that the concerns of any number of resource specialists or SLT managers can be incorporated into planning before issues arise. This comprehensive approach was found to be an effective management tool because individual projects are not dealt with on an ad hoc basis; therefore, interrelationships among projects become clear, and “when evaluation [of a project] is built into the planning process, the process becomes a learning experience” (Slaiby et al. 2003:20).

**Recommendation #2: Initiate Cultural Resources Monitoring**

Although NPS, UNESCO and the European Landscape Convention are not involved in this management plan because of mandates, the experience of these organizations merits heeding their suggestions. These organizations recommend the establishment of long-term monitoring of cultural resources and cultural landscapes. With an inventory already created, monitoring locations have already been determined.
Monitoring is an effective tool for proactive management of environmental and anthropogenic threats. The major purpose of monitoring is to inform management action. The absence of site monitoring creates a void, making it difficult to outline a management strategy or to define the state of preservation. Monitoring should include annual visitation of the sites outlined in this management plan by a qualified archaeologist or other trained employee or volunteer in order to document and determine if it is necessary to mitigate the effects of erosion, vandalism, invasive species control and environmental rehabilitation. "Site steward programs, in which interested volunteers monitor sites for damage and report suspicious activity, can... be effective" (Sebastian 2004:8). Monitoring could involve the establishment of separate registration points to document the general conditions in an area over time and should incorporate the usage of aerial and ground documentary photographs, utilized for comparative purposes. Monitoring can be accomplished by filling out a cultural resources monitoring checklist for each cultural resource, which is provided as Appendix D.

Additionally, should any wild fires or other natural disaster such as slope failure occur, that area should be visited either by a qualified archaeologist or trained employee or volunteer due to the potential exposure of buried artifacts. Any sites located in the course of these reconnaissance studies should be incorporated into the monitoring plan, added to the inventory of sites and formally recorded on DRP 523 forms and submitted to the NWIC. Also, newly-realized damage sustained by any site should be updated in the monitoring documentation.


**Recommendation #2a: Record Management Decisions and Treatment Actions on Cultural Resources Monitoring Checklist Form**

It is recommended that management decisions and treatments to cultural resources are recorded. The cultural resources monitoring checklist (Appendix D) provides a means of documenting management decisions and actions/record of treatment. As described by the NPS (Page et al. 1998:121-122), maintaining an inventory of measures taken to provide proactive treatment of cultural resources and the surrounding environment is recommended. Not only does this provide documentation for alterations of existing conditions, i.e., accounting for physical changes to the environment, but it also provides data for future research on the property and aids in the determination of the effectiveness of treatment plans or actions.

**Recommendation #3: Develop an Interpretive/Educational Program**

The role that interpretation of the past plays in defining meaning is immeasurable. The American Association of Museums defines interpretation as “a planned effort to create for the visitor an understanding of the history and significance of events, people and objects with which the site is associated” (Anderson and Low 1985:64). The fusion of history and prehistory within interpretation is indispensable in providing an accurate and holistic vision of the past, and LBM provides a fitting venue to achieve this goal. Interpretation synthesizes information, and the result of that synthesis should be an overall realistic understanding of the significance of a resource, not just a list of facts or a partial view of the past.

The establishment of an interpretive program for the cultural resources present will aid not only in the appreciation and understanding of the property by invited visitors but foster through inclusion an appreciation for the general value of archaeological
resources and contemporary Native American values. On-site signage/interpretation should be avoided so that resources cannot be targeted by vandals or pothunters. An interpretive prospectus should be outlined that elaborates upon the resources present and that resources should be treated confidentially.

**Recommendation #4: Establish Sensitivity and Buffer Zones**

This CRMP recommends the establishment of buffer zones for sites and sensitivity zones for specific areas as is advocated by the NPS, UNESCO and the European Landscape Convention. A buffer zone is a defined boundary that extends outside a site’s or resource’s visible, surface limits. Without subsurface testing, the exact boundaries of a site are not known. It is recommended that in order to ensure adequate protection of a site without subsurface testing, a 100-foot buffer zone should be established around sites and resources. Thus, the idea is that the buffer will delineate and cordon a site/resource to ensure inadvertent project effects are reduced or eliminated.

A sensitivity zone provides a means of planning project/construction/activity locations. These zones designate areas where special care is given and certain activities are forbidden. Also, the sensitivity zone establishes prime locations or poor locations for proposed projects. Sensitivity zones can be categorized (1) high, (2) moderate and (3) low. High-sensitivity zones contain known sites or areas with surface indicators of archaeological deposits. Moderate-sensitivity areas are buffer zones that surround known archaeological sites or they are areas that are likely to contain cultural resources that have not been located yet (e.g., a flatland area that is adjacent to a fresh water source). Based on proximity to a resource, either natural or cultural, these areas are likely to contain either isolated artifacts or sites that have not been located yet. Low-sensitivity areas are
locations where there are no surface indicators of cultural deposits and the environmental conditions are not conducive to human activities. Additionally, other sensitivity zones may be recognized and defined as more sites are located and as more locations are surveyed throughout the property.

Recommendation #5: Enact a Holistic/Systems/Inter-Disciplinary Management Approach

The holistic/systems/inter-disciplinary management approach takes a step beyond the basic cultural resource management focus that examines cultural resources without reference to the environment or landscape within which they are situated. The systems approach promotes a trans- or inter-disciplinary approach that intends to examine the landscape, the environment and the cultural resources simultaneously as parts of a whole. In order to provide effective management of the whole landscape, ecological considerations and principles should be incorporated into management strategies (Hohmann 2008). As noted previously, this method is advocated by the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000), and additionally numerous other scholars and practitioners have highlighted the value of this approach (e.g., Kato and Alhern 2008, Naveh 2005, Head 2000). When management decisions are contemplated by SLT, it is integral to consider archaeological resources with the other resources or issues that are being dealt with. When implementing a program that does not specifically focus upon archaeological resources, an archaeologist should be included on the team in order to provide input and alternatives to potentially adverse impacts to archaeological sites, buffer zones and sensitive areas.
Recommendation #6: Involve Stakeholders and Community in Management/Planning Decisions and Activities

The following paragraphs argue for the importance of including individuals and groups that are affiliated with a cultural resource in planning, management and information sharing. It also makes recommendations concerning how to facilitate this type of consultation. Because the cultural landscape at LBM was formed by members of the regional and local community in the historic and prehistoric periods, it is logical that the community should also be involved in the management of the property. Thomas F. King (2003) asserts that in the end, there appears to be no other alternative than community involvement in order to proactively and effectively preserve a site or location (King 2003:233-254). In addition to King, a number of other scholars promote the democratic/pluralistic treatment of the cultural resources, especially within the conceptual framework of the cultural landscape (Waterton 2005, Chittenden 2006, Alanen 2000:115-126). The idea is that local participation in the caretaking and interpretation is integral to preservation because this approach has provided positive results for both cultural resources and groups and individuals involved. This understanding is part of a movement not only in California but within archaeology in general. This democratic approach is a large part of the Development of a Monitoring Concept for Cultural Heritage through European Cooperation (DEMOTEC). DEMOTEC is a project that is supported by the European Union and the Norwegian Research Council (Skar 2006:213). As DEMOTEC and other scholars have argued and proven through experience, it is important to have community involvement and invoke a wide participatory approach so that all concerned stakeholders, organizations, etc., are heard. This avoids disagreements about how resources should be treated or managed and promotes preservation because a number of
people are working toward the same goal. Therefore, a single resource effectively has multiple stewards. Information exchange up front is what contributes to effective cooperation (King 2003: 233-254).

**Recommendation #6a: Enlist SLT Caretakers, Employees, Volunteers and Property Neighbors in California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program**

Any caretaker or employee or volunteer of SLT who does not have previous archaeological training and who will be involved in the maintenance and preservation of the property is recommended to enroll in the California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program (CASSP). CASSP offers a two-day workshop run by the Society for California Archaeology that costs a minimal amount and which will aid SLT in identification and protection of resources while establishing a respect for the confidential nature of archaeological deposits. If any of these individuals locate newly identified sites, these sites should be added to the existing inventory in addition to being formally recorded by a trained professional. The brief training provided by CASSP will aid in upholding the goals and objectives established by SLT and this cultural resources management plan. In addition to attendance by SLT employees and volunteers, it is advised that neighbors of the property are invited to attend the same workshop. As has been acknowledged in the past, oftentimes it is the community or neighbors surrounding the property who trespass on the property.

Education is important in that it creates good stewards and a constituency for protection of natural, cultural and scenic resources. If there is a collaborative method to directly involve the public, people gain a greater appreciation for a site, its mission and its resources (Slaiby et al. 2003:22).

Not only would including these individuals in the process of archaeological education foster an appreciation for archaeology, but it is hoped that it would also forge an
understanding for the concept of in situ preservation and the loss of data associated with casual artifact collection.

**Recommendation #6b: Consult with Tribal Governments and Involve Them in Project Planning and Management**

Integral to a proactive management is consultation, communication and coordination with tribal governments. “Consultation is not just sending out a letter…Consultation means reasoning together, negotiating, trying to come to a meeting of the minds” (King 2003:234). Generally, this CRMP recommends that periodic meetings are established to outline objectives and consider goals, as well as provide updates. This contributes to mutual understanding and collaboration. More specifically, should a proposed project or activity potentially affect a Native American cultural resource, the THPO should be consulted regarding appropriate treatment. Kent Lightfoot (2006), who has worked extensively with the Kashaya Pomo at Fort Ross State Historic Park, asserts that there are three ways to promote this type of communication into a constructive interaction: (1) make sure the meeting space is congenial; (2) involve good food; and (3) most importantly formulate a joint plan of action or multi-staged research design (Lightfoot 2006:30).

**Recommendation #7: Protect Against Vandalism and Pot Hunting by Screening Resource Locations and By Limiting the Number of Individuals Who Know Where Resources Are Located**

One of the most effective ways of preserving a cultural resource is limiting public access. There are a number of ways to accomplish this goal:

(1) Resources that are not currently along an established trail or road should remain obscured or should become hidden by careful plantings. Planting of
native vegetation along the main dirt road can effectively screen resources from view or prevent trespass.

(2) Site location should be kept confidential, and disclosure regarding cultural resources location should be given only on a need-to-know basis. The indiscriminant release of site information may lead to destruction of cultural resources by individuals interested in monetary gain from collection or sale of artifacts.

Recommendation #8: Prior to Initiating Any Earth-Disturbing Activities, Formal Site Assessment and Evaluation and Treatment Options Should Be Devised by a Qualified Archaeologist in Consultation with Kashaya Pomo Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

Avoidance/preservation in place is regarded by this CRMP and by state law as the best protective and preservation measure for cultural resources (CCR 15126.4). If avoidance is not a viable option, further evaluation of the site is necessary in order to determine site significance. Therefore, before any earth-disturbing activities (e.g., trail creation, digging of fence posts, alteration of existing building footprints, vegetation removal, etc.), a qualified archaeologist in conjunction with Native American consultation should be consulted to determine site significance and proper treatment.

Recommendation #9: Supervision of Ground-Disturbing Activities in Designated Sites, Buffer Zones and Sensitive Areas by a Qualified Archaeologist and Kashaya Pomo Representative

A qualified archaeologist in addition to a Kashaya Pomo representative should monitor any of the activities mentioned above if projects are located in a sensitive area, such as in the buffer zone of a cultural resource. It is recommended that ground-disturbing activities within site boundaries are permitted only after determinations of significance have been made and only if such an activity is condoned. It is suggested that
for ground-disturbing activities in buffer zones and sensitive areas Native American and archaeological monitors are present. Although this may seem redundant, each monitor is there for a different reason: the archaeologist is concerned with a site’s archaeological values; whereas, the Native American cultural monitor is concerned with traditional values.

Recommendation #10: Follow the Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan When Unplanned Resources or Remains Are Encountered

An Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan outlines the course of action and parties that should be consulted in the event that human remains or cultural resources are discovered during maintenance, construction, ground-disturbing or other activities. It is recommended that the SLT staff member supervising such activities has access to a copy of the Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan whenever construction-related activities are occurring without the supervision of an archaeologist (see Appendix C). Adherence to the steps provided in the Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan will potentially accomplish the following: prevent illegal treatment of human remains, provide an opportunity to repatriate remains, prevent destruction or loss of a resource, protect a resource’s valuable provenience (i.e., the context or source of an artifact) until an archaeologist can assess the situation, and guard from harm the traditional values associated with the cultural resource.

Recommendation #11: Kashaya Pomo Recommendations and Considerations Should Be Respected and Adhered to Whenever Possible

This CRMP recommends adherence to the recommendations and considerations put forth by the Kashaya Pomo (see heading and discussion below). As discussed under Recommendation #6 of this CRMP, the benefits of the democratic approach that involves
stakeholders in management have been proven through experience. In a number of instances, practice has shown that integration of the community into stewardship has not only positive results for the resource, but also for the community. This practice comes with the acknowledgement that resources and associated cultural landscapes have cognitive value in addition to cultural values and research potential.

**Kashaya Pomo Management Recommendations**

In keeping with the suggestions made by NPS, UNESCO and the European Landscape Convention, stakeholder involvement is of utmost importance not only in terms of interpretive potential and in establishing the value of a resource but with its contribution to management strategies and objectives. As was discussed in Chapter II, LBM is within the territory that is ethnographically, culturally, and historically associated with the Kashaya. Therefore, the recommendations and considerations that have been suggested through conversation with Reno Franklin, the Kashaya THPO, are offered in this section.

*Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #1: Adhere to Khela Traditions: Any Woman Who Is Menstruating Or The Partner Of A Woman Who Is Menstruating Is Asked To Observe Traditional Kbela Practices—This means that if a visitor or the partner/mate of a person who is kbela visits the property that person should neither visit where there are known Native American cultural resources nor should said individual look for cultural resources.*

The Kashaya have a specific rule that is respected and obeyed by not only tribal members but also many archaeologists. This rule is related to $k^e$ela or menstruation. While many in American society today are uncomfortable talking about a woman's menstrual cycle, this part of life is and was a part of Pomoan culture that influences actions and decisions. Menstruation is believed to carry with it incredible power that can disrupt the tenuous stability in the Kashaya world. In order to counter this force ritual
practices are observed. Observation of k'ela rules is considered to be of paramount importance to the maintenance of the balance within nature. California Department of Parks and Recreation Senior State Archaeologist, Breck Parkman (1994), elaborates on the significance and customs associated with this belief. Both men and women observe k'ela rules: if a woman is menstruating her mate will also observe these same rules. Women are not allowed to cook, gather food, participate in ceremonies, etc., when they are k'ela. With this, the Kashaya ask that these rules are honored on their traditional territory, which includes LBM.

Two archaeologists, Katherine Dowdall and Otis Parrish (Dowdall and Parrish 2003), have shown how respect and observance for these beliefs has fostered more enlightened management of resources. Their work with the Kashaya Pomo provides a landmark example of how collaboration between landowners and the Kashaya provide a viable foundation for management and understanding. The principles for working together, which stem from Ian Hodder's reflexive method, are based on inclusivity, reciprocity and mutual respect.

Dowdall and Parrish (2003) explain the necessity for honoring k'ela rules in the course of an archaeological survey or excavation on Kashaya territory. Because excavation and survey run the risk of upsetting the balance between things of the spirit and things of the earth by way of their stirring up and uncovering the past and the potential negative implications that these actions hold, it is necessary to provide protection or mitigate these impacts for those involved in the archaeological procedure and for members of the tribe; thus, to accomplish this, these actions are placed in a ceremonial context. Once an action has been placed within a ceremonial context it is
considered inherently “of the spirit,” and aspects invoking the earth need to be removed.

As menstruation is associated with the earth, k\textsuperscript{\textit{k}ela} rules need to be followed (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:118). Dowdall and Parrish note that the observance of k\textsuperscript{\textit{k}ela} rules “enriched our appreciation of a site and allowed us to develop a methodology that merged aspects of the secular and sacred” (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:125). The Kashaya ask visitors to LBM to respect and honor these beliefs and to uphold the traditions and practices that are associated with k\textsuperscript{\textit{k}ela}.

**Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #2: Nominate Little Black Mountain to the NRHP as a Traditional Cultural Property**

This nomination would be in keeping with the definition of a TCP. Thomas F. King and Patricia L. Parker, pioneers in the concept of the TCP, and the people who wrote the NPS Bulletin #38, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties* (1998), describe the TCP NRHP nomination process and assert that a property that fits the definition of a TCP is

...a location associated with the traditional beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world....A traditional cultural property, then, can be defined generally as one that is eligible for inclusion on the National Register because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community.... (Parker and King 1998:1).

As discussed earlier in this chapter, a determination that LBM is eligible for the NRHP affords an added degree of protection and consideration under cultural resource legislation. A well-known expert on TCPs, Patricia Parker points out that the difference between a TCP and other National Register-listed, -eligible or -nominated properties is that a TCP should be defined by the group that finds them important:

One fundamental difference between traditional cultural properties and other kinds of historic properties is that their significance cannot be
determined solely by historians, ethnographers, ethnohistorians, ethnobotanists, and other professionals. The significance of a traditional cultural property must be determined by the community that values them (Parker 1993:5).

**Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #3: Notify the Kashaya if Angelica is located on LBM**

In terms of ethnobotanical resources, the flora associated with extra-worldly power is angelica. Angelica is important both in a spiritual sense and in a practical sense. It was used by shamans and for example, it is carried or placed around the home for protection. It is utilized medicinally for sore throat, menstrual cramps and stomachache, etc. (Goodrich et al. 1980). Although this plant has not been listed in any type of flora inventory of the property, it is likely to occur. The plant favors the mixed redwood environment and it additionally favors serpentine soils, both of which are present on LBM (Calflora 2009). Should this highly-prized ethnobotanical resource be located on the property, the THPO should be contacted, as it is likely the tribe will request permission to gather this resource.

**Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #4: Photographs Only Be Taken for the Purposes of Formally Recording or Research, and these Images Should Not Be Put On Display.**

Because of the spiritual and ritual aspects associated with both LBM and the cultural resources present on it, it is recommended that photographs only be taken for two purposes: (1) formally recording sites or cultural resources on DPR 523 forms or NRHP-nomination purposes and (2) research. Additionally, these images should not be displayed on any public medium of communication such as the Internet or brochures. The cultural resources are considered sacred; therefore, it is felt that these items should neither be included in any marketing nor public outreach campaigns nor disseminated to individuals and groups that do not need to know about the resources and associated values.
Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #5: Visitors Invited to the Property and Privileged to View the Cultural Resources Should Only Be Included If Interest and Purpose Are Educational

Restrictions on visitor access to the cultural resources on LBM are recommended. Visitors may be afforded access only if it provides an educational or research benefit to an individual, group or organization. The principle behind this recommendation is that SLT can aid in the protection of these cultural resources and associated values from derogation.

Kashaya Pomo Recommendation #6: Visitors Should Sign a Confidentiality Agreement Regarding Cultural Resources

Because cultural resources are non-renewable resources, the importance of their protection and preservation is underscored. One of the best ways to protect cultural resources is to not only restrict access, but also generally not have people know about them. Therefore, it is recommended that visitors to LBM sign a confidentiality agreement regarding the cultural resources on LBM. Pursuant to state and federal laws, archaeological information must be kept confidential and is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552, PRC 6254).

Impact-Specific Management Recommendations

The following section outlines specific impacts that may occur throughout the LBM property and it offers recommendations on how to avoid or mitigate the effects of these impacts.

Impact-Specific Recommendation #1: Advise Feral Pig Hunters Regarding Cultural Resource Locations and Have Them Sign a Cultural Resources Confidentiality Agreement

Due to the impact potential of bullets on cultural resources, individuals given permission to hunt feral pigs on the property should be advised as to general areas where
cultural resources that could be affected by this activity are located in order to limit adverse effects. Additionally, these individuals should sign a confidentiality agreement regarding information about the cultural resources.

Impact-Specific Recommendation #2: Avoid Pruning or Thinning of Trees in Archaeological Sites and Around Cultural Resources and Only Use Hand-Held Equipment in Buffer Zones and Sensitive Areas

Pruning/thinning of trees is prescribed in the Sonoma Land Trust Little Black Mountain Stewardship Plan (Appleton 2002). Should pruning/thinning occur, care should be taken not to subject archaeological sites/cultural resources to disturbance. This may be accomplished by avoidance of this activity in cultural resource locations. Additionally, only hand-operated equipment should be used in archaeological sites/cultural resource locations, in buffer zones or in sensitive areas; no large, heavy machinery or large equipment should be allowed in these designated areas.

Impact-Specific Recommendation #3: Prohibit Felling of Trees in Archaeological Sites/Cultural Resource Locations and Implement Buffer Zone

The felling of trees and the large equipment necessary for harvesting trees may affect cultural resources. If such a management strategy is deemed appropriate, specific areas of LBM will be delineated and cordoned from such a procedure, and a buffer zone around these areas will be established to ensure inadvertent project effects are reduced or eliminated. Additionally, existing roads and skid trails should be utilized, rather than building new roads and creating new skid trails.

Impact-Specific Recommendation #4: Designate Entire St. Elmo Creek as a Sensitive Area and Prohibit Logging

The St. Elmo Creek watershed contains an abundance of archaeological sites. This area should be regarded as a “sensitivity zone.” Despite conditions stipulated in the
deed agreement that logging should only occur in the St. Elmo Creek watershed, this activity should be forbidden. There is a high potential for adverse impacts to cultural resources in this area should logging occur.

**Impact-Specific Recommendation #5: Locate Burn Piles of Non-native Vegetation Outside of Sites, Buffer Zones and Sensitivity Areas**

Burning piles of non-native vegetation has been suggested as a means of facilitating the removal of such vegetation. As mentioned previously, fire can affect cultural resources by affecting data potential and integrity. Therefore, it is recommended to locate burn piles of non-native vegetation outside of sites, buffer zones and sensitivity areas.

**Site-Specific Management Recommendations**

This section outlines site-specific impacts and recommendations. These recommendations are designed to provide for responsible management and treatment of cultural resources. Table 5, at the end of this section, provides a summary of general and site-specific recommendations. If any ground-disturbing activity is proposed on an archaeological site, a formal site assessment and evaluation is required so that the data potential of the site can be determined, allowing for development of appropriate treatment and mitigation. As mentioned previously, preservation in place is the preferred method of treatment. In terms of treatment, there are three primary approaches depending on impact(s), values and physical characteristics: (1) intentional site burial, (2) civil engineering techniques (i.e., slope stabilization measures) and (3) vegetation management (e.g., planting vegetation with shallow roots around a site) (McManamon 2005:1249).
**FOSTER-1, LBM-11 and LBM-12**

FOSTER-1 is a cupule rock that is located approximately 20 meters off the main dirt road. Adding to this exposed location, a fairly well-defined trail leads to this boulder and surrounding sites (LBM-11 [historic-era water works and prehistoric isolate] and LBM-12 [prehistoric lithic debitage and tool concentration]). Cartridge casings have been located at this site. In order to best preserve this resource, the present caretaker and employees who either reside on the property or frequently make visits to the property will be informed of this cultural feature and the value of its presence and its non-renewable nature. These individuals will also be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement. With this knowledge, visitors and residents who visit this and other sites are asked to observe kā'ela restrictions. Additionally, it is suggested that either a sign is posted asking visitors to stay on the path due to “habitat restoration” and/or native plants may be used to effectively screen the area and minimize access. Another option is to fence this area off.

**FOSTER-2**

FOSTER-2 is a 240-meter (north-south) x 100-meter (east-west) multi-component site that consists of a lithic debitage and tool concentration in addition to being the location of a cabin constructed in the 1930s. It is currently where visitors park while visiting the property. An alternative parking area should be defined that is located within a low-sensitivity zone. The vehicle and pedestrian traffic have already disturbed the site and affected the provenience of a number of artifacts. Additionally, the northeastern corner of this site is effectively sliding down the slope towards St. Elmo Creek. It is suggested, due to the economic infeasibility of slope stabilization measures, an intensive survey should be conducted in this portion of the site. Located artifacts should be
documented, mapped on a USGS topographic map and locations obscured so that any potential pothunters will not be able to locate them. If any ground-disturbing activity is proposed, a formal site assessment and evaluation is required. The data potential and other values of the site can be determined, allowing for appropriate treatment and mitigation to be developed. Should slope stabilization measures become feasible, any ground-disturbing activity should be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. See below for additional specifications regarding the preservation and treatment of this site.

_LBM-2, LBM-3, LBM-4, LBM-5, LBM-6, LBM-7, LBM-8, LBM-14, LBM-15, LBM-16 and FOSTER-2_

Should pruning and thinning of trees become necessary for fire safety within the St. Elmo Creek corridor, the utmost care and supervision should govern these activities. This is a high-sensitivity area with at least eight known cupule boulders and several prehistoric sites. Heavy machinery should not be utilized in this area or in the vicinity. Any trimming or pruning should only be accomplished with hand-operated tools. No ground-disturbing activities should occur in this area without a formal site assessment and evaluation.

_LBM-10_

The placement of water tanks is proposed as a fire management strategy in the southwest corner of prehistoric archaeological site LBM-10, which consists of a lithicdebitage and tool concentration. It is recommended that the archaeological site/area should be covered by a layer of chemically stable soil before building. If any ground-disturbing activity is proposed, a formal site assessment is required so that the data potential and values of the site can be determined, allowing for appropriate treatment and mitigation to be developed. Additionally, should any minor ground-disturbing activity
occur in the course of construction, a qualified archaeologist should be present and possess the authority to halt any activity should any artifacts be uncovered. It is also recommended that during ground-disturbing activities a Kashaya Pomo monitor is present.

LBM-17

A portion of this oval-shaped site consisting of lithic debitage and tools is located literally in the garden of the caretaker’s cabin. In addition to the damage to the site by past and current gardening activities, future projects (e.g., rebuilding of a shed, cabin retrofitting, planting of fruit trees and the potential burial of water pipes in the ground) are proposed at this location and in the vicinity. This is a sensitive area, and because ground-disturbing activity is proposed, the site should be analyzed further. A formal site assessment and evaluation is required, allowing for appropriate treatment and mitigation to be developed. Additionally, any ground-disturbing activities should be monitored by both a qualified archaeologist and Kashaya Pomo representative. Should any such activity occur without the supervision of a qualified archaeologist and artifacts are encountered, these locations should be documented and mapped on a USGS quadrangle. All ground-disturbing activities shall cease until the area has been examined by a qualified archaeologist and a tribal representative, and the archaeologist and the tribal representative have given permission to proceed.

CONCLUSION

As illustrated in the previous chapters, the cultural resources present on LBM provide a multi-faceted view of the past, offering a glimpse into history and Native American prehistory. The high density of cultural resources present on the property,
specifically in the northeastern corner, along the St. Elmo Creek corridor, attest to the frequent usage of the property in the past. Two different types of Native American sites are present on the property: single-task and multi-task areas. The single-task areas are the petroglyph sites. These locations do not contain an accompanying lithic debitage or for that matter any remains that would indicate that activities other than those associated with grinding these schist rocks was taking place. Within the multi-task sites (e.g., FOSTER-2, LBM-10, LBM-12, LBM-13, LBM-15, LBM-16 and LBM-17), it is evident that activities associated with food processing and procuring occurred. The presence of mortars and handstones indicate that some sort of acorn or seed processing occurred in these areas, while the abundance of lithic debitage and bifaces attest to hunting activities throughout the property and vicinity. This rich array of cultural resources provides an opportunity to illuminate the past lifeways of the Kashaya Pomo people and with this, the property possesses the potential to provide insight into the function of cupule production. As pointed out in Chapter II, the interpretations regarding the function and usage of cupule rocks is highly contested. Moreover, because of the rich concentration of artifacts, it can be reasonably concluded that a portion of LBM was utilized as a seasonal village or camp. As Chapter I and Chapter IV have made clear, the next step to be taken for the sites that may be adversely impacted by a proposed project is formal assessment and evaluation. This testing should be initiated in order to determine whether the site possesses enough data potential and depositional integrity to satisfy the criteria to be formally eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Should it be determined that a site possesses these qualities, a research design and data recovery plan should be formulated in order to provide for the most effective management and treatment. "To provide a
reasonable foundation for management decisions, all types of archaeological studies conducted to satisfy regulatory needs should be directed by research designs” (OHP 1991:1). This research design should be created by a qualified archaeologist, in compliance with the Office of Historic Preservation’s *Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs* (1991) and in consultation with the Kashaya Pomo. The research design should address current regional and thematic archaeological research issues, debates, data gaps and theory. Input from these areas may demonstrate that the information that may be provided by the site possesses value and insight for both archaeology and the Kashaya Pomo, thus providing an overall public benefit.

In addition to site-specific recommendations advanced by this cultural resources management plan, general recommendations are put forward based on suggestions, recommendations and guidelines made by organizations with a multitude of cultural resource management experience. The general recommendations are as follows:

- **Recommendation #1:** Initiate a Project Review System;
- **Recommendation #2:** Initiate Cultural Resources Monitoring;
- **Recommendation #2a:** Record Management Decisions and Treatment Actions on Cultural Resources Monitoring Checklist Form;
- **Recommendation #3:** Develop an Interpretive/Educational Program;
- **Recommendation #4:** Establish Sensitivity and Buffer Zones;
- **Recommendation #5:** Enact a Holistic/Systems/Inter-Disciplinary Management Approach;
- **Recommendation #6:** Involve Stakeholders and Community in Management/Planning Decisions and Activities;
- **Recommendation #6a:** Enlist SLT Caretakers, Employees, Volunteers and Property Neighbors in California Archaeological Site Stewardship Program;
- Recommendation #6b: Consult with Tribal Governments and Involve Them in Project Planning and Management;

- Recommendation #7: Protect Against Vandalism and Pot Hunting by Screening Resource Locations and By Limiting the Number Individuals Who Know Where Resources Are Located;

- Recommendation #8: Prior to Initiating Any Earth-Disturbing Activities, Formal Site Assessment and Evaluation and Treatment Options Should Be Devised By An Archaeologist in Consultation with Kashaya Pomo Tribal Historic Preservation Officer;

- Recommendation #9: Supervision of Ground-Disturbing Activities in Designated Sites, Buffer Zones and Sensitive Areas by Qualified Archaeologist and Native American Representative;

- Recommendation #10: Follow the Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan When Unplanned Resource or Remains Are Encountered; and

- Recommendation #11: Kashaya Pomo Recommendations and Considerations Should Be Respected and Adhered to Whenever Possible.

Implementation of these management recommendations will not be an easy task. In fact, it is the delicate balance of all these considerations that is the ultimate goal of effective cultural resource management. An additional challenge is added to this task by the fact that there is no formulaic answer or approach as to how all cultural resources should be managed. Each resource and the surrounding environment necessitates consideration of its own preservation challenges and issues.

In general, decisions regarding cultural resources management should consider the following:

...the nature and significance of a resource and its condition and interpretive value; the research potential of the resource; the level of intervention required by treatment alternatives; the availability of data and the terms of any binding restrictions; the concerns of traditionally associated peoples and other groups and individuals (NPS 2006:67).
Finally, it is hoped that since SLT does not have any formal policies relating to cultural resources management that this report can serve as a broad template for other properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resource</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBM-1</td>
<td>Historic-era Peterson Ranch; c. 1900s Ranch Remains</td>
<td>Invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control, erosion</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-3</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-4</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-5</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-6</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-7</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-8</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-9</td>
<td>Prehistoric Isolate Collection</td>
<td>Obscure visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-10</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone, prior to water tank installation utilize chemically stable soil cover, formal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-11</td>
<td>Historic-era Water Works and Prehistoric Isolate</td>
<td>Erosion, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities</td>
<td>Mask existing trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-12</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, signage, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone, mask existing trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-13</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, harvesting not permitted, buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-14</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, signage, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-15</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, signage, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-16</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Timber harvesting, invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, signage, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBM-17</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Scatter</td>
<td>Caretaker, visitor or trespass activities; ground-disturbing activities</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, restrict ground-disturbing activity, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone, formal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource</td>
<td>Resource Description</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-1</td>
<td>Prehistoric Petroglyph</td>
<td>Invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control,</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, tree harvesting not permitted, only hand-held equipment should be used to prune, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone, advise hunter of location and have him/her sign a cultural resources confidentiality agreement, mask existing trail, signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER-2</td>
<td>Prehistoric Lithic Debitage and Tool Concentration</td>
<td>Invasive species control, visitor or trespass activities, fuel load control, erosion</td>
<td>Long-term monitoring of condition, signage, relocating current parking area, mapping of artifact locations in area of slope failure, buffer zone, designate as located in high-sensitivity zone, mask existing trail, signage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A
Native American and Historical Society
Communications
To: Native American Heritage Commission

Fax No.: (916) 657-5390
Phone No.: (916) 653-4082

Date: February 2, 2009
Total Number of Pages: 2
(including cover page)

From: Leslie Smirnoff
Fax No.: (707) 664-4155
Phone No.: (707) 664-2381
E-mail: smirnoff@sonoma.edu

Re: Little Black Mountain
Account-Job No.: N/A

COMMENTS

Please review the sacred lands files for any Native American cultural resources that may be within or adjacent to the project area depicted on the accompanying map. The project area of approximately 500 acres near Cazadero, Sonoma County, Sections 19 and 30, T8N/R11W, MDB&M, as depicted on the Cazadero 7.5' topographic map in addition to Section 25 T8N/R12W of the Fort Ross 7.5' topographic map. The proposed project is a simple survey of the property is the first step towards the creation of a cultural resources management plan. We also request a list of Native American individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Please call if you have any questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

ASC Web Site: http://www.sonoma.edu/projects/asc/

Please call as soon as possible if there are any transmission problems: (707) 664-2381
February 17, 2009

Leslie Smirnoff
803 Bowen Ct.
Sonoma, CA 95476

Sent by Fax: mailed
Number of Pages: 3

Re: Proposed Little Black Mountain - Thesis; Sonoma County.

Dear Ms. Smirnoff:

A record search of the sacred lands file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 653-4040.

Sincerely,

Katy Sanchez
Program Analyst
11 February 2009

Leslie Smirnoff
803 Bowen Court
Sonoma, CA 95476
smirnoff@sonoma.edu

Sonoma County Historical Society
PO Box 1373
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Dear Sonoma County Historical Society:

I am a graduate student at Sonoma State University in the Cultural Resources Management Program. As a portion of my thesis project, I am conducting a study of approximately 500 acres near Cazadero, Sonoma County, Sections 19 and 30 T8N/R11W, as depicted on the Cazadero 7.5’ topographic map and Section 25 T8N/R12W as depicted on the Fort Ross 7.5’ topographic map. Please see attached graphic for an illustration of the project area. The proposed project is the creation of a cultural resources management plan for this property, which is owned by the Sonoma Land Trust. The purpose of this study is to determine what cultural resources are present and therefore with this knowledge, management of these resources may be facilitated.

I would appreciate being informed of any information or concerns that your organization may have in regards to historical sites within the project area. If you have concerns, or questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (707) 343-1626. If you prefer, please write me at the address or email me at the address given above. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leslie Smirnoff
Archaeologist
Subject: Re: Question Regarding Research in Cazadero
From: toyfrog@sonic.net
Date: Fri, January 16, 2009 8:39 am
To: smirnoff@sonoma.edu
Priority: Normal
Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

Hello . . . I'm sorry not to have replied sooner. The person to get in contact with is dear friend and president of the Russian River His. Soc. Jane Barry. You may contact her at

jbarry@russianriverhistory.org

If she can't help you she can put you in contact with Cazaderoans who are old-timers there.

John Schubert

> Dear Mr. Schubert:
> 
> My name is Leslie Smirnoff, and I am a graduate student in the Cultural Resources Management Program at Sonoma State University. I am working on historic research for a property, known on maps as Little Black Mountain, for which I am writing a cultural resources management plan as my thesis project. Additionally, this property is currently owned by the Sonoma Land 
> Trust.
> 
> I was referred to you by Lee Torliatt who said that you had completed extensive research on the Cazadero area. I am emailing because for the purpose of inquiring as to whether or not you might be able to point me in some good directions for conducting research into the area or provide me with any other pertinent information.
> 
> Please advise.
> 
> I thank you in advance for your consideration.
Leslie Smirnoff
803 Bowen Court
Sonoma, CA 95476
smirnoff@sonoma.edu

Sonoma County Historical Society
PO Box 1373
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

11 February 2009

Dear Sonoma County Historical Society:

I am a graduate student at Sonoma State University in the Cultural Resources Management Program. As a portion of my thesis project, I am conducting a study of approximately 500 acres near Cazadero, Sonoma County, Sections 19 and 30 T8N/R11W, as depicted on the Cazadero 7.5' topographic map and Section 25 T8N/R12W as depicted on the Fort Ross 7.5' topographic map. Please see attached graphic for an illustration of the project area. The proposed project is the creation of a cultural resources management plan for this property, which is owned by the Sonoma Land Trust. The purpose of this study is to determine what cultural resources are present and therefore with this knowledge, management of these resources may be facilitated.

I would appreciate being informed of any information or concerns that your organization may have in regards to historical sites within the project area. If you have concerns, or questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call at (707) 343-1626. If you prefer, please write me at the address or email me at the addressed given above. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leslie Smirnoff
Archaeologist
Appendix B
Site Record Forms
CONFIDENTIAL

This report contains confidential cultural resources location information; report distribution should be restricted to those with a need to know. Cultural resources are nonrenewable, and their scientific, cultural, and aesthetic values can be significantly impaired by disturbance. To deter vandalism, artifact hunting, and other activities that can damage cultural resources, the locations of cultural resources should be kept confidential. The legal authority to restrict cultural resources information is in California Government Code 6254.10.
Appendix C
Unanticipated Cultural Resource Discovery Plan
UNANTICIPATED CULTURAL RESOURCE DISCOVERY PLAN

Cultural resources (i.e., archaeological sites, the built environment or artifacts that are created by and associated with human culture) include but are not limited to the following prehistoric and historic items:

- obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or tool-making debris;
- culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rock, artifacts, or shellfish remains;
- stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones);
- stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls;
- artifact-filled wells or privies; and
- deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic artifacts.

ENCOUNTERING HUMAN REMAINS

The possibility of encountering human remains in the study area cannot be discounted. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that it is a misdemeanor to knowingly disturb a human grave. It is a felony to obtain or possess Native American artifacts or human remains from a grave or burial cairn except as otherwise provided by law or in accordance with an agreement reached pursuant to Public Resource Code §5097.94 or Public Resource Code §5097.98. The checklist that follows is taken from Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and from Public Resource Code 5097.98, which outline the procedures to follow if unanticipated cultural resources or human remains are encountered. Steps provided below that are marked with an asterisk (*) are recommended additions to legally mandated requirements.
Should human remains be encountered the following steps should be taken:

**STEP 1:** There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5).

**STEP 2:** Measures should be implemented to protect the discovery from looting and vandalism until the requirements of the law have been completed (i.e., the area should be flagged or fenced off for the purpose of inhibiting further vehicle or pedestrian traffic and covered with a weather resistant tarp) (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5).

**STEP 3:** The County Coroner should be notified immediately. County Coroner: 707.565.5070. If human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours of this identification (California Health and Safety Code 7050.5).

**STEP 4:** If an archaeologist is not already present, one should be contacted to evaluate the situation. Qualified Archaeologists: Tom Origer and Associates, 707.584.8200 or the Anthropological Studies Center, 707.664.2381.

**STEP 5:** In the interest of maintaining hospitable relations with all parties involved, the Native American Tribal Historic Preservation Officer who has been consulted in the course of survey and inventory completion shall also be notified. Native American Contact: Reno Franklin, 707.591.0580.
**STEP 6:** Under Public Resource Code §5097.98, the NAHC immediately designates a person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased (MLD).

**STEP 7:** Within 48 hours of being granted access to the site, the MLD recommends means for treating and disposing with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated items. If the NAHC does not identify the descendant, or the descendant does not make a recommendation, or the landowner does not accept the recommendation, and any mediation attempted fails to provide the Sonoma Land Trust acceptable measures, the Sonoma Land Trust must re-inter the remains on the property in an area not subject to further disturbance (Public Resource Code §5097.98).

**STEP 9:** Record the re-burial location with a DPR 523 form and submit this record to the Northwest Information Center.

**STEP 10:** No ground disturbing activities should commence until the qualified archaeologist has confirmed that such an activity will no longer harm any human remains or cultural items.
UNANTICIPATED CULTURAL RESOURCES

The possibility of encountering unanticipated cultural resources is very high. Should such a deposit be encountered during a construction related activity or development project, the following are recommended by this CRMP in order to ensure responsible management:

**STEP 1:** Construction activities shall halt in the area and within a 100-foot radius from the point of discovery.

**STEP 2:** Measures should be implemented to protect the discovery from looting and vandalism (i.e., the area should be flagged or fenced off for the purpose of inhibiting further vehicle or pedestrian traffic and covered with a weather resistant tarp).

**STEP 3:** If an archaeologist is not already present, one should be contacted to evaluate the situation. Qualified archaeologists include: Tom Origer and Associates, 707.584.8200 and the Anthropological Studies Center, 707.664.2381.

**STEP 4:** The archaeologist shall evaluate the site/cultural resources. Through this process, the resource’s location should be recorded on a USGS topographic map and physical attributes should be formally recorded on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form and submitted to the Northwest Information Center.

**STEP 5:** The archaeologist will construct a treatment plan that is tailored to the cultural resource and the site.
**STEP 6:** No ground disturbing activities should commence until the qualified archaeologist has confirmed that such an activity will no longer harm any cultural remains.
In the event that an unanticipated isolated artifact is encountered, the following steps are recommended by this CRMP to provide responsible stewardship and effective management:

**STEP 1:** Document isolate by way of photographs and/or drawings.

**STEP 2:** Map location of found artifact on a USGS topographic map.

**STEP 3:** Formally record resource on a DRP 523a form, and submit form to the Northwest Information Center.

**STEP 4:** Efforts should be made to visually obscure the artifact (e.g., cover the item with soil).
Appendix D
Cultural Resources Monitoring Checklist Form
## CULTURAL RESOURCES MONITORING CHECKLIST FORM

**Site Condition Assessment**
Sonoma Land Trust's Little Black Mountain Property

Site Identification Number: ____________________________
Date Recorded: ____________________________
Recorded By: ____________________________

Insert image of registration location

Direction of photo and description of photo location: ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
<th>Impact Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal/Pests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inspiration for this form was drawn from the following work:*
Page, Robert R., Cathy A. Gilbert and Susan A. Dolan
### IMPACTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural (continued)</th>
<th>Impact Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber thinning or cutting</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Cut</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New trail</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifact Collection</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other impacts that seem to be affecting the site? ________________

Are there any management actions that need to be taken immediately or in the near future in order to preserve this site? ________________

What if any management actions/activities have been implemented at this site or within the 100-foot buffer? ________________

Were any newly-identified artifacts located at this site? ________________

If so, please attach photo documentation of the artifact(s) and documentation of where artifact(s) was/were found. Most importantly, please obscure the found artifacts so that their presence is not immediately obvious.

Notes: ____________________________________________