

COMMUNITY HERITAGE IN SONOMA: BUILDING A CITY INVENTORY OF

HERITAGE SITES

by

Kristel Daunell

A thesis submitted to

Sonoma State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Cultural Resources Management

Dr. ~~Margaret~~ Purser, Chair

Wayne Goldberg

George McKale

04/23/10

Date

Copyright 2010

By Kristel Daunell

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPRODUCTION
OF MASTER'S THESIS

I grant permission for the reproduction of parts of this thesis without further authorization from me, on the condition that the person or agency requesting reproduction absorb the cost and provide proper acknowledgment of authorship.

DATE: 4/23/10

Signature

Street Address

City, State, ZIP

COMMUNITY HERITAGE IN SONOMA: BUILDING A CITY INVENTORY OF HERITAGE SITES

Thesis by
Kristel Daunell

ABSTRACT

The Certified Local Government Program presents an opportunity for Sonoma to create an inventory of heritage resources that meets the requirements of the program, and is also a community-based project. The themes of civic engagement, community building, and collaboration with the public and stakeholders in all stages of planning and research, tie together the diverse approaches that can be taken toward community-based heritage programs. Partnerships with stakeholders, public outreach, and ongoing, cooperative interpretation are recognized as strategies that have worked to build relationships between researchers, agencies, and the public, and to inspire in the public a concern for history and preservation.

This thesis describes the consultation process that occurred between this researcher, Sonoma's City Historian, the Sonoma Planning Department, and the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, and the cultural resources planning issues that were highlighted. It examines the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, and compares the historic inventory programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Opportunities for the city of Sonoma to expand its historic preservation policies, based on these cities' CLG programs, are explored. Involving the public in heritage management has benefits for Sonoma, and this can be done based on recommendations from the heritage community, and approaches other cities have taken. Tourists have been visiting Sonoma for more than wine since the 1880s, and stakeholder involvement in heritage tourism is critical to its success. A community-based inventory of heritage sites can also help the city promote Sonoma's rich history for locals and tourists alike.

This thesis concludes with recommendations for specific actions that Sonoma can take to create a community-based inventory of heritage sites that meets the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and begin building a firm foundation for a comprehensive heritage management program. It closes with a few thoughts for heritage professionals who are striving to create such programs.

Chair:

Date: 05/23/10

MA Program Cultural Resources Management
Sonoma State University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without my parents and grandparents. Thank you for supporting my educational endeavors, no matter how unconventional they seemed. Thank you, Dr. Margaret Purser, for your generous time, valuable insight, and reminders not to take things personally. Thank you, George McKale, for entertaining my crazy ideas and letting me pester you long after my internship was officially over. Thank you, Wayne Goldberg, for your expertise in planning matters, and encouragement that I may be doing something worthwhile. Thank you, Kristof Gross, for showing me how to be fearless, and encouraging me to sing in the key of weird. Thank you, Garrick Bowie, for being amazing in every way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Chapter</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Brief History of Sonoma..... | 1 |
| Introduction to Project..... | 4 |
| Contents of This Thesis..... | 5 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 6 |
| II. PROJECT NARRATIVE..... | 8 |
| Pilot Survey Proposal..... | 12 |
| Issues Revealed | 15 |
| III. THE CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM | 21 |
| Inventory Process..... | 24 |
| Inventory De-Listing and Demolition..... | 29 |
| Public Participation..... | 32 |
| Coordination with Stakeholders..... | 34 |
| IV. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT..... | 36 |
| Why Involve the Public?..... | 37 |
| How Can the Public Be Involved? | 40 |
| Public Involvement in Certified Local Government Inventories | 48 |
| Benefits..... | 52 |
| V. HERITAGE TOURISM..... | 54 |
| Sonoma Tourism Older Than Fine Wine | 55 |
| Stakeholder Involvement..... | 59 |
| Inventory Benefits Heritage Tourism..... | 60 |
| What Can Sonoma Do?..... | 64 |
| VI. RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 67 |
| Sonoma's Current Inventory..... | 68 |
| Preliminary Actions..... | 73 |
| Community-Based Inventory..... | 76 |
| Community-Based Inventory Supports General Plan Goals..... | 84 |
| Thoughts for Heritage Professionals | 88 |
| REFERENCES CITED | 90 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---------------|----|
| Table 1 | 85 |
|---------------|----|

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

From its perch on the northern frontier of the Spanish and Mexican empires, the city of Sonoma has been a witness and participant in the shaping of modern California. Sonoma has many historic buildings, yet it is also a living city, not frozen in time. As Sonoma plans for the development that comes with growth and economic expansion, the issues surrounding what merits preservation in Sonoma have become prominent. This thesis addresses how the city of Sonoma can build an inventory of heritage sites that is based on local significance criteria, developed with a maximum of public input. It examines the Office of Historic Preservation's Certified Local Government program, community based heritage projects, and the implications of such a project on heritage tourism that is already occurring in Sonoma. The thesis concludes with a set of recommendations to the city of Sonoma, and also to heritage professionals who may be considering community based projects.

BRIEF HISTORY OF SONOMA

The history of Sonoma Valley begins with the settlement of Native Americans, thousands of years ago. Located on the northern edge of San Francisco Bay, with hot springs, creeks, and abundant plant and animal resources, the Sonoma Valley must have presented an attractive place to settle, as there is evidence for several village sites in the valley.

In 1823, Mission San Francisco de Solano was established by the Franciscan Father Jose Altimira as the last and northernmost in the chain of California missions. It is the only mission established under Mexican, rather than Spanish, rule. The mission was built with Native American labor; records show that Native Americans from the Sonoma

Valley had traveled as far as San Jose as part of the mission system, and that Native groups from as far north as Clear Lake and as far east as Fairfield were part of the workforce at Mission San Francisco Solano de Sonoma (Milliken 1995).

By 1835 the missions were secularized by the Mexican government, and Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo was sent from the San Francisco Presidio to Sonoma to oversee the dispersal of the Mission's assets. Vallejo's assignment was to establish a pueblo that would both reinforce Mexico's claim to its northern frontier and keep a watchful eye on the Russian colony at Fort Ross. Vallejo, later promoted to General, laid out the town of Sonoma according to the Spanish Law of the Indies, with an eight-acre central plaza and grid-based street plan radiating south, east and west from the mission church.

On June 14, 1846, Sonoma was the scene of the "Bear Flag Revolt," in which a group of Americans opposed to Mexican rule seized the town for 25 days and declared it a part of the "Bear Republic." This group raised their own homemade "Bear Flag" in the northeast corner of the plaza, and this flag inspired the design of the California state flag. California was soon occupied by the United States military, and even though General Vallejo supported American rule of California, he was still imprisoned in Sutter's Fort for three months over the incident. In 1848 California became part of the United States with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and in 1850 California officially became a state.

Sonoma served California during the gold rush as a supply center and source of fresh meat and produce, which sold for high prices in the Sierras. Many of the people who came to eventually settle the Sonoma Valley first passed through on their way to the gold fields. The town also played a minor role in the Donner Party tragedy: search parties

were sent into the Sierras from Sonoma, and two surviving girls were adopted by Sonoma families.

The second half of the nineteenth century brought many changes to Sonoma. The city was incorporated on April 4, 1850, and held the county seat from 1850 until 1854, when the county seat was moved to Santa Rosa. General Vallejo's once vast landholdings were drastically reduced in the American period; the seven million acres that were once under his control were parceled out in the form of gifts, squatted upon by settlers, and stripped by American courts who did not recognize Vallejo's Mexican title to the land.

The wine industry was putting down roots in Sonoma by the 1860s. The Buena Vista Winery had thousands of European grapevines, cultivated by Chinese laborers, producing wine and champagne. Other settlers were putting in grapes as well, including such notable names as Jacob Gundlach, Charles Bundschu, and Nicholas Carriger. The phylloxera parasite practically destroyed every grapevine in Sonoma and Napa counties in 1873, but the industry replanted with resistant vines and has thrived ever since, with a brief pause during Prohibition.

In 1878 Sonoma became more connected to California when the Sonoma Valley Railroad was completed. The railroad linked Glen Ellen and Sonoma to the steamships at Sonoma Landing, and to the Northwestern Pacific line that ran through Marin County. Tracks were laid down Spain Street, past the mission, and a depot and round house were constructed on the north side of the plaza. The forerunner of today's City Hall, the Sonoma Plaza Pavilion, was constructed in 1880 to serve picnickers arriving on the railroad.

Electric lights came to Sonoma in 1898. The present City Hall, designed by San Francisco architect A.C. Lutgens, was completed in 1908 on the site of the former Plaza Pavilion. In 1911 a fire that started with the explosion of a coal oil stove destroyed nearly all of the structures on the east side of the plaza, and was extinguished with the help of Agostino Pinelli's thousand gallon wine tank.

Today Sonoma is well known for its excellent wine-producing climate and soil, world-class cheeses and dairy products, and Mission San Francisco Solano de Sonoma. The Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, General Vallejo's home, and the Mission and Barracks are popular tourist destinations, as are the wineries.

Sonoma is a living city; it has not been frozen in time. The original street grid, laid out by General Vallejo and later expanded by Jasper O'Farrell, has been faithfully followed and expanded. New neighborhoods, schools and shopping centers have sprung up, but the original neighborhoods have been mostly preserved. As Sonoma heads into the twenty first century, the issue of balancing the development that comes with growth and economic expansion and preserving the historic fabric of the city has become prominent. It is hoped that that this thesis project can address this issue, in ways that allow for the maximum participation of the community in shaping its future.

INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT

The city of Sonoma is preparing to apply to the Office of Historic Preservation's Certified Local Government Program. This program is meant to encourage heritage preservation by helping local governments to align their preservation and planning laws with national and state standards. The Certified Local Government Program presents an

opportunity for Sonoma to create an inventory of heritage resources that meets the requirements of the program, and is also a community-based project.

The themes of civic engagement, community building, and collaboration with the public and stakeholders in all stages of planning and research, tie together the diverse approaches that can be taken toward community-based heritage programs. Partnerships with stakeholders, public outreach, and ongoing, cooperative interpretation are recognized as strategies that have worked to build relationships between researchers, agencies, and the public, and to inspire in the public a concern for history and preservation.

CONTENTS OF THIS THESIS

Chapter II is a project narrative that describes the process by which this thesis was formulated. This process led from internship to consultation, from the proposal and rejection of a pilot survey, to the formulation of recommendations. This chapter closes with a discussion of the larger issues which this consultation process has brought to light, such as the disconnect between resources recognized by law and resources recognized by the planning department, the public perception of historic preservation as being in conflict with private property rights, use of sustainability concepts, and the importance of time in germinating ideas.

Chapter III describes the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and compares the historic preservation inventory programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Issues examined include the criteria and processes used to determine if a property is eligible for an inventory, processes for removing a property from the inventory, demolition and development, public input and building relationships

with stakeholder groups. These issues have been chosen for their potential relevance to Sonoma; the chapter concludes with a discussion of opportunities for the city of Sonoma to expand its historic preservation policies, based on the Certified Local Government programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

Chapter IV explores public involvement in heritage projects. The chapter discusses why public involvement is encouraged by heritage professionals, and how different cities in the Certified Local Government program have interpreted this requirement. The chapter then shows how public involvement can be incorporated into Sonoma's inventory process, based on recommendations from the heritage community and approaches other cities have taken, and the benefits of this approach.

Chapter V addresses heritage tourism, arguing that tourists have been visiting Sonoma for more than wine since the 1880s, that stakeholder involvement in heritage tourism is critical to its success, and that a community-based inventory of heritage sites can help the city promote Sonoma's rich history for locals and tourists alike.

Chapter VI recommends specific actions, based on the preceding chapters, that Sonoma can take to create a community-based inventory of heritage sites that meets the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and begin building a firm foundation for a comprehensive heritage management program. It concludes with a few thoughts for heritage professionals who are striving to create such programs.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Throughout this document, the terms “heritage” and “cultural resources” are employed. This reflects an expansion of the field of cultural resources management (CRM) over time. In general, CRM refers to the management of cultural resources such

as museum collections, archaeological sites, historical buildings and districts, within a legal context. The scope of topics under the purview of CRM increased exponentially in the final decades of the twentieth century, and “heritage” came to stand for this expansion and alignment with international legal concepts and contexts. The evolution of the National Park Service publication *CRM Journal* illustrated this expansion when, in 2003, it was renamed *CRM: the Journal of Heritage Stewardship*. In explaining the journal's broadening focus, editor Antoinette J. Lee argued,

CRM Journal responds to the evolution of the cultural resources field itself. Where once cultural resources management was practiced by relatively small staffs in the National Park Service and a handful of other government agencies, serious and substantive work is now being conducted by many Federal Government agencies, tribal governments, State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, and consulting firms under contract with government agencies and private organizations (Lee 2003).

Yahaya Ahmad argues “the scope of heritage has broadened from a concern for physical heritage such as historical monuments and buildings to groups of buildings, historic urban and rural centres, historic gardens and to non-physical heritage including environments, social factors, and lately, intangible values” (Ahmad 2006:293). It is in the spirit of Ahmad's definition that “heritage” is employed throughout this document.

CHAPTER II: PROJECT NARRATIVE

This chapter begins by describing the process by which this thesis was produced, from internship to consultation, from the proposal and rejection of a pilot survey, to the formulation of recommendations. This is followed by a discussion of the larger issues which this consultation process has brought to light, such as the disconnection between resources recognized by law and resources recognized by the planning department, the public perception of historic preservation as being in conflict with private property rights, use of sustainability concepts, and the importance of time in germinating ideas.

This project developed out of a graduate studies internship with Sonoma's first City Historian, George McKale. The internship began with historical research on a list of buildings for a city plaque program being implemented by the planning department. In the course of that research, it became clear that the planning department's existing historic inventory had not been updated in years, was too narrowly defined, and was not regularly consulted in planning decisions. Around the same time, members of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation were pressuring the city to adopt the California Mills Act, as well as preparing to update their own architectural survey of Sonoma Valley. In researching the Mills Act, and talking to the planning department, City Historian, and members of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, the Certified Local Government program came to light, and this thesis project began to take shape.

The primary goal of this project is to recommend how the city of Sonoma can implement an official inventory of heritage sites that meets the requirements of the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, with a maximum amount of public input. To formulate these recommendations, the requirements of the CLG program were

researched, as well as the inventory programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The community involvement practices of these cities, and others, were examined, and various approaches to heritage tourism were also investigated. Throughout, there was an ongoing dialogue between this researcher, the City Historian, the city planning department, and the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation about Sonoma's historic preservation planning needs. Generally, this researcher and the City Historian met with representatives from either the planning department or the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's Architecture and Community Education Committee. This resulted in the proposal, and rejection, of a pilot survey project in partnership with the Sonoma Valley League for Historic Preservation, and recommendations for the city's inventory program.

Another goal of this project is to use Sonoma as a case study from which to examine the issues relevant to implementing small-scale governmental historic preservation policies that utilize community engagement approaches. These issues include a disconnect between the kinds of resources that are recognized by federal and state law, and those resources recognized as important by residents and local governmental representatives; the perception of historic preservation measures as limiting private property rights; connection of historic preservation to sustainability and “green” practices; and the importance of time and continuity of contact in affecting change.

While the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation was pressuring the city of Sonoma to adopt the California Mills Act, the planning department had several reasons for resisting, which ultimately led them toward the goal of becoming a Certified Local Government. The Mills Act works by allowing local governments to enter contracts with property owners that lower their property taxes for a set number of years, in exchange for

rehabilitation or maintenance of their historic buildings according to national standards. The planning department expressed concern that Sonoma's adoption of the Mills Act might reduce property taxes for a few owners of prominent buildings, but the benefits to the city at large were intangible, and would not outweigh the property tax money taken from local schools. In discussions between this researcher, the City Historian, and the planning department, it was decided that the Certified Local Government program was a more comprehensive way for the city to address the heritage preservation planning needs of different types of resources in addition to historic buildings, and that the program could produce more tangible benefits for the city as a whole, rather than just a few property owners. And the city could still adopt the Mills Act at a later date.

The CLG program is quite comprehensive; it was agreed that this thesis project would focus solely on the inventory requirement. It is the city's responsibility to develop the other requirements, such as remaking the Design Review Commission to meet the standards of the program, updating the heritage preservation element of the General Plan, and adopting heritage preservation ordinances to coordinate these efforts.

A research design was drafted, and sent to the city planning department and Sonoma League for Historic Preservation. It was also presented to the Design Review Commission at their monthly meeting. The planning department was pleased with the research design and had no immediate comments; the Design Review Commission members were enthusiastic about the prospect of having such an inventory at their disposal. At the Design Review Commission presentation, members expressed concern for cultural resources planning issues, but admitted they did not have all the tools they needed to make informed planning decisions on that subject. Patricia Cullinan and Pat

Pulvirenti, of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's Architectural Conservation and Education (ACE) Committee, were present at the Design Review Commission meeting; they requested another meeting with this researcher and the City Historian to further discuss this thesis project.

The research design was sent in advance to the ACE committee, and our meeting discussion topics ranged over the many heritage planning issues facing Sonoma. Patti Williams told the group about her experiences as a council member in another California city, where they had faced opposition in adopting a city inventory because of strong objections from property owners. This concern for privacy, and their perception of private property rights, was cited by the ACE committee as a factor that was shaping how they were planning to update the League for Historic Preservation's survey of historic architecture in the Sonoma Valley. At the meeting, the ACE committee asked how they could help with this thesis project.

Throughout the process of meeting with the City Historian, planning department, and Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's ACE committee, research on the Certified Local Government program, community involvement practices, and heritage tourism was being conducted. To inform the city inventory recommendations, the standards of the CLG program were researched. The inventory guidelines of other participating Certified Local Governments were also examined, in order to learn how the requirements can be tailored to the needs of each place, and what Sonoma could incorporate into their own inventory practices.

Of primary concern is that Sonoma's inventory of heritage sites meets the standards of the Certified Local Government Program. The exact requirements of this

program were researched; issues such as how the inventory must be maintained and updated, how it is be utilized by the city in the planning process, and the roles of the public and stakeholder groups were examined. Marie Nelson of the California Office of Historic preservation was instrumental in directing my attention to the model CLG programs of Los Angeles and San Diego.

Since these California cities have been participating in the CLG program for years, it was useful to examine their inventories for comparative purposes. Approaches for maintaining and expanding their inventories were examined, as well as the function of the inventory in city planning processes. How these cities provide for public and stakeholder groups in the inventory process, as well as coordinate with tourism programs, was also probed. Most of this information was available through the planning department websites of the various cities. Occasionally more information was requested through email.

PILOT SURVEY PROPOSAL

The Sonoma League for Historic Preservation is a primary stakeholder in the city planning process, since their inventory of historic buildings in Sonoma Valley is specifically mentioned in Sonoma's Municipal Code as “a guide” for the preservation of historic structures (City of Sonoma: 19.42.010B). The planning department acknowledged that, in practice, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's inventory was not regularly consulted for city planning purposes, because there were concerns about its accuracy and comprehensiveness. The ACE Committee of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation was aware of this; they complained in meetings with this

researcher that the planning department did not regularly contact them to consult on historic preservation planning issues.

It seemed that one way the ACE Committee could help with this thesis project would be to participate in a pilot survey. After consulting with City Historian George McKale and Marie Nelson from the Office of Historic Preservation, this researcher proposed a pilot survey that would record one square block of Sonoma. This pilot survey would train the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's volunteers how to record historic resources according to state standards, while informing how a citywide survey effort could be undertaken by heritage professionals and volunteers for the purposes of this thesis project. A pilot survey proposal was presented to the Sonoma Valley League for Historic Preservation's ACE Committee, and their comments in return informed a recommendation to the city.

This researcher and the City Historian met several times with members of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's ACE Committee. We discussed that they were gearing up to begin their own survey project, which they said entailed recording every historic house in the Sonoma Valley. So it was striking to read in their comments to the pilot survey proposal, "The League has not yet identified the cadre of volunteers for undertaking its own survey update. We had anticipated that your experiences in soliciting volunteers, training them and conducting the pilot survey would provide valuable insights for us in developing our plan" (ACE Committee 2009). In hindsight, the pilot survey proposal should have specified more clearly how volunteers would be recruited, rather than assuming that the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation was ready to hit the ground running with a survey.

Other interesting comments on the pilot survey proposal included the following:

Our understanding is that your thesis proposal is to work with the City of Sonoma to create guidelines for a city inventory of heritage sites that meet the requirements of the OHP's Certified Local Government program. Although supportive of better preservation ordinances for the City of Sonoma, the League views its survey as a historic resource document, not as a government regulation resource and therefore we want to limit our attachment to government regulations at this time. Our previous survey experiences have shown reluctance by some community members to participate because of a perception that participating interferes with private property rights. The League wants to take a different tack and keep the reference to government use of the survey to a minimum. The League's desire is to make a longer-term commitment to the citizens of Sonoma in maintaining its' historic fabric. [ACE Committee 2009]

Since the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's existing survey of historic buildings is currently designated by Sonoma's Municipal Code as "a guide" for the preservation of historic structures, and hence their survey is already being utilized "as a government regulation resource" it appeared from these comments that the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation seems reluctant to wield the power of their supposed historical authority in public, and may be fearful of property owners misconstruing their authority under the Sonoma Municipal Code (City of Sonoma: 19.42.010B). Or, perhaps the ACE Committee members did not have a full understanding of their organization's current role in city planning under the Municipal Code when they responded to the pilot survey proposal.

Based on comments received from the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's ACE Committee, and time constraints, the pilot survey proposal was dropped. Because it is not clear how property owners in Sonoma perceive historic preservation policies, only how the ACE Committee perceives them, the ACE Committee's comments were used to inform a recommendation to the city that they perform a community needs assessment to

determine the attitudes of property owners, as discussed with more detail in the recommendations chapter.

The process of consultation between this researcher, the City Historian, the planning department, and the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, has directly informed the recommendations presented at the end of this thesis. It has also raised several issues that are larger than Sonoma, and these are discussed below.

ISSUES REVEALED

The process described above has illuminated several issues related to the secondary goal of this project: to use Sonoma as a case study from which to examine the melding of community engagement approaches with historic preservation policies. These issues include a disconnect between types of resources recognized by national and state historic preservation policies, and types of resources recognized by the local government and residents; the perception of historic preservation as limiting private property rights; the connection of historic preservation to concepts of sustainability and “green” practices; and the importance of allowing time for new ideas to sink in.

This project revealed a chasm between the kinds of resources and research themes recognized by state and national policies, and those recognized by the planning department of Sonoma, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, and possibly the community at large. There is a popular conception in the United States that archaeology equals the exclusive study of ancient, prehistoric Native Americans, and this is reflected in the city of Sonoma's cultural resources policies. Although the 2020 General Plan has an Implementation Measure directing the city to “Refer development proposals to the California Archaeological Inventory at Sonoma State University to ensure that important

archaeological sites are identified and protected” this is not consistently enforced (City of Sonoma 2006a:23). Applications for demolitions are also routinely approved without cultural resources studies, even though demolition inherently involves ground disturbance and therefore has potential to impact archaeological sites.

The Cultural and Historic Resources section of the Final Environmental Impact Report for Sonoma's 2020 General Plan contains a short historic summary, riddled with typos; the “prehistory” section ends with the “emergence” of Coast Miwok people in the area around 500 BC (City of Sonoma 2006c:125). The next section, “history,” picks up with the 1775 exploration of Bodega Bay. The founding of Mission San Francisco de Solano in 1823, and the assignment of Mariano Vallejo to oversee the closure of the mission and the founding of the pueblo in 1835, is summed up in two sentences, and there is no mention of Native Americans (City of Sonoma 2006c:125). By writing out those twelve lost years, Sonoma's mission period, the city of Sonoma has effectively denied that Native Americans lived in the Sonoma Valley beyond 500 BC, and that the landscape of Sonoma was a point of sustained colonial contact between the Mexican government, Franciscan missionaries, and Native Americans.

It is perhaps understandable that the city of Sonoma has written a period of conflict and radical transition out its history. That the California mission system can stir strong sentiment long after its dismantling shows that these places and issues have relevance to the present. In fact, the denial of the crucial importance of Sonoma's mission period has direct implications for the implementation of cultural resources policies in the city. If the “official” history glosses over the mission period, there is no basis from which

to consider how cultural resources associated with the mission period are impacted by city planning decisions.

Colonial contact during Sonoma's mission period is the key transition between “prehistory” and “history.” Prehistoric archaeology, historical archaeology, and historical documentary research have been shown to be integral to each other, not discrete disciplines that cannot be utilized in tandem on the same piece of property. The integration of prehistory and history, and the study of history in general using the tools of archaeology, has been recognized by scholars and regulatory frameworks as a legitimate approach, but the popular conception of “prehistory” as the archaeological study of ancient Native Americans, and “history” as a purely documentary pursuit, persists.

To date, historical archaeological investigations have rarely been required as part of the development process in the city of Sonoma. Even though historical archaeological resources are recognized as legitimate and legally worthy of preservation and study, suggestions that historical archaeological resources be protected from development through mitigative measures have been met with incredulity from the Sonoma planning department. This is a major obstacle to the recognition and preservation of these types of resources, which is disappointing because historical archaeology has the potential to address many issues relevant to Sonoma's community in the present.

Another issue encountered in Sonoma is the focus of the city's history entirely upon national and state themes, at the expense of smaller scales of local history and vernacular architecture. While the mission period is glossed over, the subsequent Mexican and American periods have become the sole sources of Sonoma's official historic significance. It is as if nothing interesting has happened in Sonoma since General

Vallejo died in 1890. This fossilized approach to Sonoma's history has made it impossible for the city to recognize resources for their local significance, or consider vernacular architecture as worthy of preservation, which has resulted in the destruction of potentially significant resources. While a handful of Sonoma residents can trace their history in the area back to 1890 or before, most cannot, and this is a missed opportunity to establish meaningful connections between the past and present, and cultivate stewardship of historic resources in today's Sonoma residents.

The public perception of historic preservation policies as conflicting with private property rights, or at least the fear of this public perception, has been a recurring theme and major stumbling block in this project. The planning department is opposed to adopting an ordinance that would require cultural resources studies prior to the approval of demolition permits, even in the city's historic overlay district, purportedly because they feel they cannot justify the increased cost to the applicant. The Sonoma League for Historic Preservation declined to join the proposed pilot survey because, "Our previous survey experiences have shown reluctance by some community members to participate because of a perception that participating interferes with private property rights" (ACE Committee 2009). It is not clear if the property owners of Sonoma actually fear historic preservation policies as much as the planning department and Sonoma League for Historic Preservation think they might. The legality of government historic preservation policies rests on a firm foundation of case law. If no one asks the community what they think about historic preservation, and what they value in Sonoma's historical environment, there will be no way to address this issue.

Concepts of “green” practices and sustainability are quite popular in Sonoma. These concepts have been used to enact strict landscaping plans, water use restrictions, architectural design guidelines and traffic plans, to ensure Sonoma's residents are treading lightly upon the planet. The Design Review Commission, in approving the demolition of a hundred year old house within the historic overlay district, did not require a cultural resources study, but did require that all of the materials from the demolished house be recycled. Preservation of existing structures and neighborhoods is much more sustainable and “green” than demolition and new construction, however, these two concepts remain miles apart in Sonoma.

The importance of time and continuity of contact has been crucial to the reception of new ideas. A year long internship with the city historian helped this researcher gain credibility with the city planning department and the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, but the new ideas presented were not necessarily warmly received. Over the course of this thesis project, stakeholders who were initially hostile to the idea of Sonoma becoming a Certified Local Government took more than one year to consider the notion and become supportive. The planning department is far from convinced that they need to adopt a demolition ordinance, but over the last year they have become more receptive to requiring cultural resources studies on a case by case basis. The idea that historical archaeological sites are protected by state and national laws also had a rough reception, and is still germinating.

This chapter has shown the process by which this thesis project grew from an internship to a consultation exercise, through the proposal and rejection of a pilot survey project, to the recommendations on how the city of Sonoma can update and expand its

current inventory of historic sites. This process has revealed several larger issues, such as the difficulty in bridging the gap between resources recognized by law and resources recognized by a city planning department, the public perception of historic preservation laws, the difficulty of connecting concepts of sustainability to historic preservation, and the importance of time and continuity of contact in gaining credibility and achieving project goals.

CHAPTER III: THE CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

The city of Sonoma is going to create an inventory of their heritage sites that meets the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and is also a community-based project. In order to do this, it is important to understand the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and to examine how other cities have used these requirements as a platform on which to build historic preservation programs that are tailored to the particular circumstances of each city. This chapter describes the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and compares the historic preservation inventory programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego in order to understand the criteria and processes used to determine if a property is eligible for their inventory, as well as the processes for removing a property from the inventory, demolition and development, public input and building relationships with stakeholder groups. These issues have been chosen for their potential relevance to Sonoma; the chapter concludes with a discussion of opportunities for the city of Sonoma to expand its historic preservation policies, based on the Certified Local Government programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

The Certified Local Government Program is administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. This program is meant to encourage heritage preservation by helping local governments to align their preservation and planning laws with national and state standards. The benefits of participation for local governments include eligibility for grants to do public outreach and expand their inventories, plus indirect benefits such as tourism, aesthetic improvement, and community building. Benefits for property owners within participating local governments include eligibility for Mills Act contracts, which

lower property taxes for a period of years in exchange for rehabilitation or maintenance of historic resources according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

There are five main requirements for participation in the Certified Local Government Program. First, a local government must adopt historic preservation ordinances with provisions to enforce the designation and protection of historic and archaeological resources. These ordinances must be consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act and the California Environmental Quality Act, and be supported by a historic preservation plan or element in the General Plan (California Office of Historic Preservation [CAOHP] 2007:35).

Second, a historic preservation review commission must be established. The commission members:

are encouraged to be appointed from among professionals in the disciplines of history, architecture, architectural history, planning, prehistoric and historic archaeology, folklore, cultural anthropology, curation, conservation, and landscape architecture or related disciplines such as urban planning (CAOHP 2007:35).

This commission will participate in environmental review of federal and local projects, and “develop standards for demolition stays, design review criteria, anti-neglect requirements, and appeal strategies” (CAOHP 2007:35). The commission is also charged with developing procedures for conducting an inventory of cultural resources that meets state standards and uses state forms, such as the DPR-523 forms. In addition, each commission member is responsible for attending at least one educational workshop a year, and the commission must prepare a yearly report to the OHP on their activities (CAOHP 2007:36).

Third, a Certified Local Government must have a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties. The California Office of Historic Preservation defines survey as follows: “the systematic process for identifying and/or evaluating the historical significance of resources within a defined geographic area or thematic context. Information gathered in the course of a survey becomes a part of the historic resources inventory for that area” (CAOHP 2007:21). This survey must be “coordinated with and complimentary to” national and state standards for evaluation. The same entity defines “inventory” as follows: “The list of resources evaluated through either an historical resources survey or other review process” (CAOHP 2007:18). This inventory must be update-able, have an articulated relationship with the historic preservation review commission, and be used in the planning process (CAOHP 2007:37).

Fourth, there must be “adequate” public participation in the local historic preservation program. This includes open commission meetings, and public participation in the historic survey program and National Register Nomination process (CAOHP 2007:37).

Finally, the previous four requirements must be performed “satisfactorily,” as judged by a yearly review at the state level. There will also be a more thorough review, with accompanying site visit by representatives of the OHP, every three years. There are procedures for becoming “de-certified” if the OHP's requirements are not met (CAOHP 2007:38).

As dictated by the Certified Local Government Program, the inventory must be update-able, have a relationship with the historic preservation review commission, and be used in planning decisions; there must also be “adequate” public participation in the

overall historic preservation program. However, the specific means of accomplishing these objectives are left up to the local governments. What follows is a comparison of how Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego, all Certified Local Governments, approach key issues of their inventory processes. These issues include determining the eligibility of a property for the inventory, mechanisms for removing the property from the inventory and demolition, encouraging public input, and building relationships with stakeholders. These issues have been selected to illustrate how the various requirements of the Certified Local Government program articulate with each other to create a comprehensive historic preservation program, and for their potential relevance to Sonoma.

INVENTORY PROCESS

The Requirements for Certification state that each local government must:

develop or have in place a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties.... This system must be coordinated with the OHP's statewide inventory program, use state-approved inventory forms and evaluative criteria consistent with the National Register, and be in line with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Identification and Evaluation. Communities...must update their survey data as new resources become eligible for consideration, or when older surveys warrant re-examination over time (CAOHP 2007:9-10).

Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego are required to utilize National Register criteria in their inventory processes, but they also describe alternative means by which places can be considered for official inventory listing in those cities, mostly having to do with local history. For example, Monterey uses a zoning system to designate city landmarks, adding an "H" to the zoning code of listed properties. In order for a structure, site or feature to be eligible for H zoning in Monterey, it must be at least fifty years old,

and meet one or more of a set of criteria that includes National Register criteria for historic buildings, but also such things as:

Archaeology: The site includes evidence of settlement, occupation, work areas, farming, hunting, gathering, burials, artifacts, and structures of all types dating from prehistoric or aboriginal periods (before 1769), the Spanish period (1769-1821), the Mexican period (1821-1846), or the earlier American period (1846-1879) (City of Monterey 1999: Article 15, Section 38-74A).

Monterey's potential criteria also includes: "Distinctive Local Feature- It has unique location or physical characteristics representing an established and familiar local visual feature of a neighborhood or the city, such as fences, walls, bridges, trees, waterways, beaches, and forests" (City of Monterey 1999: Article 15, Section 38-74E).

In addition, Monterey allows places to be eligible for listing as landmarks if they are made of "unique local materials" such as Carmel stone, Monterey shale, whale bone, "or if it is an adobe structure built before 1879" (City of Monterey 1999: Article 15, Section 38-74G). Monterey's criteria does not mention whether sites, archaeological or otherwise, must retain their integrity in order to be eligible. Monterey and Los Angeles both include "Distinctive Interior" as a possible criteria for listing on their inventories (City of Monterey 1999: Article 15, Section 38-72H; City of Los Angeles 2007: Section 22.171.8).

While Monterey uses H zoning as a historic planning tool, Los Angeles designates its locally-designated historic landmarks as Monuments. A site, building, object, or structure can become a Monument on the city inventory if it meets at least one of five criteria and retains integrity from its period of significance (City of Los Angeles 2007:

Section 22.171.8). The first four criteria are National Register criteria, but the fifth pertains to local history:

Demonstrates historic significance because it reflects or exemplifies the diversity of Los Angeles, including, but not limited to, the important contributions of people of color, women, and workers; or because it stimulates and promotes a greater understanding of diversity, democracy and freedom (City of Los Angeles 2007: Section 22.171.8.5).

Unlike Monterey, Los Angeles applies the National Register definition of integrity to their criteria for Potential Monuments, requiring that they retain integrity from their period of significance (National Park Service 1997; City of Los Angeles 2007: Section 22.171.8B). Los Angeles' criteria go on to specify that sites should retain “a sufficient degree of those aspects of integrity that relate to why it is significant” however, flexibility may be used in assessing integrity, particularly when a proposed Monument's significance falls under the local history criteria. In addition, “a proposed monument's deferred maintenance, dilapidated condition, or illegal alterations shall not, on their own, be construed to equate to a loss of integrity” (City of Los Angeles 2007: Section 22.171.8B).

While Monterey and Los Angeles use general terms like structure, site or feature in defining the field of their potential resources, San Diego broadens the categories considerably by allowing that “Any improvement, building, structure, sign, interior element and fixture, feature, site, place, district, area, or object may be designated a historical resource” (City of San Diego 2008:HP-7). In addition to the National Register criteria, San Diego also includes as criteria such local history categories as “Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's, or a neighborhood's, historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping,

or architectural development” and another criteria that is similar to the National Register definition of a historic district:

A finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way; or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest or aesthetic value; or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City (City of San Diego 2008: HP-7).

Of the three cities, San Diego's broad categories of possible historic resources and criteria, combined with the lack of integrity requirements, makes their heritage inventory criteria the most open to creative interpretation.

In addition to establishing inventory criteria that coordinates with National Register criteria, the Certified Local Government requirements state that the local government must “develop procedures for conducting an inventory of cultural resources” (CAOHP 2007: 37). Generally, anyone can start the nomination process, including the local government. The Historic Resources Commission makes a recommendation to the planning department or city council, who vote on the issue after a public hearing. Monterey, Los Angeles and San Diego have similar procedures for inclusion on their inventories; all three cities allow anyone to nominate a site to the inventory, and Monterey specifies that it is city policy to only designate a property with H zoning with the owner's permission (City of Monterey 1999:16).

In Monterey, the Historic Preservation Commission makes a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding whether to place a property on the inventory. However, if H zoning of an entire property is “not practical” the City Council can

designate any structure, site or feature as a “Landmark” at a public hearing, if it meets their criteria (City of Monterey 1999:62).

In Los Angeles, the procedure for listing a property on the city inventory varies by who initiates the process, but the Cultural Heritage Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council, and it is the City Council who ultimately has the final vote (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.9(c)1). If someone other than the owner nominates a property, then the city will notify the owner at least ten days before the first public meeting where the potential nomination will be discussed (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.9(d)).

Unlike Monterey and Los Angeles, the San Diego Historical Resources Board generally has the final say on their inventory. Anyone can nominate a property, and the city will notify the owner at least ten days before the Historical Resources Board hearing on the matter (City of San Diego 2006: Section 123.0202(b)). The Board determines that the requisite “research report or similar documentation” is adequate, then votes on listing the property at a public meeting. The City Council only gets involved if a decision of the Historical Resources Board is appealed (City of San Diego 2006: Section 123.0203(a)).

INVENTORY DE-LISTING AND DEMOLITION

The Certified Local Government requirements do not specifically state that local governments need mechanisms for removing properties from their inventories, or processes governing the demolition of inventoried properties. But all three cities studied have some guidelines on these issues. Monterey does not discuss how properties can be removed from their inventory, but they have a permit process for approving demolition of

any structures or features within an H zoned district. Los Angeles and San Diego have guidelines for both inventory removal and proposed demolition.

Monterey does not appear to have a process for removing a property from their city inventory. In order to demolish or remove “any structure or any feature within the H overlay district” a Historic Permit is required (City of Monterey 1999). The application is made to the Community Development Department, and it “shall contain whatever detailed information as is required to review the application” (City of Monterey 1999:Section 38-75E).

As long as a Monument in Los Angeles does not pose a threat to the public health, it cannot be removed from the inventory, demolished or substantially altered without the approval of the Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council. The Procedures for the Designation of Monuments state:

Once a monument designation is made, it shall not be repealed by the Commission and the City Council unless it is determined at any time that: 1) The evidence used to establish the designation was erroneous, or that material procedural errors were made during the designation process; or 2) The Monument no longer meets the criteria for designation...due to damage caused by natural disaster or reasons otherwise outside the control of the Owner...A change of use, a difference of opinion of a subsequent Commission, the desires of property Owners, or financial considerations are not sufficient to repeal a designation...Repeal of a Monument designation shall be considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.9(h)).

If an owner wishes to demolish a property listed on Los Angeles' inventory, they must “obtain approval for new development on the same premises in compliance with CEQA before issuance of a demolition permit” (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section

22.171.9(h)). This insures a full environmental review of the new project occurs before the demolition of the Monument. Monument owners are also required to apply for a Certificate of Hardship, which examines such issues as: the structural soundness as determined by a licensed structural engineer, costs of demolition versus costs of rehabilitation, maintenance costs, and market value of the property before and after demolition and new construction (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.14(b)). The city also states that certain factors “shall not be considered evidence of hardship” these include negligent acts by the owner, failure to perform maintenance, and failure to solicit or retain tenants (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.14(b)).

While San Diego has broad criteria for inclusion on their city inventory, it is very difficult to remove a property from the inventory or demolish it. The Historical Resources Board will amend or rescind an inventory designation “only if there is new information, the discovery of earlier misinformation, or a change in circumstances surrounding the original designation” (City of San Diego 2006:Section 123.0205).

If one wishes to demolish or develop a designated property in San Diego, what the city requires depends on the type of historical resources contained therein. For example, development on Traditional Cultural Properties is not allowed “unless all feasible measures to protect and preserve the resource are required” (City of San Diego 2000: Section 143.0252). “Up to twenty five percent encroachment” is allowed on important archaeological sites, and this figure includes “all grading, structures, public and private streets, brush management” (City of San Diego 2000: Section 143.0253(1)). Essential public service projects are permitted a total encroachment of forty percent on important archaeological sites, if it has been demonstrated “that there is no feasible, less

environmentally damaging location or alternative” (City of San Diego 2000:Section 143.0253(2)). In addition, any encroachment into important archaeological sites must be mitigated through avoidance and the implementation of a research design and excavation program” (City of San Diego 2000:Section 143.0253(2)). From these optional requirements it is clear that all three cities, especially Los Angeles, value their historic resources and are trying to use the environmental review process to protect them and close possible loopholes that could be exploited by property owners in order to alter or destroy them.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Certified Local Government Guidelines encourage public participation. It is required that local governments “provide opportunities for public participation in all responsibilities delegated to the CLG” including the National Register nomination process, California Environmental Quality Act review, and review of local development projects (CAOHP 2007:37). The Historic Resources Commissions must follow the Brown Act in posting their agendas and holding public meetings, and “public participation shall be fully encouraged in the performance of the historic survey program at all levels of responsibility to identify and inventory significant cultural resources...the public can serve as volunteers to assist in the survey effort” (CAOHP 2007:37-38).

While some level of public input is dictated by the CLG program, the approach of each city to this requirement varies. It seems, especially in Monterey and Los Angeles, that the cities are using a top-down model of public interaction, rather than facilitating a dialog on historical resources within the community. San Diego is the only city of the

three with a specific mandate to conduct outreach to ethnic communities in order to include a broader representation of heritage sites in the city inventory.

In the Zoning Ordinance, several of Monterey's "Specific Purposes" relate to the public, however they are phrased in ways that reinforce the authority of the city over any potential dialog. These Specific Purposes include:

To encourage and promote public knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the city's history.... To promote public awareness of the benefits of preservation.... To encourage public participation in identifying and preserving historical and architectural resources, thereby increasing community pride in the city's cultural heritage (City of Monterey 1999:Section 38-72D,F,G)

Los Angeles lists as one of the "Duties" of its Cultural Heritage Commission the following: "Participate in, promote, and conduct public information, educational and interpretive programs pertaining to Historic-Cultural Monuments and provide for public participation and input in all aspects of the City's historic preservation programs" (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section22.171.7.10). The phrasing of Los Angeles' Cultural Heritage Commission's duties follows a top-down model where the city is the authority who educates the public, and public participation and input is solicited because it is a requirement of the Certified Local Government program.

In contrast, one of San Diego's main Policies in its Historic Preservation Element is to "Foster greater public participation and education in historical and cultural resources" (City of San Diego 2008:HP-B.1). Approaches to this policy include:

Encourage the participation of the City's rich diversity of ethnic groups in efforts to preserve historical and cultural resources through outreach to historical societies, interviews to document oral histories, and inclusion of

ethnic resources on the City's Register of Designated Historical Resources.... Engage the public when creating 'context statements' by adopting an oral history component of historical survey work (City of San Diego 2008: HP-B.1(b)(c))

San Diego's emphasis on outreach, engagement of the public through oral history, and the stated goal of inclusion of ethnic resources on the city's inventory goes far in establishing a dialog with the public, rather than a top-down informational model.

COORDINATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Although the Certified Local Government Guidelines do not require it, some local governments have established goals and procedures for interaction with other groups that have stakes in the historic preservation process. Monterey's number one Historic Preservation Policy states that the city should coordinate its historic preservation efforts with Monterey State Historic Park, which owns several significant properties in the heart of town (City of Monterey 1999:General Plan Historic Preservation Policies 1).

Monterey also identifies local schools as partners in historic preservation, noting that “When a community is exposed to and offered interpretation of the historic and cultural resources, they will better understand their local heritage and its connections to other state and national regions” (City of Monterey 1999:Historic Master Plan Element 8).

While archaeological sites are mentioned as having potential for listing on Monterey's inventory, Monterey does not spell out how it will interact with Native American tribes in the planning process. Conversely, Los Angeles and San Diego both acknowledge the importance of relationships with local tribes in managing cultural resources. Los Angeles lists as one of the duties of its Cultural Heritage Commission to:

“Consult with local tribes before the Historic-Cultural Monument designation of a tribal cultural resource, including a Native American sanctified cemetery or burial ground, place or worship, religious or ceremonial site, sacred shrine or sacred site, historic, cultural, or artistic site, historic or prehistoric ruins, and archaeological sites...the City and the Commission shall follow SB 18 and State of California Tribal Consultation Guidelines” (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.7.18).

A Policy of San Diego's Historic Preservation Element is to “Foster government-to-government relationships with the Kumeyaay/Diegueno tribes of San Diego (City of San Diego 2008:HP-A-3). This is to be carried out through regular meetings, formal consultation prior to adoption or amendment of the General Plan, maintaining confidentiality, and supporting “tribal governments holding conservation easements over land voluntarily set aside for the protection of cultural places” (City of San Diego 2008:HP-A-3).

The Certified Local Government program is a platform on which cities can build their historic preservation programs. The comparison of the Certified Local Government programs of Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego has been undertaken in order to identify opportunities for Sonoma to address issues such as criteria and procedures for designation of properties to the official inventory, de-listing and demolition mechanisms, public participation, and relationships with stakeholders.

The Certified Local Government program presents the city of Sonoma with an opportunity to articulate its historic preservation policies with federal and state laws, as well as address local concerns. While specific actions will be outlined in the

Recommendations chapter, some opportunities for Sonoma are discussed here. For example, Sonoma's current inventory has no criteria for the inclusion of properties with local significance; this is an opportunity to begin a dialogue with the community on what criteria for local historical significance should be used. Sonoma's current inventory also does not proscribe procedures for nominating or removing properties from the inventory, or how properties on the inventory are to be considered in the context of potential demolition; this is an opportunity for Sonoma to examine how the Certified Local Government program can be used to ensure the articulation of the city's historic preservation policies with the city's development goals.

As demonstrated by Monterey, Los Angeles, and San Diego, the Certified Local Government program's public participation requirement is open to interpretation. Sonoma has the opportunity to interpret this requirement in ways that are meaningful for the community, facilitate dialogue on the values of local history, and foster community support for historic preservation. This opportunity for public participation in the shaping of Sonoma's future should not be overlooked.

CHAPTER IV: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement at all levels of community planning is a mandated part of public planning processes, including the Certified Local Government program. Public involvement is also encouraged by heritage professionals. While a basic level of public involvement is required by the Certified Local Government program, participating cities have interpreted this requirement in different ways. This chapter addresses why it is important to incorporate public involvement in Sonoma's heritage inventory, how this can be done based on recommendations from the heritage community and approaches other cities have taken, and the benefits that others have realized from incorporating community involvement into heritage projects.

WHY INVOLVE THE PUBLIC?

It is important to involve the public as much as possible in the creation and maintenance of Sonoma's heritage inventory because it is a requirement of the CLG program, because it is the right thing to do, and because the resulting heritage inventory will be richer with the inclusion of places valued by the community that may be overlooked by “experts.”

The Certified Local Government program requires a basic level of public involvement. One of the five main responsibilities of a Certified Local Government is to “Provide for adequate public participation in the local historic preservation program” (CAOHP 2007:37). Meetings of the Heritage Resources Commission are subject to the open meeting laws of the Brown Act, with published agendas and meeting minutes, and “public participation shall be fully encouraged at local commission meetings” (CAOHP 2007:37). Further,

Public participation shall be fully encouraged in the performance of the historic survey program at all levels of responsibility to identify and inventory significant cultural resources.... The public can serve as volunteers to assist in the survey effort. Survey results shall be of public record and on file at a public institution (CAOHP 2007:38)

In addition to being mandated by the CLG program, public involvement in community heritage planning is ethical, it creates social capital and reinforces a sense of local ownership of heritage resources, and creates a richer, more inclusive history that has relevance to the present. Sabloff (2008) promotes the concept of “action archaeology” as archaeologists working for living communities, practicing an “engaged archaeology” and “communicating with their varied publics” (Sabloff 2008:17). This engagement is necessary because the past informs the present, archaeologists have an obligation to the communities they study, and the collaboration of heritage professionals with communities results in research agendas that both illuminate the past and help communities in the present (Sabloff 2008:23). Sabloff calls for archaeologists to engage in more “community action projects” that “fully involve local groups in the planning, fieldwork, analysis, and dissemination stages” of research (Sabloff 2008:25).

Maureen Malloy (2003) points out that public involvement in community heritage projects builds public support for the stewardship of sites, and also enriches the quality of research being conducted, since “local communities bring their own unique perspectives and insights on the past that can inform and enrich our...interpretations” (Malloy 2003:ix). Furthermore, “communities benefit when archaeology is used to help meet local needs” (Malloy 2003:ix).

Heritage management can be a messy business, and different communities can value resources for different reasons. Waterton's (2005) study of a community project in

Hareshaw Linn, England, showed that neighbors of the Linn were not enthusiastic about the management practices of the National Park Authority. The attempts to reconcile a community's heritage values with a top-down governmental management program led her to conclude that:

the role of stakeholder must be expanded and allowed to encroach upon the terrain of the archaeological steward, thereby also rocking the idea of perceived universal rights and a common heritage: and ultimately, the tendency of filtering heritage and the management process through the privileged hands of a few (Waterton 2005:318).

Heritage policies in the United States have also been largely shaped by a privileged few, and the destruction of New Orleans by Hurricane Katrina starkly illustrates how places that are valued by a community are not necessarily supported by our historic preservation laws. Morgan et al. (2006) state “Hurricane Katrina made us reconsider exactly what it is that our preservation system documents and how effective it is at helping communities preserve the places important to them” (715). There is a gap between “heritage resource professionals operating under federal mandates” and communities living in cultural landscapes. This gap is not adequately addressed by the National Register of Historic Places framework, and “seemingly ordinary places underrepresented in the federal documentation process can be as important to the people who live in them as the properties that outside preservationists deem worthy” (Morgan et al. 2006:715). Without public participation in heritage projects, how would “outside preservationists” ever know about these other important places?

HOW CAN THE PUBLIC BE INVOLVED?

The most widely advocated element of public and community-based archaeology calls for researchers to “actively seek public participation in all stages of project design and interpretation, and be willing to refine these in light of community responses and concerns” (Gadsby and Chidester 2007: 224). Steps toward this goal include collaboration with varied community stakeholders, innovative public outreach, use of the press for publicity and credibility, ongoing cooperative interpretation, and a focus on heritage tourism.

The following examples of community-based projects are wide-ranging in depth, scope, level of commitment of all parties, and the particulars of each individual community. They have been chosen to illustrate what others have done to bridge history and community, and what could be possible for Sonoma.

Every community has individuals, groups, and organizations whose projects and goals, even if not overtly stated as such, can dovetail with archaeology and historic preservation issues. In CRM today it is standard practice to consult with Native American groups, but the circle of stakeholders is widening to include groups who are affiliated in ways other than ethnicity, such as environmentalists and genealogists. Local teachers and students are another set of stakeholders whose participation is key to community projects, leading some to conclude that the community itself is a stakeholder in archaeological projects. These themes, such as identifying stakeholders, conducting public outreach, utilizing the press, and considering heritage tourism, should be components of Sonoma's community-based inventory process. The specific examples cited raise important issues and many of them could be adapted to the particulars of Sonoma.

Kathleen Dowdall and Otis Parrish (2003) are involved in a long term project researching Kashaya Pomo landscapes. The project originated as a working relationship between CalTrans and the Kashaya Pomo to excavate a single site, and has become a collaboration between the agency and the tribe that unites the goals of regulatory historic preservation and Kashaya Pomo cultural preservation in a multifaceted project that is grounded in “inclusivity, reciprocity, and mutual respect” (Dowdall and Parrish 2003: 11). According to Dowdall and Parrish, this collaboration has informed every aspect of the ongoing project, from dictating the terms of contracts and selection of research topics and methods, to what information gets published, and who can work on a Kashaya Pomo site and when (Dowdall and Parrish 2003:123).

When Kelly Dixon (2005) was preparing to excavate the site of a saloon owned by an African American man in nineteenth century Virginia City, she worked with the local chapter of the NAACP, African American church groups, the Northern Nevada Black Cultural Awareness Society, and African American specialists in history and archaeology to build the research design and do public outreach (Dixon 2005:5). Kelly argues that the public outreach performed by these groups led to a large number of community volunteers who helped to excavate what they saw as a part of “their heritage in the mining West” (Dixon 2005:5). The saloon project also involved more than three hundred local children in learning about archaeology and the role of African Americans in Virginia City over the course of the project (Dixon 2005:4).

In discussing her work in Cahawba, Alabama, Linda Derry (2003) illustrates how her projects have benefited from working relationships with the African American community, as well other stakeholders such as environmentalists and genealogists. For

example, Derry was interested in excavating a site that she hoped would highlight issues of slavery. However, the local African American community was of the opinion that slavery was too sensitive a topic to “dig up,” so Derry instead connected the community's present-day concerns about schooling to a re-oriented research project that focused on an undocumented, abandoned one room schoolhouse that had served as a segregated school into the 1950s (Derry 2003:21).

Derry also shows how she was able to use archaeological data to reconstruct historic flood events, which was used to inform a flood control project, and that this “built strong relationships with environmental groups and agencies” (Derry 2003:23). These partnerships led to the granting of funds for “park development and outdoor education programs that stress the interface between archaeology and the environment” (Derry 2003:23).

Another stakeholder group identified by Derry are genealogists (2003:25). Derry describes how she responds to letters and inquiries from genealogists by photocopying and mailing, free of charge, information on families and properties they request. Derry says, “I am almost always repaid fourfold” because in return the genealogists often send her documents such as pictures, portraits, genealogical charts, old diaries, and sometimes even family heirlooms (Derry 2003:25). Of her relationships with genealogists, Derry says that “Most of the descendants I write eventually decide to visit the site.... Their visit contributes to the local economy, and they become part of a vast and extremely loyal support network for the site” (Derry 2003:25).

Patrice Jeppson and George Brauer (2003) have been working together to use archaeological concepts to teach other subjects in elementary and high schools in

Baltimore, Maryland. They describe their project as extending “the archaeological profession's offerings beyond archaeological needs to reach a community's needs while still teaching ethical principles and maintaining archaeological standards” (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:80). While it may seem obvious that teachers would become stakeholders in such an undertaking, Jeppson and Brauer make an argument that the children are the ultimate community stakeholders. Their program allows students to:

gain an appreciation of what and why archaeologists do what they do, to thoughtfully consider historical properties in their own community, and to be more inclined to promote (vote for, financially support) the cause of archaeology in their future. They will also likely be more proactive in cautioning their peers concerning the importance of protecting their cultural heritage because they will have been converted into stewards themselves (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:83).

Kelly Britt (2007) sees the entire community as a stakeholder in community-based heritage projects. Britt argues that communities become stakeholders through a process that involves the interaction of “volunteers and civic-minded citizens” with visitors to heritage sites. Visitors create social capital by becoming patrons of the site, which creates a link between past and present, as well as links between producers and consumers, “building social capital among all participants” and tying the community together as a stakeholder (Britt 2007:152).

Public outreach is another important facet of community-based heritage. This can take the shape of formal public history workshops, such as those utilized by David Gadsby and Robert Chidester (2007) in their work with the Hampden neighborhood of Baltimore, Maryland. These workshops were organized around a locally-focused topic, such as labor history or archaeology, with a knowledgeable speaker giving a presentation,

then opening the floor to discussion. According to Gadsby and Chidester, the discussions at these workshops led to the identification of the major research themes the participants would like to see addressed by heritage projects in their community, such as race and racism; gentrification, stability and social change; and gender, family and work (Gadsby and Chidester 2007:232). This type of workshop would be useful in identifying themes in Sonoma's history to be included in the Context Statement as part of the inventory process.

Kelly Dixon's (2005) Virginia City excavation took place in the historic business district, during the summer tourist season, so public outreach took both formal and informal approaches. The excavation incorporated a university field school, and also encouraged community volunteers. The student and volunteer crew were often excavating in front of a public audience, sharing their finds as they were being processed (Dixon 2005:4). Large signs at the site explained the project, and pamphlets describing the Boston Saloon and the role of African Americans in Virginia City were available for those who did not wish to interact with the crew (Dixon 2005:5).

The press can be helpful to the cause of community-based heritage. Kirsti Uunila's (2003) work on the Maryland site of Sukeek's Cabin shows that having someone in the local press who cares about history and preservation is invaluable. Uunila describes how the African American editor of the local newspaper was a vocal advocate for actively doing African American history, and even though he has since been replaced by a white editor who does not advocate overtly for historical causes, a precedent has been set: "Calvert County residents know that we 'do African American history' at JPPM [Jefferson Patterson Park and Museum] and have accepted and come to expect it" (Uunila 2003: 37).

Press coverage can be used to gain credibility and strengthen community support for heritage projects. Linda Derry (2003) recounts how she had difficult time gaining the trust and respect of the African American community with whom she hoped to work. Derry got middle school students involved in documenting the segregation-era school, and interviewing community members who had attended: “People, who could just never find enough time to talk with me, spent hours discussing their memories with these children” (Derry 2003:21). The results of the research were published in *Historical Archaeology*, which Derry says helped her gain “legitimacy in the rural African American community that surrounded the site” (Derry 2003:21). After the article's publication, “people in Beloit began to trust me with family stories more dear to my initial research interests, pre-emancipation history” (Derry 2003:21).

Ongoing, cooperative interpretation is another key to community-based heritage projects. In working with the descendant family of Sukeek's Cabin Site, Uunila (2003 40) found that some family members were concerned about interpretive displays that they felt reduced their past to be “only about slavery” (Uunila 2003:40). Uunila worked with the family members to alter the displays, removing some references to slavery and including more information about the lives of more recent generations, demonstrating the “dialogic nature” of public collaboration (Uunila 2003: 40).

The city archaeology program in Alexandria, Virginia, is an example of a comprehensive, community-based program that incorporates all of the ideal elements, and more. Pam Cressey (2003) has been the City Archaeologist since the 1970s, and she has been instrumental in constructing and maintaining a model community program that articulates relationships between multiple nonprofit groups, government agencies,

volunteers, schools, and stakeholder groups. Cressey et al., describe their interaction with the community as “a spiraling double helix of public and professionals linked by many community needs and groups” (Cressey et al. 2003:4). This interaction has led to unexpected partnerships with the arts community, to city adoption of the Alexandria Archaeological Protection Code and formation of the Alexandria Archaeological Commission, and to other citizen-inspired projects such as the creation of a park on the site of an African American cemetery that had been under a parking lot and was scheduled for development (Cressey et al. 2003:7). Cressey et al. close their chapter with a list of twelve principles for engaging in community archaeology; these include “look for the opportunity to produce some value from archaeology in the community,” “ask others in the community what is needed,” and “bring archaeological heritage data and issues into the larger planning of the community” (Cressey et al. 2003:16).

The city of Sonoma (2006a) has identified tourism as an important part of the local economy. Community workshops held in advance of the preparation of the 2020 General Plan indicated that “the relationship between tourism and agriculture should be emphasized” and that “the city's tourism industry benefits greatly from the presence of vineyards, wineries, and other agricultural activities in Sonoma Valley” (City of Sonoma 2006a:35-36). However, viticulture is not the only reason that tourists visit Sonoma. As the northern terminus of the El Camino Real, California's first paved north-south highway that attempted to retrace old mission routes while linking the missions to tourism and economic potential, Sonoma's Mission San Francisco de Solano has been a tourist destination for nearly one hundred years (Kropp 2006:55).

Although not mentioned in the City's General Plan, tourists visit Sonoma year-round, for reasons only tangentially related to wine tasting. The restored Mission and the associated adobe barracks are popular tourist sites, managed by the California State Department of Parks and Recreation. Sonoma's downtown plaza area is a National Register Historic District, with distinctive architecture and specialty shops and restaurants, where locals and tourists alike are encouraged to stroll. General Mariano Vallejo's home, just west of the plaza, is another established tourist attraction. A community-based inventory project would benefit the city of Sonoma by emphasizing historical aspects of the city in ways that attract tourists and enrich their experiences, which would ultimately enrich the city itself in many ways. From creating tours of historic sites to partnering with heritage professionals to generate research that directly impacts tourist opportunities, there are several community-based approaches available.

In Alexandria, Virginia, Cressey et al. (2003) describe how a heritage bicycle tour has evolved from the divergence of the city archaeology program and bicycle advocates. This tour utilizes existing bicycle routes through the city, with stops at historical sites and archaeological digs in progress (Cressey et al. 2003:9). Tourists can also join a scheduled, guided historical tour of the city, or pick up a walking tour booklet at the Visitors Association, produced by the city archaeology program (Cressey et al. 2003:10). Sonoma already has extensive bicycle and walking routes that could be utilized to showcase the history of the area to tourists. In fact, for \$99 per person, one can currently take a Segway tour from the Mission to General Mariano Vallejo's home, stopping along the way to taste wine and learn about Sonoma's history (Segways in Sonoma 2008).

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT INVENTORIES

Participants in the Certified Local Government program interpret the public involvement requirements in different ways. Los Angeles and Napa, two cities who are currently involved in the multi-year survey process, solicit public participation through neighborhood meetings, volunteer opportunities and websites.

Los Angeles has recently embarked on a program to record all heritage resources within the city limits. This ambitious multi-year project, called SurveyLA, has several facets of public involvement, from an open invitation to community organizations “to become involved in a positive and enduring citywide initiative” to volunteer opportunities for individuals, and an interactive website soliciting information on historic resources (City of Los Angeles 2009).

Community organizations have been invited by Survey LA to participate at several levels. Existing organizations can “consider forming a special Historic Preservation Committee” to lead their community’s participation in the project (City of Los Angeles 2009). Another way for organizations to get involved is by starting an “outreach and research effort” that parallels Survey LA “to begin identifying key properties and areas that may warrant further evaluation” (City of Los Angeles 2009). This is needed because “while professional architectural historians are likely to identify resources with obvious architectural significance, they are less likely to know resources that may have historic, social and cultural significance” (City of Los Angeles 2009).

As part of that research effort, Survey LA advises organizations to “begin thinking about how your community group might 'surface' some of the less-than-obvious

historically significant resources in your area” and even provides a list of questions to get started (City of Los Angeles 2009). These questions include:

What places served as focal points of your community over the years? Which resources were associated with the most important individuals and groups that shaped your community’s history? Which buildings and structures may have been associated with important architects, builders and designers whose work helped define the character of your area? What resources shaped social movements and the cultural evolution of your community? Which sites and areas provide a key window into understanding the demographic changes that your community experienced over the years? Written information that helps answer these questions will prove invaluable to the survey teams that will be conducting local field surveys (City of Los Angeles 2009).

Other ways for organizations to be involved in SurveyLA include collecting and digitizing historic photographs, conducting oral history that focuses on the evolution of the built environment, and developing contact lists of knowledgeable people (City of Los Angeles 2009).

While the actual recording of heritage resources as part of SurveyLA will be done by “consultant teams that meet professional qualification standards as historians and architectural historians,” individual volunteers “may assist in community outreach activities and provide valuable information about resources...particularly those of social and cultural significance” (City of Los Angeles 2009). Individuals can be involved in SurveyLA through photography, historical research, data entry and general administrative tasks, as well as “Field Survey Assistants,” which are people who “have specific subject matter expertise or extensive knowledge of community histories and students who have coursework in historic preservation or related fields” (City of Los Angeles 2009).

Volunteers can also help draft the historic context statement, and serve as neighborhood

coordinators or volunteer coordinators (City of Los Angeles 2009). Potential volunteers can fill out an application form on the SurveyLA website that can be emailed or faxed to the city.

Another aspect of public involvement in SurveyLA is their Speakers Bureau program. This program sends volunteers out to public meetings and events that request them, to make presentations that describe the SurveyLA effort and invite the public to participate. According to the website:

If you and your neighbors are interested in finding ways to participate in SurveyLA, the Speakers Bureau is also discussing the type of information needed and how each community can participate in helping to put together the stories that shaped the social, cultural, and architectural development of our city's diverse communities (City of Los Angeles 2009).

The most immediately accessible form of public involvement utilized by SurveyLA is their online "Historic Resource Identification Form." Located on the SurveyLA website, this form is downloadable, and can be emailed directly to the appropriate authorities. The form asks for such information as the name, address and neighborhood of the resource, as well as the construction dates of structures, date ranges for districts, architectural styles present, and why the place is significant (City of Los Angeles 2009). Most importantly, the form poses two key questions: "Do the physical characteristics of the resource matter? If it were to change, what features would you miss and why?" (City of Los Angeles 2009). With this form, anyone with access to a computer can take a few minutes to participate in the heritage process, and the information will be formatted in a way that is useful to the city. This is brilliant, and it should be adopted by Sonoma.

The city of Napa is also beginning a program to survey all heritage resources within the city limits, called Heritage Napa. Like Los Angeles, Napa is employing consultants to record the resources, but is holding neighborhood meetings to encourage public involvement. At these meetings, a presentation is made that describes the survey process, and people are asked for input on neighborhood resources. As advertised in the meeting notices, “residents are invited to share photographs, maps, and other materials and information related to historic architecture in the area. Images will be scanned and returned during the meeting” (City of Napa 2009). Residents are also encouraged to review to completed Citywide Context Statement and make comments to the planning department (City of Napa 2009).

Public involvement in heritage management is mandated by the CLG program, ethical, and necessary to enrich our historical knowledge. There are many approaches to involving the public in all stages of historical research, from working with stakeholders to utilizing the media. Specific strategies for soliciting public participation can also be found in the Certified Local Government survey programs of Los Angeles, and Napa. What are some of the benefits of public involvement in heritage projects?

BENEFITS

Benefits of public involvement in heritage projects include creating a useful history that is valued by the community, fostering community connections, and instilling a sense of stewardship of heritage resources. City Archaeologist of Alexandria, Virginia, Pam Cressey describes public involvement in her city's heritage programs as “a spiraling process that starts with public dialogue, includes public interaction along the way, and

produces many different public products that meet community needs as defined by its members” (Cressey et al 2003:3).

In advocating for Los Angeles to undertake a comprehensive, citywide survey informed by public input, Kathryn Welch Howe notes,

City agencies can utilize such data in project planning and permit and review processes; community groups and property owners can use the information to engage in education and property planning; and to protect and improve their homes and neighborhoods; and the real estate community views it as integral to 'smart growth' and increasing certainty in the development process. The absence of reliable data is recognized a source of risk and conflict in community and economic development projects (Howe 2001:6).

Because “seemingly ordinary places underrepresented in the federal documentation process can be as important to the people who live in them as the properties that outside preservationists deem worthy of the National Register,” public input is key to gaining the community's perspectives on local history (Morgan et al 2006:715). Emma Waterton notes that public involvement in the management of Hareshaw Linn “provided a deeper sense of the Bellingham community itself, allowing the somewhat homogeneous term 'community' to develop into a layering of groups and individuals, thereby expressing a complex account of Bellingham social life” (Waterton 2005:314). This is important because the interpretations produced by this approach will “hold value not only for heritage practitioners but also for those people whose identities are affected by what is said about their pasts” (Waterton 2005:319). Howe argues that “Bringing the community into the survey process in a way that engenders community

knowledge, appreciation, and support for survey recommendations and historic preservation is a critical element in a prospective LA survey” (Howe 2001:14).

Another benefit of public involvement in heritage projects is the fostering of community stewardship of heritage resources. Describing her work in the historic African American town of Cahawba, Alabama, Linda Derry states that the project “created opportunities for community members to form their own strong, meaningful, and emotional connections with the resource. Once established, these personal connections motivated the community to take action to protect the site” (Derry 2003:26).

Projects involving students have been successful in cultivating stewardship in the larger community, because “Students come to understand, firsthand, the role they have as stewards of the past through an intimate involvement with a piece of their county's history” (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:89). Furthermore, “They present their interpretations to the broader community as part of a feeling of public responsibility and community pride” (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:89). Jeppson and Brauer argue that public engagement “also fosters the conversion of public sites, artifacts, documents, and records to wider public ownership through expanded access and responsible engagement, and this has led to a greater involvement in the preservation of resources by that public” (Jeppson and Brauer 2003:90).

In her comparison of Certified Local Government programs for Los Angeles, Kathryn Welch Howe noted an “important correlation between the strength of the local historic preservation program and neighborhood stability and property investment” (Howe 2001:22). Another benefit of community stewardship is that “a well-planned survey and preservation planning program can open new development opportunities and

generate widespread neighborhood conservation and business development.” (Howe 2001:22). In addition, “Last minute identification of resources and the perception that a project could be ambushed by preservation interests appeared to be nonexistent in the cities with advanced survey programs” (Howe 2001:22).

In conclusion, public involvement in heritage planning is a mandated part of the Certified Local Government program, although this requirement has been interpreted in different ways. There are many approaches to incorporating public input into heritage projects, and doing so has concrete benefits, such as fostering community connections and instilling stewardship of resources.

CHAPTER V: HERITAGE TOURISM

Situated in the heart of Sonoma Valley, the city of Sonoma is a tourist destination with broad appeal. There are multiple historical sites in the city, and the surrounding valley is known for its historic wine and agricultural industries. While the wine industry is a widely publicized and lucrative tourist attraction, the city of Sonoma could benefit by addressing other attractions that bring tourists to Sonoma, such as historic Mission San Francisco de Solano and associated sites, the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, and the historic architecture and charm of the neighborhoods surrounding the Plaza. This chapter argues that tourists have been visiting Sonoma for more than wine since the 1880s, that stakeholder involvement in heritage tourism is critical to its success, and that a community-based inventory of heritage sites can help the city promote Sonoma's rich history for locals and tourists alike.

SONOMA TOURISM OLDER THAN FINE WINE

The city of Sonoma (2006a) has identified tourism as an important part of the local economy. Community workshops held in advance of the preparation of the 2020 General Plan indicated “the relationship between tourism and agriculture should be emphasized” and that “the city's tourism industry benefits greatly from the presence of vineyards, wineries, and other agricultural activities in Sonoma Valley” (City of Sonoma 2006a:35-36). However, viticulture is not the only reason that tourists visit Sonoma.

The Southern Pacific Railroad established freight and passenger service to Sonoma Valley in the 1880s, purchasing a narrow gauge spur that ran down Spain Street in front of the mission and terminated at a round table in the Sonoma plaza (Mathes and

Smith 2004:83). Passengers arrived daily and dispersed to the numerous hot springs resorts in the valley, making the hot springs an early tourist draw for Sonoma.

Also by the 1880s, Sonoma's history as the setting of the Bear Flag Revolt was being used to promote the city as "a desirable place to live and work" as demonstrated by the July 4 festivities of 1887 (Mathes and Smith 2004:16). These included a re-enactment of the raising of the Bear Flag by veterans of the Bear Flag Party and Mexican War, and a parade by the Sonoma Brass Band, all catered by Sonoma residents, who were asked to provide food for visitors (Mathes and Smith 2004:16). Nearly five thousand people attended the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Bear Flag Revolt in 1896; special excursion trains ran from San Francisco, Petaluma, and Santa Rosa, there was a parade, "symbolic raising of the Bear Flag," and other festivities (Mathes and Smith 2004:17).

As the northern terminus of the El Camino Real, California's first paved north-south highway that attempted to retrace old mission routes while linking the missions to tourism and economic potential, Sonoma's Mission San Francisco de Solano has been a tourist destination for nearly one hundred years (Kropp 2006:55). Helen Hunt Jackson's book *Ramona* is widely credited with sparking a national interest in California's Spanish past (DeLyser 2005; Kropp 2006). Although it is a work of fiction, *Ramona's* publication in 1884 coincided with the expansion of the railroad system in southern California; subsequent price wars enticed tourists and settlers from the eastern United States to visit the landscapes and locations described by Helen Hunt Jackson, and hopefully buy land at speculative prices (DeLyser 2005:36). By 1898 the Southern Pacific Railroad was advertising package tours of California missions (Kropp 2006:49).

Tourist visits to the fictive locations of *Ramona* by rail was big business; promoting automobile tours of the California Missions, and other crumbling Spanish and Mexican adobes, seemed a logical expansion. The economic potential of El Camino Real was the primary reason for its construction, and the “proper promotion of the Spanish past” at each mission site was linked explicitly to tourist dollars (Kropp 2006:55). This “proper promotion of the Spanish past” led directly to restoration work at missions throughout California, including Mission San Francisco de Solano.

This early restoration work was initiated statewide by the Federation of Women's Clubs, the Native Daughters of the Golden West, and the California Historic Landmarks League, using the goal of historic conservation as a vehicle of demonstrating that women could be “civic persons, boosters even” and therefore worthy of suffrage (Kropp 2006:56). Mission San Francisco de Solano was purchased in 1903 by the Sonoma Valley Woman's Club, Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West, and the California Historic Landmarks League, restored, and donated to the State of California in 1926 (Mathes and Smith 2004:11).

Beginning in the early twentieth century, Mission San Francisco de Solano was promoted as a worthy component of California's heritage; tourists and residents celebrated such events as the dedication of the El Camino Real bell at the mission in 1909, and the Grand California Festival of 1912, which was hosted by the Sonoma Valley Woman's Club, attended by Jack London, and featured “an exhibit of relics from the old Sonoma Mission,” as well as London's “collection of South Sea curios” (Mathes and Smith 2004:13).

The Bear Flag Revolt, already associated with patriotism and July Fourth celebrations, became folded into the mission narrative, as in 1914 when a re-dedication ceremony of Mission San Francisco de Solano coincided with the unveiling of the Bear Flag monument in the plaza across the street from the mission (Mathes and Smith 2004:14). Mission San Francisco de Solano was also the setting for the Sonoma Mission Play, produced by Garnet Holme (producer of Hemet's Ramona Pageant, which is still performed today) and performed during the week of July Fourth, 1923, along with “concerts, fiestas, a Spanish ball, parades, high mass, theatrical performances, a rodeo and a fandango” to crowds of more than three thousand people (Mathes and Smith 2004:14).

Tourists today visit Sonoma year-round, many for reasons only tangentially related to wine tasting. The restored Mission San Francisco de Solano and associated adobe barracks are popular tourist sites, managed by the California State Department of Parks and Recreation. Sonoma's downtown plaza area is a National Register Historic District, with distinctive architecture and specialty shops and restaurants. General Mariano Vallejo's home, just west of the plaza, is another established tourist attraction. The old rail bed of the Southern Pacific Railroad has become a popular bicycle and pedestrian path that cuts across the city, connecting vineyards, wineries and neighborhoods. Although there are no markers identifying its past life as a railway, the path is popular with both residents and tourists. There are no hot springs resorts left in the city, but a few remain in the Sonoma Valley. Tourists are already visiting Sonoma for more than wine tasting; the city of Sonoma can benefit from a focused approach to

heritage tourism that is developed in partnership with stakeholders and is creatively informed by a community-based inventory of heritage sites.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Stakeholder involvement is critical to the success of a focused tourism program. “Most [heritage] assets have multiple stakeholders with many management viewpoints” on how to best present the city's history to a tourist audience (McKercher and du Cros 2002:57). Further, “understanding cultural significance and how it ties socially constructed meanings to the physical is at the basis of dealing with community stakeholders” (McKercher and du Cros 2002: 81). Who are potential stakeholders in heritage tourism in Sonoma, what are their attachments to Sonoma's history, and how can these attachments and their meanings be enhanced through tourism?

Similar to Monterey, Sonoma has several prominent tourist attractions in the heart of the city which are owned and operated by the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, including Mission San Francisco de Solano, the adjacent adobe barracks and Toscano Hotel, the Blue Wing Inn, and General Mariano Vallejo's home. The California State Department of Parks and Recreation is a primary stakeholder in heritage tourism in Sonoma, and, as in Monterey, it is important that the city and the State Parks coordinate their historic preservation efforts (City of Monterey 1999:71). This includes presenting a unified vision of Sonoma's history, and coordination on such issues as traffic, pedestrian routes, and promotion of local events.

The city government itself can be considered a stakeholder, as it benefits from tourism through sales and bed taxes, business licenses, and other direct and indirect means. Owners and operators of businesses in the historical buildings of the Sonoma

Plaza National Register Historic District, and those in the Historic Overlay District, including owners of bed and breakfast inns, are definitely stakeholders. Other stakeholders in heritage tourism in Sonoma include the Sonoma Valley Historical Society, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, school teachers and students, and the community at large. It has even been argued that the tourism industry can be a stakeholder unto itself in some communities (McKercher and du Cros 2002:182); this is especially true in Sonoma, given the inter-relatedness of history and tourism in the city.

INVENTORY BENEFITS HERITAGE TOURISM

A community-based inventory project would benefit the city of Sonoma by emphasizing historical aspects of the city in ways that attract tourists and enrich their experiences, which would ultimately enrich the city itself. This includes examining the heritage tourism recommendations of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), making sure that the local community values any development that is ostensibly for tourists, shaping the presentation of heritage sites to influence the message conferred to the community as well as tourists, and using the platform of heritage tourism to tell hidden or forgotten stories about Sonoma's history.

The NTHP recommends an inventory of heritage sites as a first step in historic preservation, so that representative samples of different types of heritage assets that may be present can be targeted for preservation, and to determine the potential use values of those heritage assets (NTHP 1999). The National Trust also espouses “Five Principles and Four Steps” toward sustainable heritage tourism. The Five Principles are Collaborate, Find the Fit, Make Sites and Programs Come Alive, Focus on Quality and Authenticity, and Preserve and Protect (NTHP 2010). Under the first principle, Collaborate, the

National Trust notes that “tourism demands resources that no single organization can supply” and that regional partnerships can help to “develop regional themes, pool resources, save money and expand marketing potential.” The second principle, Find the Fit, stresses that “programs that succeed have widespread local acceptance and meet recognized local needs” and prompts tourism proponents to question, among other things, whether tourism is wanted by residents, and why (NTHP 2010).

The third NTHP principle, Make Sites and Programs Come Alive, highlights the importance of interpretation in making the historical message “creative and exciting.” This is best accomplished through the engagement of all five of the visitor's senses. The fourth principle, Focus on Quality and Authenticity, points to the importance of a “sense of place” in attracting visitors, because authenticity is what distinguishes Sonoma from any other place. The final principle, Preserve and Protect, discusses the importance of long range planning:

When your historic and cultural assets are at the heart of your plans to develop tourism, it's essential to protect them for the long term.... Hearts break when irreplaceable structures are destroyed or damaged beyond repair, instead of preserved and protected as they deserve. A plaque pointing out 'on this site a great building once stood' can't tell the story (NHTP 2010).

In addition to the above Five Principles, the NTHP also advocates “Four Steps for Successful and Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism” (NTHP 2010). These four steps are: Assess the Potential; Plan and Organize; Prepare, Protect, and Manage; and Market for Success (NTHP 2010). According to the first step, Assessing the Potential, inventorying heritage sites is a starting point from which to identify places with heritage

tourism possibilities. The second step, Plan and Organize, stresses the importance of gaining the support of local businesses and service organizations for successful heritage tourism endeavors. Step three, Prepare, Protect, and Manage, has several facets: Interpretive materials such as signs, brochures, maps, and exhibits should make Sonoma's history "emotionally accessible" to locals and visitors, and these materials should present a unified historical message (NTHP 2010). Under the rubric of Protection, the value of a comprehensive preservation plan is stressed, to structure the designation of historical resources and demolition reviews "so that property owners cannot abruptly tear down buildings that have historical significance" (NTHP 2010). On the subject of Management, it is emphasized that a balance of competing considerations is key, and measures to monitor and quantify progress should be implemented. The fourth step, Market for Success, suggests various means of marketing heritage tourism, including first considering the local community and children as potential visitors (NTHP 2010).

Others agree it is crucial that the local community value any development that is aimed at tourism. In a "guide to integrating tourism and cultural heritage management" directed to a worldwide audience, McKercher and du Cros (2002) state that "if the community values it, the tourist will too" (46). An example of this can be found in Hurley's (2006) account of the different uses of heritage narratives in revitalizing the waterfront neighborhoods of St. Louis, Missouri. The historical narratives used in early revitalization approaches in St. Louis focused on the pre-Civil War "steamboat era" of the 1850s, and St. Louis as the historical "Gateway to the West" (Hurley 2006:28).

More recently, a river path connecting neighborhoods became the impetus for historical reflection when the Mary Meacham Freedom Crossing was incorporated within

it (Hurley 2006:33). The Freedom Crossing was located near the site of an infamous slave escape that went awry, and the goal of this project was to

transform the northern waterfront into both a community asset for nearby residents and a major tourist destination by highlighting the special historical relationship between African Americans and the Mississippi River...by bringing previously unknown stories from the city's past to public light (Hurley 2006:33).

The surrounding neighborhoods were involved in the planning of the trail, and residents did not express a connection to the pre-Civil War steamboat era, or to the Golden West. Hurley posits that “while the goal of making the site a national tourist destination demanded a compelling national framework for the story, the community called for elaboration of the local context” (Hurley 2006:35). The stories a community tells about itself reinforce how the community sees itself; if the stories are compelling any visitor will be moved, not just ones from farther afield.

Elaboration of the local context is also an excellent vehicle for telling stories about Sonoma's past that may have been hidden or forgotten behind the nationalist narratives of the Bear Flag Revolt and the romantic mission past (Little 2004:279). For example, Sonoma Valley was inhabited by Native Americans for thousands of years; they were involved in complicated colonial encounters which are just beginning to be understood (Lightfoot 1995; Milliken 1995). Other than a plaque listing some of those buried near the mission, the story of Native Americans in Sonoma is not highlighted.

There was also a fairly extensive Chinese settlement on the west side of the Sonoma plaza from the 1880s to the early 1910s, including dwellings and businesses. The outward appearance of the area today does not reflect its Chinese past, and the history of

the Chinese in Sonoma is not highlighted, although there are probably many in the community that would be interested to learn of it. Sonoma's romantic Mexican past is also carefully separated from any people of Mexican descent who may reside there in the present. The popular history of Sonoma has characterized the Bear Flag Revolt as the nation-defining event that relegated Mexicans to the past, but Sonoma's Mexican history is a continuous one with multiple connections to the present that should be explored and celebrated. Residents and visitors to Sonoma may not be aware of the richness of Sonoma's past; this should be seen as an opportunity to shape the presentation of history, and tell a broader, more inclusive story (McKercher and du Cros 2002:107).

WHAT CAN SONOMA DO?

How can Sonoma use its community-based inventory of heritage sites to promote the rich history of the city for locals and tourists? It can coordinate with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to present a unified vision of Sonoma's history. The city of Sonoma can also focus historical interpretive messages on resources that are already being used by both locals and tourists, such as the bike path, and the National Register Historic District and historic overlay district.

As mentioned previously, Sonoma is in a similar situation as Monterey, where the Department of Parks and Recreation owns and operates several historical tourist attractions in the heart of the city. The first of Monterey's "Historic Preservation Policies" states that "the city should coordinate historic preservation efforts in and around Monterey State Historic Park with the California Department of Parks and Recreation" (City of Monterey 1999:71). Programs under this heading in Monterey deal mainly with funding, preservation goals, and traffic concerns, but Sonoma should go a step further to

work with the State Parks and Chamber of Commerce to present a unified vision of Sonoma's history to visitors (City of Monterey 1999:71). For example, the Blue Wing Inn is owned by the State Parks and Recreation and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is currently vacant, as the state does not have the resources to restore the adobe. The city of Sonoma could work with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to raise funds for the restoration of the Blue Wing Inn, and use it as a city museum to showcase the city's rich history.

Aside from properties owned and operated by the State Department of Parks and Recreation, there are other assets in Sonoma that are already being used by both locals and tourists which can be targeted for interpretive signs and self guided tours. Sonoma's popular and well traveled bicycle path is the old Southern Pacific Railroad bed, cutting across the city and connecting neighborhoods, vineyards and historical attractions. In Alexandria, Virginia, Cressey et al. (2003) describe how an archaeological bicycle tour has evolved from the divergence of the city archaeology program and bicycle advocates. This tour utilizes existing bicycle routes through the city, with stops at historical sites and archaeological digs in progress (Cressey et al. 2003:9). Tourists can also join a scheduled, guided historical tour of the city, or pick up a walking tour booklet at the Visitors Association, produced by the city archaeology program (Cressey et al. 2003:10).

Interpretive signs can be installed along the bicycle path, with photos and text describing the importance of the railroad to Sonoma's history, tourism, hot springs resort and agricultural industries. There are also several designated bicycle routes through the city streets of Sonoma; a tour booklet could be developed that showcases the historical attractions along these routes.

There are several themes in Sonoma's history that can be elucidated through the community-based inventory and incorporated into themed, self-guided walking tours. For example, visitors could choose a walking tour that focused on Mexican and American period adobes, Victorian architecture, local stonework, Sonoma's early wine, cheese and brewing industries, Chinese settlement, sites associated with the Bear Flag Revolt or early occupation by the United States Army, or the city landscape as established by General Vallejo and expanded by Jasper O'Farrell.

Plaques and interpretive signs can be used to inform locals and tourists about historical sites along the themed tour routes and throughout the city. Street names that have been changed, such as United States Street to Napa Street, can be commemorated with signs. Markers can be placed in the sidewalks showing the boundaries of the city as laid out by General Vallejo and Jasper O'Farrell's subsequent expansion, and locations of places that no longer exist, such as the Chinese laundry on the west side of the plaza. Photographs can be incorporated to show how the landscapes of Sonoma have changed over time.

The Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District and the historic overlay district can be promoted among locals and tourists through signs and brochures. An updated inventory of heritage sites will help identify significant buildings, sites and themes for promotion.

Heritage tourism is already a key component of Sonoma's economy and built environment, and Sonoma could benefit by reflecting the history of the community in ways that resonate with tourists as well as with locals. This can be accomplished through recognition that tourism in Sonoma means more than wine tasting, involvement of

stakeholders, and utilization of the community-based inventory to highlight themes in Sonoma's past that resonate with the local community as well as tourists. Coordination with the State Department of Parks and Recreation is key, as is focusing on historical interpretation of attractions already being utilized by locals and tourists, such as the bicycle path, Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, and the historic overlay district.

CHAPTER VI: RECOMMENDATIONS

The Certified Local Government program is a platform that communities can use to build heritage preservation programs that are tailored to the specifics of each place. This platform supports procedures to structure and streamline the planning process, creating a framework for decision making that fosters sustainability, and an appreciation of Sonoma's historic character. This chapter discusses issues that consultation has revealed in Sonoma's present approach to heritage management, and it identifies opportunities for specific actions the city of Sonoma can take to create a community-based inventory of heritage sites that articulates the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, as well as emerging community needs and interests. This will help the city to build a solid foundation for a comprehensive heritage preservation program. These actions support several goals and policies set forth in Sonoma's 2020 General Plan.

SONOMA'S CURRENT INVENTORY

In 2006, “A Resolution of the City Council of Establishing an Inventory of Historic Sites and Structures” was adopted by Sonoma (City of Sonoma 2006b). This inventory consists of properties with a California Register Status Code of 1 or 2, meaning that they are either (1) listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register, or (2) determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register (CAOHP 2003). According to the Resolution,

The historic resources inventory shall serve as a resource document that may be used as a) a foundation for future additions to or revisions of the Historic Overlay District, b) the establishment of other historic districts, c) the implementation of applicable codes, ordinances and policies pertaining to historic resources, and d) determining the eligibility of a structure for use of the Historic Building Code (City of Sonoma 2006b).

The Resolution concludes by instructing that, “Henceforth, any site and structure within the city limits of Sonoma that is designated as a historic resource by the State Office of Historic Preservation shall be automatically added to the inventory” (City of Sonoma 2006b). However, the inventory has not been updated since the resolution was adopted, perhaps because a process for updates has not been specified.

In meeting the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, Sonoma has an opportunity to update and expand their city inventory. The current inventory does not have a mechanism for updates, and it has not been incorporated into the citywide electronic mapping system. The current inventory is also narrowly defined in terms of national and state history. Furthermore, Sonoma's current inventory does not provide for public participation or have an articulated relationship with the historic preservation review commission, both requirements of the Certified Local Government Program.

The inventory Resolution states that anything designated as a historic resource by the State Office of Historic Preservation will be “automatically added to the inventory,” yet it does not specify how to accomplish these additions (City of Sonoma 2006b). Is the city to contact the State Office of Historic Preservation, or the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, periodically to inquire about new additions within their jurisdiction? To this author's knowledge, this has not happened since the adoption of the original resolution in 2006. It is not clear from the resolution how the city is to be made aware of recently designated historic properties, which is an obstacle to their being considered in planning and development processes.

Sonoma's current inventory is not incorporated into the citywide electronic mapping system, and this too is an obstacle to the inventory's coordination with the city's

planning process. The citywide GIS mapping system is used by the planning department in making decisions; it is publicly accessible and shows details of individual parcels. The mapping system displays characteristics such as zoning, assessor's information, and flood zones. Adding historical inventory information to the mapping system would help the planning department be aware of these resources and consider possible impacts to them as part of the planning process. Property owners could use this information to better understand their role as stewards of historical sites, and the public could use this information to orient themselves to Sonoma's historical resources. Napa has recently added historical district survey information to their city website, showing the state inventory forms for each address, organized by street and neighborhood (City of Napa 2009).

Sonoma's current city inventory also limits potential resource identification and opportunities for community participation. It only includes those properties within Sonoma that have either already been listed on the National or California Registers, or determined eligible for listing on the National or California Registers. It is not clear from the Resolution why the inventory was restricted to these properties; it may be related to the popular conception of Sonoma's history as mainly related to the gold rush and early American periods. This narrow conception has led to the exclusive listing of sites of national and statewide importance, and it does not accurately reflect a mix of residential and commercial, rural and urban sites from different periods and groups important throughout Sonoma's history. In the limited historical narrative of Sonoma as presented by the city inventory, national history equates with the Mexican period and Bear Flag Revolt, and Sonoma's contribution to California history ends with the gold rush or is

related to the wine industry. There are few properties of local significance on the inventory, and no guidelines for determining if a property of local significance is eligible for the city inventory. Broadening the inventory to include properties of local significance is an opportunity to foster a community dialogue on the local history of Sonoma, and promote stewardship of properties that the community values. Local significance criteria is a tool the community can use to consider how development plans impact the fabric of the city, not just the properties that relate to state and national history.

Meeting the requirements of the Certified Local Government Program presents Sonoma with an opportunity to expand its inventory in order to provide for public input and articulate a relationship with the historic preservation review commission. While the current inventory Resolution states “these historic sites and structures represent an irreplaceable heritage of great significance to the community,” to date it has not been clear how the community could engage with the inventory, what role they may play in its' implementation, or how they may contribute to the preservation of the properties listed (City of Sonoma 2006b). In addition, by restricting the inventory to sites that have a National Register Status Code of 1 or 2 and not providing for public input, the current inventory denies the community a voice in nominating sites of local significance.

Another key issue is the need for the historic preservation review commission to have an official relationship with this inventory. The Certified Local Government program requires that the commission weigh planning issues that affect historic resources, and function as the gatekeeper of the inventory. The current inventory Resolution does not articulate this relationship, reducing the effectiveness of the current inventory as a planning tool. By spelling out how exactly the inventory is to be

maintained and implemented as a planning tool by the commission, Sonoma has an opportunity to gain a more comprehensive view of its heritage resources, be able to engage the public and the commission in a more meaningful way, and ultimately make better planning decisions concerning heritage resources within the city.

A heritage inventory constructed along these lines would allow Sonoma to go beyond meeting the legal requirements of the Certified Local Government program, and include expanded roles for stakeholders in the community, as well as articulate relationships with the multiple heritage groups within the city. For example, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation is mentioned in the Sonoma Municipal Code as having a role in the demolition process, which seems intuitively linked to the inventory process, yet there is no articulated role for this group under the current inventory Resolution (City of Sonoma 2006b; City of Sonoma 2009: 19.42.010B). Other potential stakeholders include property owners and civic groups, as discussed in Chapter IV.

As Sonoma prepares to become a Certified Local Government, the city has an opportunity to update and expand the existing inventory of historic sites and structures. Sonoma has unique importance at many scales of history, and this should be reflected in the expanded city inventory. This inventory should also encourage public, and stakeholder, participation as well as articulate relationships with the historic preservation review commission and the multiple heritage groups in the city. What specific steps can the city of Sonoma take to reach these goals?

PRELIMINARY ACTIONS

In order to bring Sonoma's inventory up to date, and to prepare for Local Government certification, here are a series of preliminary actions the city of Sonoma can take in order to lay the foundation for a comprehensive heritage preservation program.

The Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the Historical Resources Information System at Sonoma State University is a vital resource, and the city of Sonoma should adopt policies to formalize their relationship with this agency. The NWIC functions as the regional records repository and regional representative of the State of California Office of Historical Preservation; they maintain historical records on this area's archaeology, history, architecture, and historical resources legislation. Sonoma should adopt policies that compel the planning department to contact the NWIC every six months, to determine if any new records have been filed, or old records updated, on historical resources within the city. Sonoma should also adopt a policy to share information with the NWIC such as the city's official inventory, records on historical resources, historic districts, and other historical or archaeological research that is conducted under the city's auspices.

Since Sonoma's inventory has not been updated since 2006, the city should also contact the NWIC in order to compile an updated list of historical properties. Then, the city should widen the criteria for their current inventory to include properties with the California Register Status Code of 1 through 5.

According to the California Office of Historic Preservation (2003), the National Register and California Register Status Codes have been aligned, with the Status Code 1 meaning that a property has been officially listed on the National Register or the

California Register. Status Code 2 means that a property has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register; this includes contributors to historic districts. Status Code 3 means a property “appears eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register through survey evaluation” (CAOHP 2003). Status Code 4 means a property appears eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register due to its placement on the California Master List of State Owned Properties. Status Code 5 means that a property is “recognized as historically significant by local government” (CAOHP 2003). Sonoma has an opportunity to officially recognize and work toward preserving properties of local significance in a way that integrates with state and national historical preservation laws by expanding the city inventory to include properties with Status Codes 1-5.

Sonoma's expanded city inventory should also incorporate the contributing properties to the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, with the caveat that this survey needs updating to correct errors and address properties that have become eligible for evaluation since the district was last updated in 1992. This would ensure that the contributing properties within the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District are incorporated into the citywide electronic mapping system, and that potential impacts to them are considered as a routine part of the planning process.

Since archaeological sites are considered confidential under California law, they cannot be included on Sonoma's public inventory of historic sites and structures. However, the city must keep a current list of archaeological sites within the city to be used for planning purposes. Sonoma should hire a qualified archaeologist to synthesize records from the NWIC in order to create an archaeological sensitivity map. This map

should depict all known archaeological sites, springs, creeks, drainages, soil types, and other archaeologically sensitive areas within the city. The archaeological sensitivity map cannot be publicly viewed, but it should be incorporated into the citywide electronic mapping system for ease of use in the planning process.

Another preliminary step is to hire a Cultural Resources Planner to coordinate the Certified Local Government program in Sonoma. This planner should have experience in cultural resources planning issues and their legal contexts, including the California Environmental Quality Act, National Environmental Protection Act, and National Historic Preservation Act, in addition to familiarity with the Certified Local Government program. The Cultural Resources Planner should advise the city on cultural resources planning issues, review permit applications and environmental impact reports, coordinate the community-based inventory process, serve as support staff for the historic preservation review commission, and report yearly to the state on the city's progress as a Certified Local Government, a requirement of the program.

Sonoma's municipal code must also be updated to provide a legal grounding for historical preservation, and integrated with the Certified Local Government program. The requirements of the CLG program state that local ordinances should be consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act and the California Environmental Quality Act, be supported by a cultural resources element in the general plan, and establish a process for adding properties to the city inventory (CAOHP 2007:35). As mentioned in Chapter II, these actions are necessary components of the Certified Local Government program, but outside the scope of this thesis.

In addition to these, Sonoma's municipal code should address demolition and alteration issues as they pertain to historical resources and potentially historical resources. It should also define qualifying “distinctive local features” such as buildings constructed of locally quarried stone, or adobes, or other attributes that the community values, to be targeted for preservation through the inventory process. The municipal code should also be updated in regards to the role of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's architectural inventory, discussed in detail later.

Another step would be to adopt a system of zoning for historical properties, such as Monterey's H-zoning system, in order to better integrate them into the planning process (City of Monterey 1999). Incorporation of the H-zoning system into the citywide electronic mapping system would make visible the numerous historical properties in Sonoma, and foster community support for owners and stewards of historical properties.

The actions described above are vital steps toward becoming a Certified Local Government, and they will help to build a solid foundation on which to establish Sonoma's heritage preservation program. Below are some actions the city should that are directly related to the community-based inventory.

COMMUNITY-BASED INVENTORY

Survey of every structure within the Historic Overlay District, and update of the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, are first priorities. This should be done as a community-based pilot project, for the purposes of informing how the rest of Sonoma can be surveyed. This survey should be done with as much community input as possible, building on practices utilized in the surveys of Los Angeles and Napa (City of Los Angeles 2009; City of Napa 2009). Volunteers should assist qualified professionals in

background research and identifying themes for the survey context statement, in neighborhood outreach, and in executing the survey itself. Local media, such as newspapers and radio, should be used to promote the survey project and encourage volunteer involvement. Partnerships with stakeholders such as the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation, Sonoma Valley Historical Society, Native Sons of the Golden West, and local schools should be explored to generate community support, volunteers, and possibly even funding.

Sonoma should also begin planning for the creation of a citywide historic context statement. A context statement is used to “define important patterns in the development of the area through time that may be presented by historic properties” (Derry et al 1985:15). According to National Register Bulletin 24, Guidelines for Local Surveys, “The importance of taking historic context statements into account cannot be overemphasized. Failure to do so can lead to the application of survey methods that are not cost-effective, that fail to identify significant resources, or that contain uncontrolled biases” (Derry et al 1985:14). The Certified Local Government program also requires that historic context statements meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (CAOHP 2007).

A citywide historic context statement should include a narrative historical background of Sonoma, a group of themes that embody the historical development of the city, a list of property types likely to be found eligible under the themes, and preservation goals and priorities. Individual properties are then analyzed to determine their historical significance and relationship to a particular theme. A short list of possible context themes for Sonoma includes: the Mexican period (1823-1846), the Early American period (1846-

1850), Gold Rush, statehood and early urban development (1850-1870s), railroad period (1878-1940s), Prohibition (1920-1933), shipping and transportation, historic wine and brewing industries, cheese and dairy industry, Victorian architecture, ethnic groups, and civic organizations.

The citywide context statement should be created with the maximum amount of public input. Public workshops, such as those utilized by David Gadsby and Robert Chidester (2007) in their work with the Hampden neighborhood of Baltimore, Maryland, would be quite useful for this purpose. These workshops were organized around a locally-focused topic, with a knowledgeable speaker giving a presentation, then opening the floor to discussion. According to Gadsby and Chidester, the discussions at these workshops led to the identification of the major research themes the participants would like to see addressed by heritage projects in their community, such as race and racism; gentrification, stability and social change; and gender, family and work (Gadsby and Chidester 2007:232). This type of workshop would help identify themes and gather the broad story of Sonoma's historical development, as expressed by Sonoma's community. These workshops would also be very helpful in identifying community historic preservation goals to inform the Cultural Resources element of the General Plan, another requirement of the Certified Local Government program. Local press should be utilized to promote these public workshops, to encourage the participation of a diverse audience, and to gain credibility and support for historic preservation in the community.

Over the course of this project, the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation expressed concern over the perception of historic preservation laws among Sonoma property owners. This is a legitimate concern, and since the attitudes of Sonoma property

owners toward historic preservation laws are not known, the city should conduct a community needs assessment in order to quantify them. This assessment can be used to design a community outreach program that informs property owners of the city's historic preservation goals and policies, owners' responsibilities and best practices as stewards of historical resources, and clearly articulate how the policies uphold private property rights.

The city of Sonoma should also take steps to identify stakeholders and begin discussing strategies for partnership and coordination on cultural resources planning issues. The California State Department of Parks and Recreation is a significant stakeholder in Sonoma; they own and operate several historic properties in the heart of the city. This situation is very similar to Monterey, and the city should adopt policies that foster cooperation and coordination of historical interpretation with the State Parks, as Monterey has done (City of Monterey 1999).

The Sonoma League for Historic Preservation is another main stakeholder in Sonoma. This organization gathered an architectural inventory in 1978 that has become interwoven throughout Sonoma's municipal code. This is problematic for several reasons: The Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's architectural inventory was not designed according to a specific methodology or supported by a historic context statement, it was not supervised by cultural resources professionals that meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards, it has never been filed with the local office of the State Office of Historical Preservation (the NWIC at Sonoma State University), and it was never intended to address the many ways that a property can achieve historic significance beyond architecture. Due to the factors listed above, the Sonoma League for

Historic Preservation's inventory does not meet the criteria of a "local inventory" for the purposes of the Certified Local Government program.

By weaving the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation's inventory into the municipal code, the city of Sonoma has presumed the inventory is a comprehensive, evaluative document which contains the entire story of Sonoma as expressed in its architecture. As it is currently constituted, this inventory is unable to serve this function, as it is neither comprehensive nor evaluative. This is an unwarranted regulatory function of the inventory, and a shaky foundation from which to build a historic preservation program.

In addition, representatives of the Architecture and Community Education Committee of the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation have communicated to this researcher that they do not desire to have their survey used for city planning purposes: "The League views its survey as a historic resource document, not as a government regulation resource and therefore we want to limit our attachment to government regulations at this time" (ACE Committee 2009).

In order to strengthen the legal basis of Sonoma's historic preservation program and respect the wishes of the Sonoma League of Historic Preservation, references to that organization's architectural inventory should be removed from the municipal code and replaced with Sonoma's own city inventory, expanded and updated according to the recommendations outlined above. However, there are still many roles for the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation to play in Sonoma's historic preservation program that are not directly related to government regulations. They can help promote the cause of historic preservation through public outreach and education. Individual members can

volunteer to be trained for the Historic Overlay District pilot survey, and then they will be more qualified to help the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation update their own architectural survey. They can partner with the city and contribute resources such as meeting space, architectural reference materials and knowledge, historical documents relating to other aspects of Sonoma's history, and funding. The Sonoma League for Historic Preservation also serves a key function as watchdog and counterbalance to the city planning department, as representatives attend public meetings and approach historical preservation issues with different perspectives.

Other stakeholders in Sonoma include the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR). Sonoma Valley is recognized as the territory of the FIGR by the Native American Heritage Commission. Many cities, and especially Certified Local Governments, establish official relationships with their designated tribes, in order to include them in the planning process and promote the preservation of archaeological sites. For example, included in the duties of Los Angeles' Cultural Heritage Commission is the directive to "Consult with local tribes before the Historic-Cultural Monument designation of a tribal cultural resource" (City of Los Angeles 2007:Section 22.171.7.18). A policy of San Diego's Historic Preservation General Plan Element is to "Foster government-to-government relationships with the Kumeyaay/Diegueno tribes of San Diego" (City of San Diego 2008:HP-A-3). This is to be carried out through regular meetings, formal consultation prior to adoption or amendment of the General Plan, and maintaining confidentiality about sacred sites (City of San Diego 2008:HP-A-3). The city of Sonoma should adopt policies to formalize its relationship with the FIGR that are

consistent with California Tribal Consultation Guidelines (Governor's Office of Planning and Research 2005).

Sonoma should also consider partnerships, funding, and volunteer opportunities involving other stakeholders in their historic preservation program. Other groups to consider include schools, the Sonoma Chamber of Commerce, the Sonoma Valley Historical Society, property owners in the Historic Overlay District and Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District, the Sonoma chapter of the Native Sons of the Golden West, the Sonoma Women's Club, and more.

Volunteer opportunities such as those provided by Los Angeles should be encouraged by the city of Sonoma. Community organizations play a vital role in historic preservation because “while professional architectural historians are likely to identify resources with obvious architectural significance, they are less likely to know resources that may have historic, social and cultural significance” (City of Los Angeles 2009). Other ways for organizations to be involved in SurveyLA include collecting and digitizing historic photographs, conducting oral history that focuses on the evolution of the built environment, and developing contact lists of knowledgeable people (City of Los Angeles 2009).

Individuals can be involved in SurveyLA through photography, historical research, data entry and general administrative tasks, in addition to assisting with the field survey of historic properties. Volunteers can also help draft the historic context statement, and serve as neighborhood coordinators or volunteer coordinators (City of Los Angeles 2009). Potential volunteers can fill out an application form on the SurveyLA website that can be emailed or faxed to the city. All of these volunteer activities would

transfer easily to Sonoma, and they can be coordinated by the Cultural Resources Planner.

Sonoma should also incorporate public participation in heritage preservation into their city website. This can be done by placing a simple “Historical Resource Identification Form” on the website that can be downloaded or emailed directly to the city. This form can be used to identify properties with special significance to the community beyond architecture, and to nominate properties to the city's inventory. This approach has been used in Los Angeles, and the form they use asks for such information as the name, address and neighborhood of the resource, construction dates of structures, date ranges for districts, architectural styles present, and why the place is significant (City of Los Angeles 2009). Most importantly, Los Angeles poses two vital questions: “Do the physical characteristics of the resource matter? If it were to change, what features would you miss and why?” (City of Los Angeles 2009). With this form, anyone with access to a computer can take a few minutes to participate in the heritage process, and the information is formatted in a way that is useful to the city.

There are a few actions that Sonoma can take to address the heritage tourism that is already occurring in the city. It is important to remember that residents should be the primary audience of interpretive efforts, and that if residents find aspects of Sonoma's history interesting, then tourists will too. Public input should be solicited for a program that interprets the historical significance of the bike path, for residents and tourists alike. Small signs and markers bearing photographs and text can be placed along the cross-town route, showing different aspects of the history of Sonoma, and of the path itself as a railroad for passengers and freight, as a connection between vineyards and

neighborhoods. The design of the signs, their content and their placement, should be decided by the community. Walking and bicycle tours can also be designed to showcase different themes of Sonoma's history, based on the themes identified by public input in the context statement.

The actions outlined above will help Sonoma build a solid foundation for a heritage preservation program that meets the requirements of the Certified Local Government program, allows for maximum public input, provides roles for stakeholders and community organizations, and fosters community dialogue. These specific actions support goals and implementation policies espoused by Sonoma's 2020 General Plan.

COMMUNITY-BASED INVENTORY SUPPORTS GENERAL PLAN GOALS

Implementation of the specific actions described above supports the City Council's Vision Statement, as well as other goals and policies in the Community Development and Local Economy sections of Sonoma's 2020 General Plan, as seen in Table 1 (see below). The City Council Vision Statement says that “In 2020 Sonoma will be a place where...the community's history and its role as a cultural center are enhanced through public art, special events, and careful preservation of historic features” (City of Sonoma 2006a:2). A community-based inventory project can be conceived as a public art project, ongoing special event, and celebration of history all in one. Update and expansion of the city's inventory will help the city shift from reactive to proactive historic preservation planning, and the inventory itself will quantify the city's historic features in order to help preserve them.

The Community Development Element of the General Plan states “The community's past helps to guide its future, with historic buildings and sites preserved for

Table 1, adapted from the Sonoma 2020 General Plan (City of Sonoma 2006a).

| General Plan Reference | How Recommendations Support |
|---|---|
| <i>“Encourage the designation and preservation of local historic structures and landmarks, and protect cultural resources.”</i> (Goal CD-5, Policy 5.8) | Updated and expanded inventory will encourage community participation in designation and preservation of local historic sites, and becoming a Certified Local Government will foster policies that protect cultural resources. |
| <i>“Reinforce the historic, small-town characteristics that give Sonoma its unique sense of place.”</i> (Goal CD-5) | Inventory enumerates the characteristics that contribute to sense of place. Also cultivates sense of place through community participation. |
| <i>“Develop incentives for property owners to preserve historic resources.”</i> (Goal CD-5, Policy 5.8, Implementation Measure 5.8.1) | Community-based inventory demonstrates how the community actively values its history. Other incentives such as the Mills Act become possible with CLG certification. |
| <i>“Preserve and continue to use historic buildings as much as feasible.”</i> (Goal CD-5, Policy 5.4) | Inventory identifies historic buildings for preservation and continued use. |
| <i>“Implement the Development Code and update it as necessary to ensure the provision of appropriate street connections, lot patterns, site designs, building forms, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities in specific areas of the community and to encourage useful innovation, especially with regard to sustainability.”</i> (Policy 5.4, Implementation Measure 4.1.1) | Inventory quantifies historic lot patterns, site designs, and building forms. Historic preservation is more sustainable than new construction. |
| <i>“Promote and accommodate year round tourism that is consistent with the historic, small-town character of Sonoma.”</i> (Goal LE-1.5) | Community-based inventory helps to elucidate Sonoma's character. Promote tourism that enhances these qualities by presenting aspects of Sonoma's history that are significant to the community or tell hidden stories. Make history accessible through signs, tour route pamphlets, and other means. |
| <i>“Preserve and enhance the historic Plaza area as a unique, retail-oriented commercial and cultural center that attracts both residents and visitors.”</i> (Goal LE-1.8) | Update of the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District will help assess the historic qualities of the Plaza, and the area can be incorporated into self guided walking / bicycling tours. Interpretive signs, markers, or pamphlets can be used to make meaningful the history of the Plaza area to the public. |
| <i>“Refer development proposals to the California Archaeological Inventory at Sonoma State University to ensure that important archaeological sites are identified and protected.”</i> (Goal CD-5, Policy 5.8, Implementation Measure 5.8.2) | This measure not currently being implemented. Becoming a Certified Local Government, and subsequent overhaul of the city's preservation policies, would help ensure this measure is consistently practiced. |

use and enjoyment by future generations.” (City of Sonoma 2006a:3). A community-based inventory can help the city's past to guide it's future by enumerating the variety of land uses, building types and housing in the city, by expressing what values the community instills in them, and by establishing concrete measures of the city's scale and historic character.

A community based inventory, and comprehensive historic preservation program, would definitely “encourage the designation and preservation of local historic structures and landmarks, and protect cultural resources” (City of Sonoma 2006a:23). Sonoma's current inventory is heavily weighted toward properties of national and state significance. Broadening the inventory to include sites related to local history, as informed by the community, is directly supportive of this Community Development goal.

The execution of a community-based inventory project would help the city better understand, and therefore reinforce, Sonoma's “unique sense of place” by partnering with the community to elucidate what Sonoma's history means to them (City of Sonoma 2006a:22). The project itself fosters a heightened “sense of place” just by asking the community to think collectively about their personal connection to Sonoma's history.

This positive reinforcement of Sonoma's “unique sense of place” can also translate into incentive for property owners to take proactive roles in stewardship of their historical resources, and “preserve and continue to use historic buildings as much as feasible” (City of Sonoma 2006a:22, 23). When it is clear that the community actively values the historical resources that contribute to its “unique sense of place” property owners will take pride in their historical investments, and this positive incentive can foster even more community participation and dialogue on Sonoma's history and its sense

of place. Becoming a Certified Local Government could also open the door to other financial incentives for property owners such as the California Mills Act.

“Sustainability” is a popular concept lately, and the creation of a community-based inventory and comprehensive historic preservation program promotes sustainability at many levels (City of Sonoma 2006a:22). An engaged community sustains itself through projects that foster dialogue and participation of citizens at all levels of society and government. A community in active engagement with its history nurtures a collaborative environment, where sustainable solutions to problems in the present can be informed by historical perspective. And, in terms of economic and environmental sustainability, it is much cheaper and more practical to maintain and preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods than to demolish them and build anew.

General Plan goals regarding tourism would also be supported by a community based inventory and comprehensive historic preservation program. The inventory project would solicit input from the community on the qualities of “Sonoma's historic character” (City of Sonoma 2006a:30). Tourism that enhances these qualities could be promoted by presenting aspects of Sonoma's history that are significant to the community, telling hidden stories, and making them accessible through signs, tour routes, and other means. Update of the Sonoma Plaza National Register Historic District will also help assess the historic qualities of the Plaza; the story of the Plaza as the “commercial and cultural center” of Sonoma can be made meaningful to tourists and locals through public events, pamphlets, signs, and interpretive programs (City of Sonoma 2006a:30).

There is one General Plan goal that is not currently being consistently implemented: “Refer development proposals to the California Archaeological Inventory

at Sonoma State University to ensure that important archaeological sites are identified and protected” (City of Sonoma 2006a:23). While a community based inventory project cannot address archaeological sites due to confidentiality issues, the protection of archaeological sites is mandated by state law, and is a worthy community goal, especially in a place as archaeologically rich as Sonoma. Overhauling and strengthening the city's historic preservation policies as part of the Certified Local Government program, in addition to the creation, regular consultation, and update of an archaeological sensitivity map, would help ensure this goal is met.

In conclusion, the Certified Local Government program is designed to function as a platform upon which cities can build tailored heritage preservation programs. Sonoma's current inventory process could be improved, and this chapter presented specific actions the city of Sonoma can take to bring its historic preservation program into compliance with the standards of the Certified Local Government program, as well as engage the community in order to begin building a comprehensive heritage preservation program. These specific actions support goals and policies promulgated by Sonoma's 2020 General Plan.

THOUGHTS FOR HERITAGE PROFESSIONALS

The secondary goal of this project is to use Sonoma as a case study from which to examine the issues that arise from the integration of community engagement approaches with historic preservation policies. These issues include a disconnect between the kinds of resources that are recognized by state and federal law, and those resources recognized as important by residents and local government officials; the perception of historic preservation measures as limiting private property rights; connection of historic

preservation initiatives to sustainability and “green” practices; and the importance of time in affecting change. Below are some recommendations for heritage professionals who may encounter similar issues in their work with local governments and the public on historic preservation issues.

Sonoma is not so very different from many historic cities. Certain aspects of the past, such as the mission period, may be viewed by the public and city officials as incidental to the story of the city, or politically risky to emphasize. Practices that are common in archaeology, such as historical archaeological investigation in regulatory contexts, may not be commonly associated with archaeology by the public and city officials; development decisions on these issues are made by people who are not archaeologists. Heritage professionals faced with such issues should attempt to see them as opportunities for inspired interaction.

When a city has no codified criteria for determining the local significance of a potential historic resource, the only resources that have a chance at preservation or mitigation are those related directly to state and national themes. Local significance criteria is the cornerstone of a comprehensive historic preservation program, and those criteria cannot be established without consulting the community. If a heritage professional can position themselves as facilitators of a community dialog, rather than dictators of arcane policy, they are in a better place from which to advocate the importance of local significance criteria, and of consulting the community to establish this criteria.

Positioning oneself as a facilitator, and advocating community consultation, can help heritage professionals address the public perception of historic preservation policies

as conflicting with private property rights, and the connection of sustainability concepts and “green” practices with historic preservation. Asking the community what they think about historic preservation, what they value in their city's historical environment, and how those values can be sustained, is the only way to find out if property owners are as concerned as they have been perceived to be. Often, property owners are not receptive to policies that appear to be arbitrary and imposed from outside the community; beginning a dialog within the community will ensure that historic preservation policies are developed with the support of property owners who will be affected. Seeing that the community values the resources managed by private property owners can foster immediate, relevant, connections between the past and present, and strengthen stewardship for the resources.

The final, and most important, recommendation, is for heritage professionals to be patient, and remember that new ideas take time to germinate. This project has been a nearly two year process; it has only been in the final months that certain stakeholders have become receptive to the CLG program, and no historic preservation policies have been updated at the city level due to the efforts of this researcher. This project has not really begun, and the extended time frame is very different from the way cultural resources management has been practiced in the past. Community consultation takes much more time than simply hiring experts to determine the historic significance of a city. However, the payoff, in terms of creating a richer, more informed and inclusive history, and fostering community stewardship through the development of criteria for local significance, is our best hope for the long term preservation of historic resources and communities.

REFERENCES CITED

ACE Committee of Sonoma League for Historic Preservation

- 2009 Memorandum: Draft Proposal for Pilot Survey. Personal email communication in possession of the author.

Britt, Kelly M.

- 2007 Archaeology: The “Missing Link” to Civic Engagement? An Introspective Look at the Tools of Reinvention and Reengagement in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara Little and Paul Shackel, pp.151-172. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

California Office of Historic Preservation

- 2003 California Historical Resource Status Codes.
www.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/chrstatus%20codes.pdf.
- 2007 Certified Local Government Program Application and Procedures.
www.parks.ca.gov/pages/1072/files/clgmanual10.pdf.

City of Los Angeles

- 2007 Cultural Heritage Ordinance, Los Angeles Administrative Code Chapter 9, Division 22, Article 1, Section 22.171
- 2009 Survey LA website <http://preservation.lacity.org/survey> <http://preservation.lacity.org/survey/volunteer>, accessed November 22, 2009.

City of Monterey

- 1999 Monterey Historic Master Plan.

City of Napa

- 2009 Heritage Napa website. http://74.205.120.199/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=656&Itemid=525, accessed January 11, 2009.

City of San Diego

- 2000 San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2: Historical Resources Regulations. 143.0201 – 143.0260.
- 2006 San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2: Designation of Historical Resources Procedures. 123.0201 – 123.0206.

2008 Historic Preservation Element, City of San Diego General Plan.

City of Sonoma

2006a 2020 General Plan. http://www.sonomacity.org/uploads/Planning/2020_General_Plan.pdf

2006b Resolution No.18-2006: A Resolution of the City Council of Establishing an Inventory of Historic Sites and Structures. On file at the City of Sonoma.

2006c City of Sonoma 2020 General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report, City of Sonoma Planning and Community Services Division, State Clearinghouse No. 2006052117, July 2006.

2009 Sonoma Municipal Code. www.codepublishing.com/ca/Sonoma/index.html

Cressey, Pamela J., Ruth Reeder and Jared Bryson

2003 Held in Trust: Community Archaeology in Alexandria, Virginia. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, pp.1-18. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Derry, Anne, H. Ward Jandl, Carol D. Shull, and Jan Thorman

1985 National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning. United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington DC.

Derry, Linda

2003 Consequences of Involving Archaeology in Contemporary Community Issues. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, pp.19-30. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Dixon, Kelly J.

2005 *Boomtown Saloons: Archaeology and History in Virginia City*. University of Nevada Press, Reno.

Dowdall, Katherine M. and Otis O. Parrish

- 2003 A Meaningful Disturbance of the Earth. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, pp.111-146. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Delyser, Dydia

- 2005 *Ramona Memories: Tourism and the Shaping of Southern California*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Gadsby, David, and Robert Chidester

- 2007 Heritage in Hampden: A Participatory Research Design for Public Archaeology in a Working Class Neighborhood, Baltimore, Maryland. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara Little and Paul Shackel, pp.223-242. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

- 2005 State of California Tribal Consultation Guidelines: Supplement to General Plan Guidelines. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento, California. [www.opr.ca.gov/programs/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_\(922\).pdf](http://www.opr.ca.gov/programs/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_(922).pdf).

Howe, Katheryn Welch

- 2001 Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project: Summary Report. The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles.

Jeppson, Patrice and George Brauer

- 2003 Hey, Did You Hear About the Teacher Who Took the Class Out to a Dig Site? Some Common Misconceptions about Archaeology in Schools. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, pp.77-96. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Kropp, Phoebe S.

- 2006 *California Vieja: Culture and Memory in a Modern American Place*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Lightfoot, Kent G.

- 1995 Culture Contact Studies: Redefining the Relationship Between Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 60(2):199-217.

Little, Barbara

- 2004 Is the Medium the Message? The Art of Interpreting Archaeology in U.S. National Parks. In *Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*, edited by Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, pp.269-286. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Malloy, Maureen

- 2003 Introduction. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, p. ix-xiii. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Mathes, Valerie Scherer and Diane Moll Smith

- 2004 *Sonoma Valley: Images of America*. Arcadia Publishing, San Francisco, California.

McKercher, Bob and Hilary du Cros

- 2002 *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. Haworth Hospitality Press, New York.

Milliken, Randall

- 1995 *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769-1810*. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, California.

Morgan, David W., Nancy I.M. Morgan, and Brenda Barrett

- 2006 Finding a Place for the Commonplace: Hurricane Katrina, Communities, and Preservation Law. *American Anthropologist* 108(4):706-718.

National Park Service

- 36CFR61. Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines: Professional Qualifications Standards.

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)

- 1999 *Getting Started: How to Succeed in Heritage Tourism*. National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington DC.

2010 How to Get Started in Cultural Heritage Tourism website.
<http://www.culturalheritagetourism.org/howtogetstarted.htm>. Accessed January 29, 2010.

Office of Historic Preservation

1999 Appendix G, Certified Local Government Application and Procedures.
<http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1072/files/clgrequirements.pdf>

Orbasli, Aylin

2000 *Tourists in Historic Towns: Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. E & FN Spon, New York.

Orbasli, Aylin and Simon Woodward

2009 Tourism and Heritage Conservation. In *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies*, edited by Tazim Jamal and Mike Robinson, pp.314-332. SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, California.

Sabloff, Jeremy

2008 *Archaeology Matters: Action Archaeology in the Modern World*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Segways in Sonoma

2008 Segway Tours in Sonoma. Electronic Document,
<http://www.sonomasegway.com>, accessed April 30, 2009.

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

1997 National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington DC: National Park Service.

Uunila, Kirsti

2003 Sukeek's Cabin: Archaeology, A Family's Story, and Building Community. In *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by Linda Derry and Maureen Malloy, p.31-44. Society for American Archaeology, Washington DC.

Waterton, Emma

2005 Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(4):309-325.