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ABSTRACT

PURPOSE OF THESIS: Interpretation is a form of education that encourages the public to appreciate cultural resources and commit to preserving them for future generations. Although there are laws, regulations, guidelines and policies that mandate or recommend public interpretation on cultural resources management work, outreach projects rarely transpire as technical reports, funding and construction take precedence.

Still, by marketing innovative ideas and consulting with agencies and communities, cultural resources management (CRM) practitioners working for a state agency, private firm or university are improving the quantity and quality of outreach programs to build public support and retain cultural heritage.

Sonoma County Regional Parks is an example of an agency influenced by these issues. Using the spirit of the legal mandates and taking inspiration from their mission statement, Regional Parks has developed a variety of public interpretation products since the agency’s founding in 1968. Their recent acquisition of 335 acres of uplands that adjoin Hood Mountain Regional Park, Sonoma County, impelled plans for park development, which includes generating public interpretation materials on the historic-period site Hendrickson Homestead. This domestic site is recognized for having both important cultural, historical and archaeological features and values. Now a part of Hood Mountain Regional Park, an immensely popular recreational destination for the local community, Hendrickson Homestead will be accessible to the public through hiking trails, including the Bay Area Ridge Trail.

Through the process of creating a public interpretation product for Sonoma County Regional Parks of Hendrickson Homestead located in Hood Mountain Regional Park, the purpose of this thesis is to illustrate the
important role that public interpretation plays in the cultural resources management industry, how public interpretation is incorporated into the cultural resource management process and how historical and CRM-driven research, archaeological features and landscape observation can be used to create public interpretation materials.

METHODS: Interviews with CRM educators and practitioners were conducted and literature was reviewed to understand the concepts, definitions and theories of public interpretation within the framework of the National Park Service and the cultural resources management field. Primary and secondary documents relating to Hendrickson Homestead and the surrounding area during the historic period and existing cultural resource studies for Hood Mountain Regional Park were reviewed in order to develop a comprehensive historical overview. Analysis of historical documents and archaeological site records and the author’s observations of Hendrickson Homestead configuration were used to create a description of the site’s features and landscape development during the historic period.

FINDINGS: Hendrickson Homestead’s history of extensive land use and landscape modification during the historic period suggests that the site is a significant example of California land acquisition that reflects the influences of agriculture, mining and recreation. Historical interpretations, CRM-driven research and landscape observations applied through public interpretation concepts provide sufficient methods for developing content for public interpretation materials. When it comes to generating such public outreach efforts within the cultural resources management field, entrepreneurial inventiveness is at the core of what will make future public interpretation products possible.

CONCLUSIONS: Sonoma County Regional Park managers should adopt an interpretative program based on the recognition that public participation and outreach are recommended actions through the legal mandates. An interpretative program can be guided by interpretation concepts as they have been integrated into the National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation. The management of public lands and public interpretation drives many research projects in historical archaeology. Still, it’s crucial for interpreters to make a connection between archeological resources and property types. Domestic sites such as Hendrickson Homestead benefit from evaluating the inside of their
social and economic contexts to make connections within local and regional settlement systems. A combined approach of integrating archaeology, history and ethnography as an interpretive tool provides a full understanding of the site not as an isolate, but as elements of larger communities.
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The idea to research and develop public interpretation materials about Hendrickson Homestead in Hood Mountain Regional Park was born in 2004. Adrian Praetzellis, director of the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University, received an e-mail from Steve Ehret, Sonoma County Regional Parks (SCRP) Park Planner, who proposed that the site's history be researched and expanded into some form of outreach by an interested student, perhaps as an internship or master's thesis.

The project seemed appropriate for me to do as a master's thesis since my focus of study throughout my term as a cultural resources management (CRM) graduate student was public interpretation and the practice of CRM work. After numerous phone calls, meetings and e-mails with Ehret and Praetzellis, the project was mapped out and my research on the historic site and surrounding area began.
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Adrian Praetzellis was also extremely helpful throughout my course of study and in the execution of this thesis. I would like to thank him for his patience and experience, and for directing me to the right sources and for taking the time to carefully explain the laws and regulations concerning public outreach and participation on CRM projects.
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Since 2000, a year has yet to go by without the U.S. House of Representatives passing a bill to enhance the preservation and interpretation of an American historic site. Bills are passed on historic sites as diverse as the:

- Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park in Hawaii: In 2003, the House passed a bill to modify the boundaries of Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park to authorize the addition of 2.14 acres of land adjacent to the park containing a facility that could be used for administrative, interpretive, resource management, and maintenance functions (Heritage News, National Park Service 2003).

- Manhattan Project: In 2004, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Subcommittee on National Parks, held a hearing on bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the preservation and interpretation of the historic sites of the Manhattan Project for potential inclusion in the National Park System. This bill would authorize a study of sites important to the development of the atomic bomb during World War II, including Los Alamos, New Mexico, Oak Ridge,

- Gullah/Geechee on the coastal islands off South Carolina and Georgia: In 2005, a bill was passed to enhance the preservation and interpretation of the Gullah/Geechee cultural heritage and establish a Gullah/Geechee Heritage Corridor, a commission that would assist with the development and implementation of the heritage corridor, and authorize the commission to establish one or more Coastal Heritage Centers within the corridor (Heritage News, National Park Service 2005).

On a national level these bills reflect the growing acceptance, specifically within the National Park Service (NPS), for generating outreach programs for archaeological, historical and architectural projects. Since 1990, the programs and activities of the Public Interpretation Initiative represent an attempt by the NPS to bring the subjects of archeology and cultural history into focus for the public eye. The program’s activities have included the organization and coordination of national and international forums. Through a variety of workshops, training courses, and academic symposia, several Initiative sub-themes, international in scope, have emerged and are continuing to be developed.
The acknowledgement that the public interpretation of cultural resources is a vital component in the management of historic sites on public lands has its place on a state level as well. Here in California, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has stewardship and management responsibilities at hundreds of state parks to preserve and protect cultural resources within a park's boundaries. A big part of DPR's efforts includes developing and maintaining public interpretative products for park visitors. DPR's mission statement reflects the agency's commitment to public outreach:

Provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation. ... Education is essential to the preservation of the State Park System. Through interpretive and educational programs, the public gains appreciation and insight into California's natural and cultural riches. Through leadership and example, the Department will mentor practices to sustain these riches into the future. (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2001:17-18).

Locally, county park systems are also doing what they can with limited resources to interpret a park's cultural resources. For example, Sonoma County Regional Parks (SCRP), which manages more than 50 park facilities including community and neighborhood parks, active regional recreation areas, passive regional open space parks, trails, and other
publicly accessible lands owned and operated by federal, State, county, city, park districts and other local agencies, has developed and maintained interpretative products and programs for various parks within the county. All programs are aimed at providing quality recreational experiences for park visitors. These products include wayside panels, walking tours, brochures, field trips, and exhibits. While Regional Parks has no stated objective for an interpretative program, the organization takes inspiration for such endeavors from their mission statement, which is posted on the agency’s web site:

To enhance the quality of life in Sonoma County by providing recreational, social and cultural opportunities for the public; and leading in the preservation, conservation, restoration and promotion of the natural, scenic, and historical resources in Sonoma County. (Sonoma County Regional Parks 2005:www.sonomacounty.org/parks/mission.htm).

Issues concerning recreational use, preservation and interpretation are heated topics for groups with conflicting expectations of how best to manage public lands — wilderness, forestry areas, range lands, national and state parks, and urban historic sites — owned by either the Federal, state or county governments. Reconciling the tensions produced by these conflicting visions of public land use and interpretation can be a fine line to walk for land managers who are, in most cases, not legally obligated to
do anything regarding interpretation but are compelled to do so because of a professional code of ethics or values cited in a mission statement. Or, in the case of the NPS, the mandate for interpretation comes from Federal code. Public land managers are acknowledging and implementing the spirit of legal mandates that ensure that archaeological data are provided to the public and, in many instances, they are doing so on a grassroots level. They recognize that the more the public understands the history of the land, the more the public is interested in preserving both the land and its cultural history.

The public’s desire to know what is going on in their community and public land managers’ responsibility to build public support for a particular project and to inform the community of their cultural heritage are what has fueled the ever-increasing awareness of the benefits of public interpretive work. Through my research, I observed that public land managers, in general, are launching more interpretation projects and see the significance of public outreach beyond their cultural resources survey reports and other scholarly technical reports for the academic arena. They see that when research is not adequately made significant to the non-specialist, it is ultimately an empty endeavor.
Since budget constraints have precluded preparation of a comprehensive strategy for a public interpretation plan for cultural resources within SCRP, this thesis is an attempt to fill this void by (1) researching an historic site, Hendrickson Homestead, which is located in Hood Mountain Regional Park, Sonoma County, (2) creating an interpretive product of that site for Park visitors, and (3) developing an overall public interpretation and cultural resource protection management plan for SCRP.

Since 1965, Hood Mountain Regional Park has been developed as a state park and now consists of 1,400 acres of publicly accessible wilderness. The park is widely appreciated for its recreational values and is popular with the people of the Santa Rosa area and the wider North Bay for activities such as backpacking, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, and mountain biking.

In 2003, SCRP acquired about 335 acres of uplands in east-central Sonoma County, which adjoins Hood Mountain Regional Park and has been added to the park. Plans to develop portions of the new parklands include constructing roads and trails, parking areas, day-use facilities and possibly campsites (Figure 1).
Figure 1
Development of Parklands: Sonoma County Regional Parks' proposed plan for park improvements to 300 acres adjoining Hood Mountain Regional Park.

Adding an additional 335 acres to a park that currently experiences intensive recreational use, Regional Parks has made an effort to protect its natural and cultural resources. Part of that effort includes a cultural resources survey by Tom Origer & Associates of Rohnert Park, California, identifying cultural resources within the property that might be disturbed by development. That report recorded one prehistoric archaeological site
and four isolated obsidian specimens. Four historic-period archaeological sites were documented during the survey as well.

Cultural resources surveys are performed within the framework of the cultural resources management (CRM) industry to identify sites that may be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, to test those sites for evaluation and, in some cases, to excavate them before they're destroyed by a project. CRM is applied archaeology, history and architectural history performed under environmental and historic preservation laws and regulations such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, guidelines of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and a variety of other statutes such as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). CRM is what practitioners (mostly archaeologists, but also historians, anthropologists and landscape architects) do to manage things of cultural value and of the impacts that these resources experience as the result of growth and change. Resources of concern include, but are not limited to fossils, prehistoric and historic artifacts, burials, sites of religious or cultural significance to Native American groups, and historic buildings and structures.
Thomas F. King, an anthropologist recognized as an expert on cultural and historic preservation laws and practice, best defines CRM in his book of essays “Thinking about Cultural Resources Management:”

It means applied archeological research, under a bunch of obscure federal laws. CRM embraces not only aspects of archaeology and such allied disciplines as geomorphology, but also the applied practice of historical research, architectural history and historical architecture, sometimes landscape architecture, sometimes of a bit of urban planning. Sometimes CRM is understood to require a bit of ethnography and occasionally it may embrace a bit of folklife documentation. CRM is centrally about living people and their communities and the values they ascribe to aspects of the physical environment. (King 2002:5-6, 15).

Within the legal constituents of CRM, agencies such as SCRP budget and hire to meet their mission needs, comply with legal requirements and respond to what the agency understands to be the public interest. With this in mind, Tom Origer & Associates submitted their survey to SCRP and recommended protecting all important resources from park development and impacts (Beard 2004). Steve Ehret, Park Planner for SCRP, requested additional historical research on one of the historic-period archaeological sites. A cabin complex, this site has come to be known as Hendrickson Homestead. Located in the northeast part of the study area, Hendrickson Homestead consists of several standing and collapsed buildings, rock walls and fences.
As a means to protect and interpret this historic-period resource, this thesis was undertaken to research Hendrickson Homestead and develop an interpretive product for park visitors. Additionally, this thesis recommends a public interpretation plan for SCRP. This plan draws upon public interpretation concepts from the National Park Service and experts in the cultural resources management field and integrates and implements Sonoma County Regional Park's diverse mandates for preservation, conservation, restoration and promotion, as implied in the agency's mission statement and other policy manuals and outdoor recreation plans. This thesis applies cultural resources management research with public interpretation concepts to consider their potential application to the management of a particular domestic historic site, the Hendrickson Homestead.

PROJECT METHODS AND ORGANIZATION

METHODS

At the core of this project is the examination of the field of interpretation. Using the principles developed by the NPS as well as concepts developed by experts in the cultural resources management field such as Freeman Tilden, Paul H. Risk and John Jameson, this thesis
examines the important role that public interpretation plays in the cultural resources management industry, how public interpretation is incorporated into the cultural resource management process, and how CRM-driven research can be used to create public interpretation materials. Interviews with CRM educators and practitioners reveal that entrepreneurial inventiveness is at the core of what makes public interpretation products possible. This study also looks at the development and growth of the interpretive field and outlines the legislation that mandates or recommends public interpretation on cultural resource management work.

Using a historic site located in Hood Mountain Regional Park as a case study, this thesis also applies public interpretation concepts and CRM-driven research (historical documentation, landscape observation and archaeological data) to create a public interpretation product. The National Register of Historic Places provides the model with its tripartite structure of place, period, and theme. Data from existing CRM reports and surveys of the study area as well as Sanborn Company maps, “breadboard” maps and block books (map locations key to deeds), assessment records, aerial photos, dates of development, historical map research, site observation, census data, directories, historical photographs of the area, assessor’s parcel maps, historic real estate
documents, genealogy research, newspaper indexes, interviews with former land owners, and city and county histories books were all used to provide a detailed overview of the historical development of Hendrickson Homestead and the surrounding area.

Sources of the historical research conducted on the historic site include:

- maps, records, survey reports, nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, and other materials on file at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, which is housed at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park;

- historical maps, from hand-drawn maps of the 1800s and survey plats from the General Land Office to topographic maps issued by the United States Geological Survey (USGS);

- U.S. Census Bureau population schedules for Sonoma County for 1850, 1860, 1870 and 1880 and archives from the Gaye LeBaron Collection housed at the Charles and Jean Schulz Library, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park. Other references held by the Sonoma County Library Local History and Genealogy Annex that were reviewed include the U.S. Census Bureau records for Sonoma County, historic Sonoma County maps, Santa Rosa City and Sonoma County directories of 1908 and 1991,
Santa Rosa Cemetery records and issues of the *Sonoma Democrat* and *Santa Rosa Press Democrat*;

- homestead proof and patent certificates from the General Land Entry Files from the National Archives, Washington D.C., and the 1888 Field Notes of Township 7 North, Range 6 West by Preston R. Davis from the United States General Land Office;

- "breadboard" maps & block books and Deed book records from the archives of the Sonoma County Recorder’s Office;

- a review of field division reports from the State Mineralogist of the California Mining Bureau on quicksilver mines in Sonoma County housed at California Division of Mines and Geology Library in Sacramento;

- historic photographs held by and oral interviews with Willard Johnson, former landowner of the historic site, Hendrickson Homestead;

- the extensive research done on the railroad, fruit farms and quarries in the Los Guilicos Valley done by John Futini (1976), John Charles Whatford (1993) and Annita Waghorn (2002); and

- fieldwork to observe the landscape and survey areas around the historic site where park improvements are planned.

Lastly, this thesis employs general concepts and principles of public interpretation from the NPS; histories and policy documents concerning
the legislative basis of cultural resources management and the public interpretation of cultural resources; and SCRP's existing management framework to recommend a public interpretation strategy for SCRP. Secondary sources, including David Blackburn (2004) and Charles Whatford (1993), were invaluable in developing a public interpretation plan for SCRP.

ORGANIZATION

The research results presented in this thesis are arranged into four separate discussions:

Chapter 2 examines the role of public interpretation in the cultural resources management industry and the theory and practice of historical interpretation. It defines what public interpretation is and identifies the laws, regulations, guidelines and policies that mandate or recommend public interpretation on cultural resources management work. This section also outlines how public interpretation results from CRM-driven work to illustrate how practitioners, working for a state agency, NPS, or private firm, are incorporating interpretation into the CRM process to build public support and retain cultural heritage. An example of a successfully implemented public interpretation program is the Cypress Replacement
Project in Oakland, California, where the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in partnership with the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) of Sonoma State University, produced historical studies in connection with archaeological data recovery. This provided an excellent source of material for a range of public outreach efforts that informed a specific community about the results of those studies (Appendix A).

Chapter 2 also provides interviews from CRM educators and practitioners to identify the issues facing the CRM industry today when it comes to developing public interpretation programs. Lastly, this chapter argues that public interpretation is an integral part of the CRM process and looks at what the future holds for public interpretation within the CRM industry.

Chapter 3 creates a historical context for the Hendrickson Homestead in Hood Mountain Regional Park and demonstrates how historical research and CRM-driven research can be used to create public interpretation materials. This section provides a historic context to the area by identifying patterns, themes, or trends in the area at the period of time that the site was first developed. Topics researched include architectural background on building types and their significance, planning and development data (land ownership and platting information, development patterns and information on the extension of utilities,
primarily water), natural design context (historic land division patterns, presences of landscaping and agriculture, topography), socio-economic data (census data, directories) and development of nearby institutions and/or businesses and how they influenced the surrounding area.

Using the Hendrickson Homestead as an example, Chapter 4 demonstrates how a public interpretation project stemmed from cultural resources survey for a county park. The historic context and identified patterns, themes, or trends outlined in Chapter 3 are put into context when presented in a concise and meaningful interpretative product. The interpretative materials feature a brochure and text for an interpretative panel for SCRP on the historic one-acre cabin complex site known as Hendrickson Homestead. Plans include an interpretative trail that will loop around the historic cabin site. The intent is to exhibit an interpretative panel at the head of the trail as well as a brochure with a numbered site map about the site and its archeological features that will be available to the public at the parking area and visitor’s center.

Chapter 5 presents both general and site-specific recommendations for public interpretation and cultural resource protection for SCRP. The idea is to develop a cost-effective strategy for SCRP to incorporate concepts and methods of public interpretation into their already existing
management plan to better protect and preserve cultural resources within Sonoma County parks.

PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

In 2003, SCRP acquired about 335 acres of uplands in east-central Sonoma County on the west flank of Hood Mountain about eight miles east of downtown Santa Rosa near the community of Oakmont (Figure 2). This land adjoins Hood Mountain Regional Park and has been added to the park. It is located both within the unsectioned Los Guilicos land grant and within Township 7 North, Range 6 West, as depicted on the USGS Santa Rosa (1994) and Kenwood (1954, photo revised 1980), California, 7.5' series topographic quadrangles. Hendrickson Homestead, located on the new Hood Mountain Park property, is accessible by Pythian Road off State Highway 12 near Kenwood two miles north of Oakmont. Hendrickson Homestead is adjacent to the southwest edge of Hood Mountain Regional Park and overlooks Los Guilicos Valley, which was formed by stream
Figure 2
Hood Mountain Regional Park: The newly acquired parklands include an historic site known as Hendrickson Homestead. Kenwood map, 1954.

erosion over millions of years that cut a groove in the mountainous area running approximately east-west for some eight miles. This fluvial erosion formed two mountain ranges: the Sonoma Mountain on the west and the Mayacamas Mountain on the east side. Hendrickson Homestead is on the Mayacamas Mountain range, specifically located in the south quarter of
Section 7 and a large portion of Section 18 of Township 7 North, Range 6 West of the Mount Diablo Base and Meridian.

The terrain is primarily steeply and moderately sloped with interspersed areas of gentle terrain. Elevation of the site ranges from approximately 1,000 to 2,560 feet above mean sea level. The top of Hood Mountain, rising to 2,227 feet high, provides broad views across the Valley of the Moon and the Santa Rosa Plain. The Golden Gate Bridge can be seen on a clear day.

The area has dry, warm summers moderated by coastal fog and cool moist winters. The rainy season, extending from approximately September until May, delivers between 35 and 40 inches of rain. Average temperatures range from 7 degrees Celsius (46 degrees Fahrenheit) in January to 19 degrees Celsius (67 degrees Fahrenheit) in September (Amme 1987).

Soils of the study area are those of the Boomer and Henneke series, with about 30 acres surrounding the site classified as rock land (Miller 1972:Sheets 76, 83). Boomer soils are well-drained loam with clay subsoils. Douglas fir and redwood trees are the primary vegetation growing on these soils with some oak and madrone trees and poison oak (Miller 1972:20-21). Henneke series soils are extremely well drained
loams, underlain by serpentine bedrock. Vegetation supported by Henneke soils includes cypress, juniper, ceanothus, scrub oak, poison oak and manzanita, with some grass and forbs (Miller 1972:44). Rock land is stony and steep with little soil accumulation. Small shrubs and a few stunted trees are found growing in these inhospitable areas (Miller 1972:73).

Specifically, Hendrickson Homestead is in a portion of a band of conifers surrounded by chaparral on three sides and farmland to the south (Lindsay 1999). It is located in a basin where water appears to be plentiful throughout the year. The homestead is surrounded by several meadows, which are covered with short grass.

The new parklands contain many microenvironments with a variety of vegetation zones. Several unnamed, seasonal streams flow through the study area, some of which are spring-fed. The combination of readily available water, diverse plant communities, and the animal life drawn to those communities would have created a favorable environment for prehistoric hunter-gathers and decent conditions for historic pioneers staking their claim to a piece of land.
CULTURAL RESOURCES AND STUDIES

In the 1930s, Jesse Peter, a local naturalist and avocational archaeologist, conducted the earliest known identification of archaeological sites within the new park area. He plotted the locations of seven archaeological sites on USGS topographical maps (USGS 1944). Archival research indicates that four prehistoric archaeological sites are within, and three immediately adjacent to, the new parklands of Hood Mountain Regional Park. However, there is no original documentation on file for these sites at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Rohnert Park, Sonoma County, and their locations have not been confirmed.

Four such sites were plotted in the 1930s within or near the new parkland (CA-SON-67, CA-SON-68, CA-SON-69, and CA-SON-72). These sites were later visited in 1999 by Jeffrey Lindsay, a Registered Professional Forester who, at the request of former landowner Willard Johnson, conducted a Timber Harvest Plan (THP 1-99-174 SON) to remove dead, dying and declining trees on what is now the new parkland of Hood Mountain Regional Park.

Lindsay re-recorded three of the four plotted sites recorded by Peter in the 1930s. One of those sites (CA-SON-67) was apparently
outside the survey area for the Timber Harvest Plan and was therefore not surveyed. Of the other three identified sites, Lindsay reported the following:

CA-SON-68: A sparse scatter of Napa Glass Obsidian was found near the identified historic-period site. The scatter is approximately 65 feet in diameter without any distinct boundary.

CA-SON-69: This site was located in a significantly disturbed area. The area was excavated during construction of a dam for a pond. No trace of the archeological site was located it is assumed that the site has been destroyed.

CA-SON-72: A scatter of cultural obsidian flakes, indicating occasional use as a possible travel corridor or hunting area, was discovered below the historic-period site.

One historic-period site referred to as an "old homestead" was also identified and recorded by Lindsay. Resource attributes of the homestead site consisted of a main cabin, barn, three bunkhouses and a bathhouse. The homestead site also featured rock retaining walls, a rock lined root cellar and brick chimney.
Most of the buildings have since collapsed and in the case of the barn, only remnants of a foundation remain. Lindsay determined that the structures were built in the early 1870s (Lindsay 1999).

This site had previously been noted in a tentative map drafted of the area in a National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the William Hood House by Michael Buhler, a consultant for the Sonoma County Architect's Office (Buhler 1997). Other than this reference in a map, the homestead site was not included in the nomination.

In 1998 a cultural resources study of the 1,400-acre Hood Mountain Regional Park was conducted at the request of Steve Ehret, SCRP Park Planner, as part of a vegetation management plan. The study and field inspection was conducted by Tom Origer & Associates and resulted in the documentation of two prehistoric sites, two historic-period sides and 21 isolated artifacts. The reported locations of four previously identified sites were revisited and prehistoric cultural materials were found at two of the four locations (Beard 1998). Although the survey area does not include the newly acquired parkland, the findings provide context to the history of the greater area and confirm prehistoric and historic land-use within the bounds of Hood Mountain Regional Park and beyond.
In 2003 Tom Origer & Associates conducted another cultural resources survey for SCRP but this time of the newly acquired land adjoining Hood Mountain Regional Park. The study was undertaken to identify cultural resources within the 335-acre property, especially those that might be disturbed by park development.

One prehistoric archaeological site and four isolated obsidian specimens were found and documented during the survey (Beard 2004). These findings included obsidian tool-making debris and a possible tool located on a flat in the northern part of the study area (Willard's Site); an isolated flake of Napa Valley obsidian found in a road cut on a moderately steep slope on the west flank of Hood Mountain (Isolate A); a tool crafted from a piece of Annadel obsidian found at a log landing on a moderately steep slope (Isolate B); the tip of a projectile point made from Napa Valley obsidian found in an area that was previously disturbed by road and reservoirs construction, and by use as a log landing on a moderately steep slope (Isolate C); and a large flake of Napa Valley obsidian found in a gently sloping, creek side meadow (Isolate D).

Additionally, four historic-period archeological sites were documented during the survey. Three are in the northern part of the study area and one is at the south end. These historic sites include a
scatter of early to mid 20th-century domestic debris such as cast iron stove parts, oblong-shaped metal tubs, bottle glass fragments and a length of a chain was noted growing into the trunk of a tree (Calla Lily Site); the homestead site, originally recorded by Lindsay for the Timber Harvest Plan (Cabin Complex); bottle, ceramic sherds, metal cans, and other domestic artifacts in the bank and bed on a seasonal creek (Creek Scatter); and a second concentration of historic-period domestic debris at that south end of the homestead site which included zinc jar lids with glass liners, enameled pans and pails, a saw blade, wagon axle, and bottle glass fragments (Evergreen Scatter).
CHAPTER 2

THE PUBLIC INTERPRETATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

Interpretation is a form of education that encourages the public to appreciate cultural resources and commit to preserving them for future generations. Although there are laws, regulations, guidelines and policies that mandate or recommend public interpretation on CRM work, interpretive projects rarely transpire as technical reports, funding and construction take precedence. Still, by marketing innovative ideas and consulting with agencies and communities, CRM practitioners are improving the quantity and quality of interpretation programs. Public interpretation is a growing area within the CRM industry and practitioners, working for a state agency, private firm or university, want public outreach to become an integral part of the CRM process.

Since little has been written about the many innovative cultural resources management interpretive programs generated out of CRM-driven research, this chapter is an attempt to fill that void by providing interviews with CRM educators and practitioners to highlight the issues facing the CRM industry today when it comes to developing public interpretation programs. Public interpretation products resulting from
CRM-driven research illustrate how practitioners are using the spirit of the legal mandates, outlined in this chapter, by incorporating interpretation into the CRM process to build public support and retain cultural heritage. Interviews with CRM educators and practitioners reveal that entrepreneurial inventiveness is at the core of what will make future public interpretation products possible.

This chapter will also briefly outline the context for public interpretation within the NPS's National Register of Historic Places framework, the concept of public interpretation, and its incorporation into the laws, regulations, guidelines and policies that mandate or recommend public interpretation on cultural resources management work.

A PUBLIC INTERPRETATION FRAMEWORK

DEFINING PUBLIC INTERPRETATION

Films, exhibits, walking tours, brochures, maps, campfire programs, and wayside panels are just a sampling of all the forms of media and interaction designed to nurture a meaningful connection between the public and a cultural resource. These public interpretive materials are all used as "an attempt to create understanding" (Alderson 1976:3). The interpretive process provides individuals with basic information on a
cultural resource, offering them the opportunity to experience the
resource in a way that is meaningful to them. Ultimately, the
interpretation of a cultural resource includes general themes that relate
to the broad patterns of history, allowing the individual to place the
cultural resource in a greater context and come to his or her own
conclusions about that resource.

Looking for a definition of interpretation presents many variations
of its meaning. "The American Heritage Dictionary" defines "interpret" as
"To explain the meaning of. To conceive the significance of; construe; To
present or conceptualize the meaning of by means of art or criticism. To
When it comes to defining interpretation within the CRM industry, CRM
practitioners and educators hold varying definitions of the term as well.
Yet all the different definitions seem to center on shared concepts of
meaning and relationships.

The NPS's definition of interpretation found in the agency's policy
document on interpretation states that the visitor will be instilled with
three things: "understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of the
significance of parks and their resources" (United States Department of
the Interior, National Park Service 1996:7). Interpretation in the National
Park Service is based on three tenets, or general principals, that together constitute another definition: “Historic resources possess meanings and have significance; the visitor is seeking something of value for themselves; and interpretation facilitates a connection between the interests of the visitor and the meanings of the resource.” NPS policy also addresses that interpretive programming “will encourage the development of a personal stewardship ethic, and broaden public support for preserving park resources” (USDOI, NPS 1996:7).

Another historical perspective of interpretation within the National Park Service includes the following:

Although the National Park Service did not invent interpretation, that organization was largely responsible for the broad public recognition of its values in developing understanding and appreciation of nature and history. The National Park Service effectively modified formal educational processes to arouse the latent interest and desires of park visitors, and, as a result of ever-increasing numbers of such visitors over the years, interpretation has become practically a household world. (Mackintosh NPS 1978).

Long before the National Park Service employed standards of public interpretation, an emerging group of writers — Thoreau, Emerson, and Muir — penned their personal interpretations of the flora and fauna around them (Blackburn 2004). In the early 20th century, Enos Mills initiated some of the first public interpretation work of natural resources. An interpretive pioneer, Mills established the first cadre of natures guides
to lead walks throughout Colorado's Rocky Mountain National Park in 1915 (Mackintosh 1984:1). Mills' philosophy was "to give information that would stir the imagination, rather than...fill them with dry facts" (McCarthy 1998:35).

Author, playwright and creative thinker Freeman Tilden, who wrote one of the first books about interpretation, "Interpreting Our Heritage" in 1957 for the National Park Service, defines interpretation as "an educational activity, which aims to reveal meanings and relationship through the use of original objects, by firsthand experiences, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information." Tilden's work is considered a classic in the genre of interpretive writing and as of 2005, is still utilized by the NPS. Tilden's six tenets of interpretation include:

I. Any interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personally or experience of the visitor will be sterile.

II. Information, as such, is not Interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based on information. But they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.
III. Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether
the materials presented are scientific, historical, or
architectural. Any are is to some degree teachable.

IV. The chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction, but
provocation.

V. Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a
part, and must address itself to the whole man rather than
any phase.

VI. Interpretation addressed to children (say, up to the age of
twelve) should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults,
but should follow a fundamentally different approach. To be
at its best it will require a separate program. (Tilden 1967:9).

A more updated definition of interpretation is: “The translation of
the technical or unfamiliar language of the environment into lay language,
with no loss in accuracy, in order to create and enhance sensitivity,
awareness, understanding, appreciation and commitment” (Risk 1994).
The final five words — sensitivity, awareness, understanding, appreciation
and commitment — comprise the “Sensitivity Continuum,” a sequence,
wrote Risk, through which a visitor passes if interpretation is successful.
Other recent definitions of interpretation by historic and cultural resource specialists include defining interpretation as the communication of the "essential meaning of the site and of the people and events associated with it" and see it as an obligation on those who preserve historic places as trustees for present and future generations (Alderson and Lowe 1976).

Russell K. Grater in "Interpreter's Handbook" defines interpretation by comparing "interpretation" to "information."

Interpretation differs from information in many basic respects. Interpretation, by contrast with information, conveys the meaning of something, through expositions or explanation. Information is the knowledge derived from study, experience, or instruction. It is information that is so often given to a visitor; it is interpretation that should have been accomplished. Good interpretation uses all sorts of information such as facts, figures, etc., but in a way that the listener can understand and appreciate. If we put into simple words the end results we hope to accomplish through interpretation, they would be: understand, stimulate and appreciate. (Grater 1976).

Archaeologist and a recognized leader in the emerging field of archaeology and public interpretation, John H. Jameson, who also founded the Public Interpretation Initiative — a public outreach program introduced and coordinated by the Southeast Archaeological Center, NPS, U.S. Department of the Interior, defines interpretation as:

A broad scope of endeavors ranging from formal education and curriculum development to less structured programs such as site
tours and museum displays. The term also encompasses singular communicative devices such as the publication of popular histories, public awareness posters and brochures, and development of multimedia presentations including the fast emerging Internet sources and web sites of modern cyberspace. It embraces outreach programs and other systematic attempts to provide educational and awareness services beyond conventional boundaries. Public interpretation involves the development of communications strategies between the technical scientist-archeologist and nonspecialists such as park interpreters, whose job is to deliver the "message" of archaeology to a variety of public audiences. The specialist and professionals who carry out these programs include archaeologists, historians, on-site interpreters, teachers, writers, artists, curators, exhibit designers, and other cultural resource specialists. (Jameson 2001:12).

The NPS "Interpretation and Education Reference Manual 6," which is intended to help staff develop effective programs to convey the meaning of historic places to the public, assumes that "interpretation is a form of education that seeks to make connections between historic places and history, between the lives we lead today and the lives that once filled these spaces." The ultimate goal is to "encourage an appreciation of the importance of historic places and a commitment to preserving them for future generations" (NPS 2001:1-15).

Personal communication with archaeologists doing CRM work in California reveals additional definitions of interpretation. Adrian Praetzelis, director of the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) and archaeology professor at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park,
California, says that public interpretation is about “making neat stuff accessible to ordinary people. It creates goodwill among the local population. It also creates ongoing outreach efforts, from museum displays and videos to web sites and booklets” (Praetzellis 2002).

Janet Pape, archaeology manager for the toll bridge program at California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in San Francisco, says that interpretation is “the art of really listening to the public and community and trying to interact with them to find out what it is that they want to see or know about the area or project that archaeologists are working (Pape 2002).

Dana McGowen, principal at Jones & Stokes, an environmental, land, water and ecology consulting firm based in Sacramento that does public outreach programs for their clients, interprets the concept broadly “to incorporate all results, products and outcomes that benefit the public and/or inform them on the topic of their cultural heritage” (McGowen 2002).

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC INTERPRETATION

Engaging the public with interpretive programming results in an educated public, nurturing constituents that can vote for legislation to
protect the nation's rich archeological and historical legacy. This is one reason why CRM practitioners want to accomplish public interpretation.

There are many other reasons why CRM practitioners may launch a public interpretation plan for a project. First, there are a number of laws that mandate public interpretation on CRM projects, but it's not just the laws that enforce or recommend interpretation (Praetzellis 2002). CRM practitioners have to consider how those laws are translated into regulations, and how those regulations are translated into policies and then guidelines, which are developed by individual agencies and offices to carry out the intent of Congress. All those factors affect how an agency sees its responsibility for interpretation.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 are examples of laws that mandate or recommend public interpretation on cultural resources management projects. The point of these laws is not to stop projects. They are to ensure that agencies fully consider historic preservation issues and the views of the public during project planning (Jameson 1997:13).

When the public understands the value of cultural resources, they are perhaps more likely to support the protection of them. As expressed
in the NHPA, cultural resources should be valued because "the spirit and direction of the nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage"; because this heritage should be "preserved as a living part of our community life in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people"; and because federal agencies are required to take the lead in establishing programs for the protection of signification historic resources "for the inspiration and benefit of the people" (Jameson 1997:12).

Therefore it behooves archeologists to engage the general public in a dialogue regarding why we should care about and preserve the past. The public needs to know why it's important to support the laws that are at the crux of cultural resources management (Pape 2002).

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 provided the first legislation for the interpretation of cultural resources under the care of the NPS. The law directed the Secretary of the Interior, through the Service, to "establish and maintain museums" in connection with historic properties, to "erect and maintain tablets to mark or commemorate historic or prehistoric places and events of national historical or archaeological significance," and to "develop an educational program and service for the purpose of making available to the public facts and information pertaining to
American historic and archeological sites, buildings, and properties of national significance" (Pitcaithely 2002:4).

Later, the passage of the NHPA of 1966 was the significant legislation that began a surge of federally mandated archaeological and historical studies in the United States (Jameson 1997:13). Soon after, a bevy of other protection laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the Archaeological Resources Protections Act of 1979, passed. In California, the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) serves as the backbone of environmental law and policy and was modeled after NEPA. Public participation is an essential part of the process in both NEPA and CEQA regulations. For example, the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act states:

Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency. (Title 14 California Code of Regulations 2004:Chapter 3).

Developing an innovative strategy for effective public participation also includes creating various forms of interpretive programming and media. Newsletters, oral history interviews and the creation of specialized
materials like exhibits and brochures reflect the concerns and sensitivities of particular resources and address many styles of learning.

Since the passage of these laws, regulations, and standards, hundreds of thousands of professional reports have recorded millions of archaeological and historical sites containing hundreds of millions of cultural objects (Jameson 1997:13). But what has the public, who has footed most of the bill in terms of tax dollars, gained and learned? Have practitioners lost sight of the ultimate purpose of the compliance process, which is to provide public enjoyment and appreciation for the nation’s cultural heritage?

The answers to these questions are subtly addressed in the National Historic Preservation Act. Congress established a comprehensive program to preserve the historical and cultural foundations of the nation as a living part of community life. Section 106 of NHPA is crucial to that program, because it requires consideration of historic preservation in the multitude of federal actions that take place nationwide.

The requirement of the law from which the regulations spring — Section 106 of the NHPA — states that federal agencies will “take into account” the effects of its undertakings on properties that are eligible for the National Register (King 2002:38). These three words, “take into
account," spawned extensive regulations that determine how agencies will take into account the resources under their care. From those three words came the development of federal regulation as promulgated by the federal government to interpret what that phrase, "take into account" means. Each governmental agency has to decide how they implement Section 106. Agency specific policies place the responsibility to execute Section 106 regulations on the federal agency official.

Section 110, another section of NHPA, covers a federal agency's responsibility for protecting and enhancing the interpretations of cultural resources. Section 110 establishes a broad range of more or less unfettered federal agency responsibilities in regards to historic preservation (King 2002:182).

It's the very spirit of these NHPA legal mandates that require CRM practitioners "to ensure that archaeological and historical information is provided to the public in an informative manner. It's also necessary to foster a dialogue with the public that distinguishes between the goals and objectives of public interpretation and those of pure research" (Jameson 1997:13).

Additionally, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act requires each federal land manager to "establish a program to increase public
awareness of the significance of the archaeological resource located on public lands and Indian lands and the need to protect such resources” (NPS Laws, Regulations & Standards 2002:www.cr.nps.gov/linklaws.htm).

Interpretive and educational programs are a primary means by which the National Park Service provides the public with opportunities for learning more about cultural resources, as required by the 1916 National Park Service Organic Act (Park Operations and Education 2002:1-15).

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation states that the results of findings should be made available to the public (NPS Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines 1983:www.crp.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_0.htm). Even though the guidelines suggest disseminating the information to the public, that doesn’t mean that it is a priority. In many cases those responsible for carrying out a study are mostly concerned with the results of technical studies or of the archaeological inventories for these technical reports that will allow agencies to proceed to do what they want to do. One of the reasons why these studies get done is because the NHPA mandates it. There are lesser implications for them to not do interpretation. Public interpretation is pushed off onto the back burner and not done at all.
However, the intention of the law is to promote the use of heritage resources (such as archaeological sites) for long-term public benefit, a notion that has begun to assume more importance in the practice of cultural resources management (Jameson 1997; Little 2002).

Yet many CRM practitioners believe that public interpretation is part of their responsibility and the ultimate purpose of the compliance process. Many also consider that it’s an archaeologist’s ethical obligation to ensure that public interpretation of newly generated archaeological information is carried out and that archaeologists should engage the general public in dialogues about why we should care about and preserve the past (Jameson 1997:11-14). According to the Society for American Archaeology’s (SAA) Principles of Archaeological Ethics, public education and outreach are part of an archaeologist’s job when negotiating the complex responsibilities he or she has to archaeological resources. One of the eight principles states, “Archaeologists should reach out to and participate in cooperative efforts with others interested in the archeological record with the aim of improving the preservation, protection and interpretation of the record” (Society for American Archaeology 2005:www.saa.org/aboutsaa/committee/ethics).
Part of that undertaking includes enlisting public support for the stewardship of resources, explaining and promoting the use of archaeological methods and techniques, and communicating archaeological interpretations of the past. This is essential to developing a supportive constituency. If the public doesn’t see the value of a CRM project, then it is unlikely they will support the regulations, laws, guidelines, and policies that support CRM.

The legislation and pressure from federal agencies to do interpretation work also make public outreach a CRM practitioner’s professional and ethical responsibility. Archaeologists are beginning to see the public value of their work and are more open to producing popular publication. They are taking the results of CRM projects and making them available to the broader public, that is the public outside of the professional audience and outside of the regulatory audience as well (Praetzellis 2002).

When scholars discuss the current approaches to archaeological interpretation, their primary intended audience is other archaeologists and social scientists (Jameson 1997:11-14). While their observations and conclusions are useful in debating the intellectual issues of cultural resource, rarely do they encompass the issues of effectively conveying
archaeological information to public audiences, nor do they include concerns about engaging, entertaining and informing in an ethically sensitive matter — issues that are among the central themes of public interpretation.

Giving the public access to archeologists' research also allows the public to participate in the critical evaluation of the interpretations that are presented to them and adds multiple voices and views to archeological interpretation (Risk 1994:37-40). While it’s the archaeologist’s responsibility to make information accessible to the public, it’s also in the public’s best interest to participate in decisions concerning CRM projects in their community.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent U.S. government agency that advises the president and Congress on historic preservation matters and oversees the Section 106 process, advises the public to learn more about the history of their neighborhood, city, or state, and to join a local or statewide preservation, historical or archeological organization (King 2002:179). If there is a clearinghouse that distributes information about local, state, tribal, and federal projects, the Council urges organizations to get on their mailing lists. The Council also suggests people become more involved in state and local decision-
making, and ask about the applicability of Section 106 to projects under state, tribal, or local review. Other suggestions include reviewing the local newspaper for notices about projects being reviewed under other federal statutes (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 2002).

When an agency provides the public with information, it is up to the community to let them know if they disagree with its findings regarding what properties are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or how a proposed project may affect them. The public's responsibility is to tell the agency — in writing — about any important properties, which they think have been overlooked or incorrectly evaluated.

Public interpretation is mandated or recommended in the law and the archeologist is responsible for delineating public interpretation, yet, in most cases, interpretive programs are rarely put into effect. Public outreach is seen as frill, and as a result, public interpretation falls by the wayside as construction, excavations, tight deadlines, politics and budget constraints take precedence (Ellick 1998:30-33). Indeed, public interpretation of cultural resources is not always the priority. Sometimes there is no way for a needed project to proceed without harming historic properties. Section 106 review does, however, ensure that preservation values are factored into federal agency planning and decisions. Because
of Section 106, federal agencies must assume responsibility for the consequences of their actions and be publicly accountable for their decisions. For example, the Section 106 regulations say that in order to take into account the effects of their action on historic properties, "an agency must consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer and other concerned parties to identify historic properties, determine what effect if any the agency's action may have on them and try to reach agreement on how to resolve effects that are adverse" (King 2002:38).

CURRENT ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Creative thinking, nurturing a fertile atmosphere for creativity, sufficient funding, and consultants who understand what is needed to interpret the subject matter to the public are key challenges facing the CRM industry today when it comes public interpretation (McGowen 2002).

Another part of the challenge is that practitioners have to be more aware of the law. Public interpretation mandates are vaguely referred to in the law. If the law had more teeth in it concerning public outreach than perhaps more people would do it (Pape 2002).
Additionally, if CRM practitioners are able to get the local community involved in a CRM project, then interpretation is more likely to occur. For example, if they’re being sandwiched between a federal mandate and an involved community on a grassroots level, then perhaps interpretation efforts are more likely to happen. The local community and general public are not the only stakeholders interested in the pursuits of a CRM project. Lawmakers and government officials, Native American and other ethnic, religious and cultural groups, academics, and reporters, journalists and other media are also part of the many publics that typically have an invested interest in a CRM project.

Other problems for many CRM practitioners include time constraints and support staff within the organizations that they work for. Someone needs to be willing to take the interpretation project on within the agency that’s facilitating and funding a CRM project. Most people like to see public interpretation, but the bottom line always seems to be lack of dollars, too. It’s difficult for some professionals to think about public outreach when they have never done it before. Archaeologists willing to take on interpretation projects have to instigate the idea and get it into the contract with their consultant. But sometimes they don’t always have
an opportunity to display an exhibit or share a project’s findings with the community (Pape 2002).

The issues and challenges of governmental agencies, such as the NPS, are a lot different than what the private sector and state agencies experience when it comes to generating public interpretation out of CRM-driven research. The NPS has the mission, mandate, venue, resources, and budget for public interpretation while CRM is creating its own mandate and struggles to find funding and venues for public interpretation, even when using guidance from the NPS’s products such as the National Bulletin.

Another challenge facing the NPS, as well as CRM practitioners working for a private firm or state agency, is trying to tell the whole story about the cultural resource without selectively editing material that is considered controversial or political such as issues of race and religion. Telling the whole story provides opportunities to reach out to new audiences that haven’t been targeted or reached in the past (Blackburn 2002).

When competing with pop culture and the pace of technology, CRM practitioners are faced with another set of challenges. CRM practitioners may ask themselves, How can we tell the story to the public that entices
them to learn more? How can we excite them enough to care and how can we do this when competing with pop culture icons and video games? How can interpreters tell the story in a way that is provocative and enticing to help the public learn even more?

In light of all the challenges, there is hope that there can only be a growing role for public interpretation within CRM for governmental agencies that have oversight over bodies of land. Public interpretation at all kinds of levels will increasingly be a part of practice within agencies like the NPS who have the mandate (Purser 2002). But if CRM practitioners don’t advocate the role of CRM and inform the public about their work and the laws that support the field then they might find themselves without the support to produce future public interpretation products (Pape 2002). For more outreach to happen, CRM practitioners will have to work harder to make public interpretation happen as interpretation is frequently the result of community-based, grassroots efforts to recognize and protect important cultural resources.

STRATEGIES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

Although there are many challenges facing cultural resource specialists when it comes to creating public interpretation materials on a
resource, they are still able to utilize key strategies for incorporating public interpretation into their work. With the cooperation of federal, state and local organizations, CRM practitioners are improving the quantity and quality of archeological site information available to the public. They are trying to generate interpretive products that present the project or its materials to the public. They are also using their positions as a working, academic or agency professionals to publicize the role of CRM (Purser 2002).

But to do public outreach, where does the onus fall? Technically, it should fall on the federal agency if you’re dealing with Section 106. In practice, interpretation and outreach are considered to be of very marginal significance. Interpretation can happen only if there’s funding and if there is somebody who is willing to undertake public education and outreach projects.

Still, how are CRM practitioners incorporating interpretation into the CRM process? To outline how public interpretation is typically carried out when a state agency hires a private firm to do CRM on a project, a step-by-step process should be applied. The following is compiled from the shared experiences of CRM practitioners:
1) Convincing the state agency by marketing the benefits of public interpretation is one of the first steps a private firm may have to take if they want to do outreach work. Since an agency rarely asks for interpretation, CRM practitioners may have to persuade the agency into doing public interpretation on their project by explaining to them how it will benefit the image of their organization. It can take a lot of marketing and, in some cases, manipulation on the part of the firm to convince the agency of the benefits of public interpretation. This can be difficult because the parties involved might see public outreach as an unnecessary expense. Each agency and project has different needs. If there are significant findings on a project, then public interpretation may be appropriate. It is important at this early stage to determine if public interpretation applies to a given project and, if so, initiate it. It’s not feasible to take one method of outreach and bend the agency and the situation to fit. Projects must be tailored to fit the circumstance (Praetzellis 2002).

2) Writing public outreach clauses and requirements into an agencies’ contract and research design is the next step. Some practitioners view public outreach as mitigation within the law, so they are writing it into their contracts (Pape 2002). However, some regulations such as the
Secretary of the Interior's Standards & Guidelines are not regulatory and do not set or interpret agency policy when it comes to public outreach efforts. The regulations are intended to provide technical advice about archeological and historic preservation and methods, including tools for developing a sound interpretive strategy and techniques for making research results available to the public. Still, many CRM practitioners push for public interpretation, and put things into the contract with various agencies to make sure it gets done.

3) Using the regulations to look beyond the mandates of the law to develop a more holistic approach to a cultural resource project is another strategy for implementing outreach efforts. For example, compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations typically results in a lot of technical reports — not widely accessible to the public — to fulfill the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. But because the purpose of the law is to encourage the use of cultural resources for long-term public benefit, other interpretive forms of presenting archeological and historical data, such as videos, displays, web sites, books and exhibits, can be done by using the spirit of the legal mandates to ensure that archaeological information is provided to the public.
4) Working with community members to develop public interpretation programs is another step. Since interpretation is frequently the result of community-based, grassroots efforts to recognize and protect important cultural resources, it is crucial to involve the community. With commitment and some creative nourishing the practitioner who takes on interpretation projects has to be willing to go that extra mile to see that the work gets done and that community members are participating (Ellick 1998:30-33).

5) Collaborating with historians, museum curators, historical societies, exhibit designers, and other cultural resource specialists to devise the best strategy for translating archaeological information to the public is another important step for incorporating public outreach into a CRM-driven research project. The key is to involve people from outside of the agency sponsoring the project such as interested community members, professional archaeologists and historians, and local government officials (Ellick 1998:30-33).

6) Using the press and other media, such as TV, radio, the Internet, as an interpretive outlet is key to successfully implementing an interpretive strategy. “The need to engage the press and the public in CRM archaeology is critically important. If archaeologists hope to see CRM
grow and thrive we must continue to address the challenge of educating the public and increasing public understanding and commitment to CRM archaeology through the media” (Kuhn 2002:208). How CRM practitioners publicize projects depends on the nature and complexity of the particular project, and the agency's public involvement procedures.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR PUBLIC INTERPRETATION

The last 25 years have seen a proliferation of efforts to meet the demand and need for public interpretation with varying degrees of success (Jameson 1997:11). In many cases, programs would never have been made possible without key individuals in numerous federal, state and municipal agencies standing behind the idea of outreach. Many contracts for CRM projects are through government agencies, on public lands and funded by taxpayer dollars. By giving tours, publishing booklets, and building displays, CRM firms and agencies are able to give something back to the general public. When sharing their findings with the public, firms and agencies receive a great deal in return when rewarded with positive feedback.
Many interpretive programs have humble beginnings. In some cases, there are no models to follow. The idea often begins with one person, and as the benefits of education hit home within the agencies and among the public, the number of people and the level of support increase.

From reviewing what has been written on public interpretation, and interviewing experts in the field that achieved success in developing public interpretation products, it's apparent that much has changed within the past few years in terms of accepting and generating outreach programs for CRM projects. The public's need to know what is going on in their community and the CRM practitioners responsibility to build public support for a particular project and to inform the community of their cultural heritage are just two examples of what has fueled this change. CRM practitioners are interpreting the legal mandates in new ways and in many instances they are doing so on a grassroots level.

The demand for public interpretation is also affecting academic programs that support the CRM industry. The University of California, Berkeley, now requires all in-residence archaeology graduate students to participate in the Archaeology Outreach Program, which includes school and community group talks and other public outreach activities (Anthropology at Berkeley, The Curriculum, Step 1, Archaeology,
2005:ls.berkeley.edu/dept/anth/dept.html); my acceptance into Sonoma State's CRM graduate program and focus of study is another example of the growth sector of public interpretation within the CRM field.

Additionally, archaeologists are also targeting public schools and universities in their interpretive efforts. For example, in the early 1990s, Utah’s statewide archaeology education program called “Intrigue of the Past,” sponsored by the Bureau of Land Management and the Interagency Task Force on Cultural Resources, was designed to train educators to teach young people about their cultural heritage. The goal was to equip the participants to make wise decisions concerning the use and protection of archeological sites now and in the future. Evaluation results showed that the program is largely successful (Ellick 1998:26-27).

Also, within the past five years, the Society for American Archaeology’s (SAA) attention to public outreach and education has expanded, providing more up-to-date information on education programs. The SAA focuses on four areas within archeological education: academic programs, curriculum development, professional development/continuing education, and public education. The SAA web site provides links to educational resources as well as information on college programs offering archaeology, ways of continuing to develop archeological skills and public
education materials for professional's working in the field. The SAA's Public Education Committee was formed in the mid-1990s to promote awareness about and concern for the study of past cultures. Their aim is to aid educators, interpreters and archaeologists about the value of archaeological research and resources. Since its founding, the Public Education Committee has developed a variety of resources to help educators incorporate archaeology into classroom teaching.

Lastly, since the early 1990s, the programs and activities of the Public Interpretation Initiative represent an attempt by the NPS to bring the subjects of archeology and cultural history into focus for the public eye. The program's activities have included the organization and coordination of national and international forums. Through a variety of workshops, training courses, and academic symposia, several Initiative sub-themes, international in scope, have emerged and are continuing to be developed. Major themes included:

1) the archeologist's vs. interpreter's respective roles in developing and designing effective interpretive programs;

2) on-site museum and visitor center critique;

3) the educator/curator/designer planning triad;

4) African-American oral histories, park programs, and popular histories;
5) interpreting culture for younger audiences; and

6) sensitive interpretation in multicultural societies (Jameson 2001: www.cr.nps.gov/seac/).

Programs of the Public Interpretation Initiative were organized at several professional conferences, including the National Association of Interpretation, World Archaeology Congress, Society for American Archaeology, Society for Historical Archaeology, American Anthropological Association, and Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History (Jameson 2001).

Publications and journals that support archaeology and the CRM industry such as *Common Ground, American Antiquity, and World Archaeology* are devoting sections and entire issues to the subject of public outreach.

*Common Ground*'s guest editor, Daniel Haas, writes in the Spring 1998 issue, which was entirely devoted to the topic of public interpretation:

Public awareness of archeology and preservation is steadily growing, thanks in large part to the many opportunities now available for people to learn about their heritage. Archeology has reached not only the remote corners of rural life, but mainstream consumer culture as well. Much of archeology's public appeal is due to curiosity, and there is nothing wrong with taking advantage of that, but we must strive to transform curiosity into understanding. Our challenge, as we close this decade and reflect on our
accomplishments, is to provide better education and more enlightened outreach in the years to come. For any of our efforts to be successful — no matter how innovative — we are going to have to understand public attitudes about archeology. Also communication between archeologist and educator should be strengthened so that the message is clear and consistent. If we can do all these things — and it will take work — what we hope for today may tomorrow be a reality. (Haas 1998:13).

And more recently, archaeologist Robert D. Kuhn of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation writes in his article, "Archaeology under a Microscope: CRM and the Press":

Maintaining and building public support for CRM archaeology is essential and efforts to understand, assess, and evaluate the impact of press coverage and public opinion on CRM archaeology can contribute to the advancement of the field. Only insofar as archaeology becomes effective public archeology can the creation and maintenance of appropriate public attitudes occur, which in turn permits decision-makers to develop and apply the legal and administrate mechanisms and the funding necessary to achieve archaeology’s goals. (Kuhn 2002:196).

Is it possible for CRM practitioners working for a state agency, private firm and/or university to incorporate public interpretation into CRM and develop successful public outreach programs? With commitment and some creative nourishing, CRM educators and practitioners say that it is possible. But where does this bring us? What does the future hold for incorporating interpretation into the CRM process? Will interpretation become an integral, expected part of the CRM process? What will make
future CRM public interpretation possible? Nobody can project the CRM industry’s future better than those who work in the field.

Here’s what working professionals, academics and others in the field have to say:

Janet Pape, archaeology manager, Caltrans, Oakland, California:

I think interpretation is one of these snowball things that if you put it out there and people are interested in it then they’ll demand it. Since the Cypress Project, I see a lot more public outreach out of headquarters now on projects that they are dealing with. You have to have people in the field who are interested in the outreach. You need to know how to work the system to your advantage. It really takes someone with that drive within an organization. I think public interpretation can happen with the city and any local agency. It takes convincing others, thinking about and being prepared for. It doesn’t have to be that expensive; that’s what’s so amazing about public outreach. Its just really convincing the agency whose ever project it is that there are benefits to the organization to do the outreach. And most of them see it. I think people are changing. You will always have people in an organization that do not value archaeology or history at all but if you can connect with someone who does see the value then you don’t have to do so much convincing. The law is the crux of it. And then you’re marketing invocation ideas. (Pape 2002).

David Blackburn, chief of interpretation at the John Muir National Historic Site in Martinez, California:

Looking outside of the box, we cannot rely upon on our old standards that the resource will bring the public in, that giving them a guided tour and slide show will be enough. In the future, interpreters have to look at ways to engage the public in the story we tell here and engage them in such a way that they make a connection to it. Out greatest challenge in the scope of our site is to keep it relevant to the current and future generation. How can
we connect with the visitor’s fears, ideas and feelings and make that link between current issues and problems? (Blackburn 2002).

Dana McGowen, principal, Jones & Stokes, San Francisco, California:

At every conference I have attended for the last five years, the need for public interpretation in CRM has been a topic. I expect the next two years to be pivotal time in the acceptance and furtherance of public interpretation. I think that the state’s budget crisis is going to require that state agencies and the CRM industry quickly figure out how to make what we do more relevant to the public. (McGowen 2002).

Steve Ehret, park planner, Sonoma County Regional Parks, Santa Rosa, California:

Within the last five years interpretation efforts have been on a rebound like never before. The more people understand the history of the land, the more people are interested in preserving both the land and our cultural history. Telling the story of how people adapted to a specific place tends to engage people in many more levels than if they just passed through it without the interpretation. Interpretation is a critical way of adding value to the outdoor experience, in order to capture a broader range of people’s interest. Simply put, many people light up when historical stories are shared and this sometimes is the greatest motivator for more open space and cultural preservation in the future. (Ehret 2005).

Margaret Purser, professor and graduate coordinator, Department of Anthropology, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California:

Public interpretation has a growing role within CRM. Public interpretation at all kinds of levels will increasingly be a part of practice within agencies like the government that have the mandate. A more challenged role for public interpretation is that if we don’t make public interpretation a greater part of what we do, we may find ourselves in trouble. (Purser 2002).
Adrian Praetzellis, director, Anthropological Studies Center, professor, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California:

Public interpretation efforts these days are not uncommon. More and more people over the last five years or so are doing public interpretation and there have been a number of books published on the subject. It's becoming more mainstream, but it's certainly no way near what it could be. The more it's done, the more it becomes respectable and the more it will be done. I think that there's a general trend for archaeologists towards serving another audience. CRM has moved out of academia, where the writing is dull, trivial, obtuse, and obscure. CRM has become it's own thing and so the people who work in CRM don't have to work under those academic constraints. (Praetzellis 2002).

John H. Jameson, NPS archaeologist, recognized leader in the field of archaeology and public interpretation:

Undoubtedly, the key to our success lies in the realization that, whether or not we are trained archaeologists, we are the ones that define and mold the interpretive and educational programs that meet the public's eye. As archaeologists, interpreters, and educators, we can and must act in tandem as a lens to focus the public eye on the learning and appreciation of archaeological and historical resources. (Jameson 2001).

Brian Fagan, profession of anthropology and archeology at the University of California-Santa Barbara:

The archeology of 2010 will be very different from that of 1998, one in which the conservation ethic, the issue of stewardship, will be all-pervasive. Yet we are unprepared. Above all, how do we convince people the archeological record is important for more than just its value as a curiosity and for the tourist dollars it brings in? There are those among you who claim that we have convinced our colleagues that public awareness is important. Maybe we have — at a superficial level. But where are the lasting curricular changes and
shifts in research priorities, which are a tangible reflection of a changing concern? Only a few institutions and archeologists have begun to look a generation ahead. These issues are important simply because the future of the past depends on how we resolve them. The preservation of this past will not come easily. In our arrogance, we also assume that everyone has a latent interest in the past. They do not, but we should at least give them respect for the lessons and perspectives that come to us from our ancestors. (Fagan 1998:17).

Barbara J. Little, archaeologist for the National Park Service, author of “Public Benefits of Archaeology”:

The turn of the millennium has encouraged a great deal of stocktaking around the world: looking to the future and looking back to gain perspective and lessons from the past. The interest in heritage that has been growing over the past few decades is currently booming, and it is not likely to be a passing fad. As we expand our view of the past to include the struggles, successes and failures of all peoples from all times and situations, our wisdom — and compassion — ought also to expand. (Little 2002:16).

The above observations culled from these industry experts all point to a common theme: that outreach efforts are more than just researching and filling the technical requirements of CRM work. Interpretation in CRM is about realizing that the requirements are there because Congress wants to see a public benefit of cultural resources. Other shared themes include using laws and regulations to incorporate interpretation into CRM, marketing the idea of interpretation and convincing others of the significance of interpretation to actualize public outreach goals.
Collaborating with historians, museum curators and exhibit designers to devise the best strategy for translating archaeological and architectural information to the public and writing public outreach clauses into contracts and research designs are also part of the experience for generating more public outreach efforts.

All of these CRM industry experts touched on another unifying element: that the qualitative benefits of public programs far outweigh the quantitative ones. In return for the investment, there is increase in community support and positive public relations for the agencies involved. The public also gets a return, as most projects are sponsored with tax dollars. Some programs will continue beyond the original contract, taking on a life of their own.

Still, with limited resources, one of the biggest challenges, say CRM practitioners, is to provide the public with a holistic view of a cultural resources project. Effective methods of interpretive archaeology include weaving data from a variety of sources, such as archival materials, oral history techniques, ethnohistories and archeological analysis, into a multifaceted interpretation. “When documents accompany artifacts, it would be foolish to ignore them. But it would be no less a mistake to
assume that they say the same thing and that the document is the more reliable source (Glassie 1999:46).

Indeed, when archaeology, history and ethnography merge as an interpretive tool, a more in-depth portrayal of the site transpires (Hardesty and Little 2000:23). With this in mind, the following chapter, Chapter 3, uses historical research and landscape observation to provide important information related to the significance of Hendrickson Homestead. This investigative technique is used as a component of archeological research to enable interpretation. Additionally, it is important to note that the main factors that lead Sonoma County Regional Parks to developing an outreach program for Hendrickson Homestead are exactly what the above CRM professionals say make interpretation happen: federal, state, local or grant funds, a forward-thinking practitioner who wants to take interpretation on, a commitment to including public programs on every project, financial assistance and institutional support, dedicated volunteers, and a staff with the educational, environmental and archeological background to communicate with diverse audiences.
CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW FOR HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD IN HOOD MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK

INTRODUCTION

Although Hendrickson Homestead was not nearly as grand or productive a farm as many of the others in the surrounding area of the Los Guílicos Valley in the late 1800s, this historic site echoes many of the themes that contributed to the cultural development of the local area, California and the nation. Hendrickson Homestead existed at a pivotal time in California history when land was in demand, and many settlers new to California staked their claim to property by squatting and using the provisions of the Homestead Act of 1862 to their advantage. The site's development is a classic example of California land acquisition. The chain of title for lands now comprising Hendrickson Homestead in Hood Mountain Regional Park has been traced back to the governments of both Mexico and the United States. It's also an important historic archeological site that contains artifacts and structural remains that contribute to our understanding of human history. The site has characteristics suggesting the likelihood that it possesses configurations of artifacts, structural
remains and other natural and cultural features yet to be retrieved, researched and carefully evaluated.

Using the National Register of Historic Places (NRHR) format, this chapter outlines an historical overview of Hendrickson Homestead by categorizing the homestead as a site, determining the historic context of the property through time, place and theme, using the concept of feature systems to evaluate all components of the site within its connection to the region, evaluating significance under the National Register Criteria, and determining if the property retains sufficient integrity to convey its integrity. Using a combined cultural, historical and landscape approach to develop a regional context assists in identifying the site as something that represents the range and variety of culture history.

This chapter outlines the basic chronology and principal events of the area’s early history from Native American use to the mid-1870s following the site’s settlement by pioneer David Hendrickson. This chapter also offers a brief overview of the enterprises of some of the inhabitants of the land that was once part of the former Rancho Los Guílicos, Hendrickson Homestead. The material in this chapter provides background for the public interpretation products presented in Chapter 4. The development of this historical overview is enhanced by previous research

NATIVE AMERICAN USE

For thousands of years before Spanish-speaking soldiers, missionaries and settlers began to arrive in California in 1769, the Southern Pomo, Coast Miwok, and Wappo indigenous groups all shared access to this region now known as Hood Mountain Regional Park (McLendon and Oswalt: 1978: 274-288; Kroeber 1976: 1-995; Sawyer 1978: 256-263).

The Southern Pomo lived in the area of the Sonoma Mountains. The other tribal unit, the Wappos, lived to the east across the Los Guilicos Valley, which was named after their village, Wilikos. Wilikos Village was located at the head of Sonoma Creek at the base of Hood Mountain (Heizer and Whipple 1971).

Because the Pomo and Wappo people were hunter-gatherers, they spent part of the time seeking animal and plant food. A lot of their time was also spent making decorated baskets and taking part in religious ceremonies. They settled in large, permanent villages throughout the
year, while other sites were visited seasonally to obtain particular resources.

The Wappo, a Spanish word for brave or courageous, are believed to have controlled the area in which Hendrickson Homestead is located, stretching from the Napa Valley, west to the hills east of Santa Rosa, where they lived in permanent villages in today’s Valley of the Moon and in seasonal campsites along Sonoma Creek, hunting, fishing and gathering plants. The site, now known as Hendrickson Homestead, was once reportedly an Indian hunting camp. Former landowner, Willard Johnson, remembers as a young boy finding “arrowheads” and other “prehistoric hunting artifacts” at the site (Willard 2005).

During the mid-1850s, white settlers displaced the Pomo and Wappo people, sending them to reservations in Mendocino County. This was due solely to the American emigration from the east, which increased rapidly during the Gold Rush era of 1849 and California’s entry as a state in the Union in 1850. Mexicans were displaced, too, as settlers assumed ownership and control of Californian lands, despite the preservation of Mexican grants included in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Forbes 1969; Robinson 1979).
RANCHO LOS GUILICOS

By 1836, this region was part of the northern section of Los Guilicos Valley, named after the indigenous group who signed the peace treaty with General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, paving the way for white settlement.

In 1839 California Governor Juan Batista Alvarado grants Captain John (Juan) Wilson, a Scottish sea captain, the 18,883-acre Los Guilicos Rancho, where Indian vaqueros tended vast herds needed to produce cowhides (Sand 1988:5; Waghorn 2002:62). This land grant encompassed the Los Guilicos Valley between the Sonoma and Mayacamas mountains. The summit of Hood Mountain was part of the Los Guilicos land grant as well.

Settlers began to pour into California in 1849 with gold as the principal lure. Land was in demand and many settlers squatted on public land. Many newcomers, however, turned from mining to agriculture; squatters and settlers broke down Mexican land grants into smaller parcels where the common person could eke out a reasonable survival as a farmer or rancher (Robinson 1979:163-165). Under the Homestead Act of 1862, settlers, many of whom were also squatters, were granted 160 acres from unappropriated public lands free from the United States
General Land Office (USGLO) after proving five years of improvements to the land by establishing a residency and transforming the terrain into a productive farm (Robinson 1979:163-168).

By 1850, William Hood, who built his fortune through construction in San Francisco, and his partner, San Francisco merchant-painter William Pettit, purchased the 18,883-acre Los Guilicos Rancho from Captain John (Juan) Wilson. In the early 1850s, Hood became the sole owner of Rancho Los Guilicos after Pettit sold his share to Amelia Wilson and she in 1854 sold it to Hood (Sonoma County Recorder’s Office, Deeds Book E:81). In 1858 Hood builds the two-story Georgian Revival house known as Hood Mansion for his bride Eliza. Under Hood’s ownership, Los Guilicos Rancho prospers as a cattle ranch and later as a farm with acres of grapes, grains and fruit trees (DaVega n.d.:5; Futini 1976:38). Fencing and plowing are necessary to keep off squatters, who settle on Hood’s land, claiming it as their own property (Sand 1988:6; Futini 1976:46). With no strong legal recourse for eviction, Hood’s original purchase of 18,883 acres dwindles to approximately 1,700 acres (Sand 1988:6; Futini 1976:50).

By 1877, financial troubles force Hood to sell and subdivide large sections of the land not already occupied by squatters (DeVega n.d.:6; Waghorn 2002:68).
SQUATTERS AND SUBDIVISION

Squatters were a problem that faced Hood from almost the beginning of his ownership of Los Guilicos. The uncertain legality of the Los Guilicos grant may have been what encouraged squatters. After the Mexican War of 1846, prime rancho lands were “up for grabs” (Murphy 1937:189). One element of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was a promise by the United States to fully protect the property rights of the Mexicans including Californios. The Act of 3 March 1851, passed by the United States, established the U.S. Board of Commissioners for California Land Titles to hear claims and required Californios to prove their ownership of land, through documentary evidence or witness testimony (Robinson 1979; Waghorn 2002:65). Although the majority of the grants were confirmed, the average length of time required for the hearing before the commission, subsequent survey of the property by the Surveyor General of California, and the issuing of the patent of ownership for each grant was seventeen years. In the meantime, the legal status of each grant was in question. Many people took advantage of the uncertain legality of the grants by squatting on the land, adding to the financial burdens of the claimants as they attempted to have the squatters evicted. The length of the grant process, and the money required to
protect their land and hire lawyers bankrupted many claimants. Others were forced by the lengthy confirmation process to sell all or portions of their grants in order to survive (Robinson 1979; Waghorn 2002:65).

As the original grantee for Rancho Los Guilicos, Juan Wilson filed a claim with the U.S. Board of Commissioners for California Land Titles in 1852, although he had not owned the land since 1850. The grant was confirmed in 1866 (Perez 1996:68; Futini 1976:48-49). Hood and Amelia Wilson issued a joint eviction suit as early as 1851, indicating the presence of squatters on the rancho. Hood, sole owner of the grant by 1854, also fenced sections of the rancho as a further deterrent to squatting. Hood's fortunes declined steadily from the 1860s due to squatters pre-empting his rancho, the decline of the cattle industry, financial difficulties and the lengthy land claims cases tied up for years in the courts. Hood family tradition maintains that he lost nine-tenths of Rancho Los Guilicos to the incursion of squatters (Futini 1976:49). Between 1851 and 1878 Hood sold or mortgaged the rancho in a piecemeal fashion (Parkman and McGuire 1981:40). Although Hood sold some land, he lost much of his rancho, including the homestead site, to squatters who took much of it over without purchasing it from him over a period of several years.
As a result, Rancho Los Guilicos was subdivided primarily into large parcels such as those bought by Martin Hudson, John McCracken and Samuel Hutchinson (Thompson 1877). By the late 1890s, a number of landowners acquired smaller parcels as the larger parcels were subdivided and sold (Reynolds and Proctor 1898 and McIntire and Lewis 1908).

A growing population created land pressures in Sonoma County during the late 1850s and 1860s. In 1850 only 560 Americans lived in the region, by 1860 the number had increased to 11,867, and ten years later it had further expanded to 19,819. Many of these settlers were farmers and from 1850 to 1860 the number of farms, an average of ten acres in size, in the Sonoma and Los Guilicos valleys increased from 90 to 756 (Futini 1976:38; Waghorn 2002:66). The rich soil and climate of the region also played an important role in high yield crop production. The average net profit per cultivated acre during the 1880s was $100 per acre for a Los Guilicos fruit grower (Kenwood Land Company 1897; Futini 1976:74).

The Act of 1851 stated that all land outside of that owned by Californios was part of the public domain and therefore open to settlement. In many areas the extent of the public domain could not be known until after rancho land claims had been confirmed and surveyed.
Many resorted to squatting without claim on the land of their own (Miller 1976; Stewart 2001:3-37). On the USGLO map of May 1859, the Rancho Guillicos was accurately plotted. For the first time, Hood Mountain, named Mount Hood by the surveyor in his supposition that Hood was the original grantee, was shown.

By the 1850s and 1860s, the United States had developed a number of ways to distribute land in the public domain to private settlers. One method was selling public domain at auction sales for cash. Later came preemption, which allowed people to settle, improve and later purchase parcels of up to 160 acres of unclaimed public land. Another method was established by the Homestead Act of 1862, which granted free land parcels of 160 acres to settlers in exchange for their agreement to live on the land, build a house and make agricultural improvements over a five-year period (Robinson 1979:166-167). Settlers also made use of the timber-culture laws, providing that a person could obtain title to 160 acres if "he would plant 40 acres of it to trees not more than 12 feet apart and would protect and keep them in a healthy growing condition for 10 years" (Robinson 1979:170). Another way for the government to dispose of the public domain to settlers in California was by way of the Timber and Stone Act, allowing land valuable mainly for
timber or for stone but unfit for cultivation to be sold for $2.50 an acre (Robinson 1979:171).

The land of what was the northern area of the Los Guilicos land grant and is now the newly acquired parkland of Hood Mountain Regional Park passed into private ownership by preemption, squatting and cash purchases in the 1850s to 1870s during the Hood years. A review of historic maps showing land ownership published between 1877 and 1908 (Bowers 1867; Thompson 1877; Reynolds and Proctor 1897; McIntyre and Lewis 1908), deed records outlining chain of title from the Sonoma County Recorder's Office, and USGLO Historical Index and Township Books, which recorded grants and purchases of public lands, verify that Hood at one time owned the land that is now occupied by the homestead. Since there is no record of the homestead site being purchased from Hood, research gleaned from the aforementioned sources indicate that the land was lost to squatters during the confirmation process of rancho land claims during the mid-1800s, and therefore was considered public domain, later passing into private ownership to David Blackburn Hendrickson by way of Homestead Entry.
HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD

WILLIAM HOOD

During the 1860s and early 1870s William Hood made every attempt to create a paradise upon acquiring the Los Guilicos land grant in 1854, managing cattle, planting 200 acres of grapes and grain, and building a Georgian Revival house that’s now listed on the NRHR (Miller 1976). But in response to the increasing number of squatters who were snatching up all of the land, Hood’s efforts had to shift as it became necessary to protect the acreage. During the 1860s, Hood was prompted into fencing and plowing as a means to keeping off squatters (Sand 1988:6). Americans who had come to pan gold had stayed to settle, taking up agriculture and squatting upon the thousands of acres belonging to the old rancheros (Sand 1988:6; DaVega n.d.:5). Since Hood refused to use vaqueros to remove the squatters, many just settled on his land and by the 1870s had claimed it as their own property (Miller 1976; Futini 1976:49).

Also, the United States government waited until 1866 to validate his claim so Hood had no strong legal recourse for eviction until that point. He switched from ranching to agriculture since the dwindling
acreage made it impossible to support the amount of cattle necessary to have a successful ranch. In order to cover his losses he began selling off large sections of the Rancho and by the early 1880s, Sam Hutchinson had acquired 3,700 acres, L. Giannella 2,500 acres and J. Austin 2,200 acres (Figure 3; DaVega n.d.:5; Waghorn 2002:68-72). There were also numerous smaller sections sold during this time. Soon Hood’s original acreage of 18,883 had dwindled to about 1,700 acres (Sand 1988:6-7). By 1897 the remaining Hood property was bought by Francis Wensinger
DAVID HENDRICKSON

It was in the 1870s, during the Hood years, that a pioneer named David Blackburn Hendrickson from Minnesota with his wife Martha and their children settled on a piece of land behind Hood Mansion just a few miles up the mountainous and broken terrain of the southwest side of Hood Mountain. The area consisted mainly of ridges, canyons and spurs extending out from the main summit. Whether Hood knew that the Hendricksons were squatting on his land is uncertain. But one thing is for sure: After cultivating about 10 acres of the land for 14 years, Hendrickson filed a Homestead Proof and received from the USGLO in January 1891 a Homestead Patent, which granted him 160 acres from unappropriated public lands free after proving at least five years of improvements to the land by establishing a residency and transforming the terrain into a productive farm (Appendix B; General Land Entry File Pre-1908; Robinson 1979:168). Hendrickson and his daughter Maud together owned about 245 acres (Figures 4 and 5; Reynolds and Proctor 1898; Beard 2004:5). Maud acquired Lots 4 and 5 Section 18 and Lot 11
Figure 4
General Land Office Plat Map, 1889, showing site of Hendrickson’s Homestead within Section 18 below the Pine Timber.

Section 7 for a total of 68.90 acres from the United States Government in 1892. Before acquiring the land, Maud was raised on the homestead site, “on the south west side of Hood Mountain” (Learned Perry 2005). In 1893 she married Chalmers McCormick, who was one of five children of Henry and Mary Hudson McCormick, a prominent ranching family. Maud and Chalmers later moved to Winnemucca, Nevada, where she died in 1956 (Learned Perry 2005; Sonoma County Marriages 1847-1902:54). Her father, David Hendrickson, owned Lots 12 and 13 section 7 and Lots 2 and 3, section 18, township 7 north, range 6 West with a total of
Figure 5 Reynolds & Proctor Map, 1897, showing lots owned by both David and Maud Hendrickson.

175.74 acres, selling both his and Maud’s portion of the land 14 years later to a Jonathon W. Minges (Sonoma County Recorder’s Office Block Books 1898-1924:90-92). Hendrickson named Louis F. Chinn, Alex W. Wiseman, Buchanan McClelland and Fred Schwan, all of Santa Rosa, as witnesses to prove his continuous residence upon and cultivation of the land (Land Office at San Francisco 1890). Wiseman stated that he didn’t
know of any time Hendrickson was absent from the property. “His family was in Santa Rosa, children going to school. But he was on the claim. If absent only temporarily. He cultivated the land himself” (Homestead Proof 1891). Chinn described the improvements made to the land: “A house, barn, chicken house, cellar, vineyard, orchard, blackberry patch, about one mile of wire fence and a mile of miscellaneous fencing. Value $800 to $1000” (Homestead Proof 1891).

Hendrickson claimed that there was already a small house on the land when he first “went there in October 1875” and that he “repaired the same and about three years afterwards built an addition 12 x 26 ... set out three acres of vineyard, two acres of orchards, valued at $1,000” (Homestead Proof, Testimony of Claimant 1891). He described the character of the land as being the most valuable for grazing stock and for vineyard and agricultural purposes. However, the field notes for the 1858, 1869, 1872, and 1878 plat survey by the USGLO make no reference to a structure of any kind. Preston R. Davis, Deputy Surveyor, however, notes the homestead in the 1888 plat survey. In his field notes, Davis describes the country as pine timber, “rough and broken, partly covered with timber with grassy openings interspersed. Land over which the greater part of this line runs is second rate. Hendrickson’s house with a small amount of
fencing and some acres of cleared land with small barn and some fencing lies in the northern portion of the NE 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of the section 18” (USGLO Field Notes 1888).

Other improvements made to the land include “small dwellings, two small out-houses and about five acres of vineyard and some fencing belonging to Carpenter, a small house and barn belonging to Clayton, house, barn, fencing and orchard belonging to Hendrickson, house barn and orchard belonging to J. Patton, and house and small quantity of fencing belonging to Beamen” (USGLO Field Notes 1888).

The site of Hendrickson Homestead appears remote, but it was accessible by foot and horse: a rough trail led up to the site from behind the Hood ranch. A stage route to Santa Rosa crossed the trail, leading up into hills from Kenwood because the swamps just north of Kenwood made travel impossible in the flat land where Highway 12 is located today. The route went along the foothills until it was necessary to ford the Sonoma Creek at the mouth of Adobe Canyon. The stage went on to the Hood ranch and then on to Santa Rosa. It operated from Santa Rosa to Sonoma and on down to points where boats could be taken to San Francisco (Sand 1988:10). The stages and boats coming up the Sonoma Creek
were the only means of travel other than horse and buggy in the days before the railroad arrived in the late 1880s.

Hendrickson, born in Ohio in 1837, was a Civil War veteran. His wife Martha was born in New York in 1845. Martha and David Hendrickson had seven children but only four were living as of 1900 (U.S. Census 1900). Daughter, Elizabeth Grace, was born in 1867 and two years later Maud was born, both while living in Minnesota. Pearl was born in 1878 and in 1881, Charlie Hendrickson was born, both in California. Charlie died an infant in 1887 from reasons unknown and he is buried at the Santa Rosa Rural Cemetery (Sonoma County Death Records 1873-1905; Press Democrat 1881:3; Sonoma County Cemetery Records from 1846-1921 1950:190). There are no other records of the other children.

The Hendrickson family cultivated potatoes, a popular crop in Sonoma County during the 1860s and 1870s, walnuts, grapes and other fruits on 160 acres of land (U.S. Census 1870, 1880; Stewart 2001:3-37). Chickens, 23 cattle and four milch cows were also raised (U.S. Census 1880). Maud reportedly raised hogs (Willard 2005). Hendrickson lived on the site until 1905 upon retiring to Santa Rosa where he lived for 10 years with his wife Martha until his death (Santa Rosa City and Sonoma County directories 1905, 1908, 1911). He died in 1915 from
“paralysis of the bowels and chronic bronchitis,” and is buried at the Santa Rosa Rural Cemetery (State of California Certification of Vital Record, County of Sonoma, Santa Rosa 1915; Santa Rosa Rural Cemetery 1853-1997:79).

During the 1860s and 1870s, the cattle industry declined and many farmers turned to crops such as wheat and hops, both known for being labor-intensive crops (Stewart 2001:3-37). The diversification of farm enterprises was characteristic of both larger ranches and small homesteading operations such as that of David Hendrickson. The arrival of the railway to Sonoma County in the 1870s provided transportation of produce to urban markets. Still, Hendrickson’s earnings were meager, eschewing the new crops of wheat and hops for more perishable products that were now a commodity with the arrival of the train. He focused much of the farm’s efforts in dairy, tilled fields and orchards, producing in 1879 over 300 pounds of butter, apple and peach orchards, 1/2 acre of vineyards, potatoes, producing 50 bushels of potatoes, and honey, producing 100 pounds (U.S. Census 1880). In 1879, Hendrickson paid $30 for labor wages and had workers on the property for only five weeks of the year (U.S. Census 1880), indicating that his farming practices were small scale.
SUBSEQUENT LANDOWNERS AND USE

The subsequent use and modification of Hendrickson Homestead provides insight into the variety of activities and land use associated with the site over the years.

Quicksilver Mine: 1905 -1909

Miner John W. Minges, originally from Arkansas, purchased the 175-acre homestead site from Hendrickson and converted the farm into a quicksilver mine (Figure 6; U.S. Census 1860 and 1910; SCRO, Deed Book 216:238). The timbered stope, an excavation in the form of a step made by the mining of quicksilver ore from steeply inclined or vertical veins (protrusions of ore), is located north of the homestead site. A large ditch, perhaps remnants of the mining operation, is now covered with vegetation.

Quicksilver, also known as liquid mercury metal, was used to recover gold from ore. Other uses of quicksilver included the manufacture of fulminate for explosive caps (California State Mining Bureau 1918: Chapter 1). Quicksilver production in Sonoma County experienced two principal periods of activity: 1874 to 1883 and 1888 to 1906. The number of flasks produced dropped from 2,070 flasks in 1906 to 500 in
1907. Flasks were made of sturdy iron, weighing approximately 14 pounds empty, 90 pounds when filled with the heavy, silvery liquid (California State Mining Bureau 1908:182-188). By 1909, the year Minges sold the property and mine, only 344 flasks of quicksilver were produced in Sonoma County (SCRO, Deed Book 216:238; California State Mining Bureau 1908:182-188).

Quicksilver deposits in Sonoma County are among the oldest known in the state (California State Mining Bureau 1908:181). A quicksilver furnace, an enclosed shaft of brick condensing chambers for roasting ores, was a great consumer of wood and even those mines located in
well-timbered regions found the cost of their fuel steadily increasing in 1906. As a result, many mines were idle, making it difficult for state mineralogists to obtain either reliable historical data of details of the old workings or of the output of mercury. Many mines were abandoned and then sold. Mines also closed due to the drop in price of quicksilver. In 1874 prices per flask of quicksilver in San Francisco were at an all time high, selling for $126.22 to $84.15. By 1905, however, the prices dropped to $35.94 per flask, indicating that Minges was operating a quicksilver mine at a less prosperous time in the industry (California State Mining Bureau 1908:8-11). Low prices, lower grade of ores, and competition with large European suppliers at lower prices all contributed to the demise of the quicksilver industry (California State Mining Bureau 1908:14).

The cost of mining and reduction of quicksilver ores differed in various mines. The nature of the ground determined whether timbering was required. In some cases the ground was so bad that the stopes had to be timbered and filled (California State Mining Bureau 1908:34).

Little is known of the conditions and production of Minge's mine. Workers reportedly lived on site, one dying from toxic fumes, causing the mine to shut down (Willard 2005).
Iron quicksilver flasks from the early 1900s were found at the Hendrickson Homestead site in 2003, suggesting that at one time the site was used as a mercury mine. Photo courtesy of Sonoma County Regional Parks.

When surveying the site, Sonoma County Regional Parks workers found blue mercury flasks in a creek bed (Figure 7). Willard Johnson, former landowner, remembers seeing them as well:

There were blue bottles there that would contain mercury because there was a mercury mine there. It was dug in the side of the hill in the back of the house. Workers lived on the property. A hired hand of sort died there from noxious poison. I once found up there on the hill an airshaft. I learned about the mercury mine from the old man who lived up the hill behind there, Henry Robinson and his uncle John Holz, before the turn of the century. The whole county was dotted and covered with mercury mines. (Willard 2005).

By 1920, Minges no longer called himself a miner; he was living in Sonoma working as a real estate salesmen (U.S. Census 1860, 1910, 1920).
Kearns Ranch: 1909-1918

U.S. State Senator Thomas Kearns, a self-made mining tycoon from Utah, acquired the homestead site from Minges and adjoining property from Francis Wensinger after purchasing Hood Mansion in 1905 as his summer home. Here he entertained Presidents Ulysses S. Grant, William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt (SCRO Deed Book 252:347; Deed Book 363:153-157; Knights of Pythias pamphlet 1934). By 1910, through acquisition of small ranches — including the homestead site — located around the property, Kearns increased the size of the ranch to nearly 1,550 acres (SCRO Deed Book 363:153-157; Futini 1976:52-53).

Serck's Subdivision: 1918-1924

Land speculator Peter Serck bought Hood Mansion and adjoining acreage, which includes the homestead site, to subdivide the property, but meets little success, selling 1,520 acres to George A. Proctor and Wallace Ware in 1921. In the years that followed, ownership changes hands numerous times, with acreage being parceled off by each subsequent owner (Futini 1976:53; Buhler 1997:6).
Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias: 1924-1942

The Knights of Pythias, a fraternal organization espousing “Friendship, Charity and Benevolence,” purchased the remaining 111 acres from Proctor and Ware to establish a home for orphaned children and the aged (SCRO Deed Book 73:6-7). The prime weather and agricultural conditions made Los Guilicos an ideal site for a home. Hood Mansion served as the main office, operating the rest home and a farm adjacent to it, which eventually grows to 1,308 acres and includes the hills and watershed areas behind the buildings (Buhler 1997:7). It is believed that the Knights used the homestead site for overnight retreats (Willard 2005). A self-sufficient farm supported the home through sales of dried fruits and nuts. The home raised much of its own beef and pork, maintained a dairy and grew vegetables. Several acres of fruit and nut trees were planted, including peaches, prunes, walnuts and figs (Buhler 1997:14; Hellam 1975). The Fraternal Order began a small 2.5-acre cemetery for its deceased members; it is still in existence today, located near Hood Mansion. Two reservoirs on the property as well as a deep well supplied all the water (Hellam 1975:3). During the Pythian years, the landscape experienced major land use from ranching and farming.
enterprises as well as the development of irrigation, water, fire prevention and sewer systems (Hellam 1975:3-5).

The Depression of the 1930s and World War II brought an end to the prosperity of the Pythians. Dwindling membership forced the Knights to sell the property (Buhler 1997:15). In 1943 the property was leased to the State of California Youth Authority for $600 per month with an option to buy. All the remaining Pythian guests were moved out and in 1944, the State exercised its option and purchased the property from the Knights of Pythias. The Los Guilicos Girls School closed in 1973, when the County of Sonoma purchased the 280 acres of land, putting the place to use as a juvenile hall and a Junior College law enforcement school (Miller 1976:8). The road leading to the home is still named Pythian Road.

Hunting Clubs: 1942-1957

When the Knights of Pythias were forced to sell, entrepreneur A.B. Knowles bought approximately 475 acres of their land, including the homestead site. He rented the cabin out to local hunting clubs during the hunting season (Willard 2005). Knowles built a ranch house overlooking Kenwood and Valley of the Moon and lived there till the late 1950s, when he began selling off parcels George Anderson, Robert Todd, William Johns
and Willard L. Johnson (SCRO Deed Books 1385:497; 1441:198; 1678:422; 1497:226; 1523:25).

Panorama Ranch: 1957-2003

Willard L. Johnson, a prominent San Francisco realtor, and his wife Alice purchased approximately 460 acres, including the homestead site and a 6,000-square-foot ranch house that they named Panorama Ranch, from A.B. Knowles (SCRO Deed Book 1523:25). They lived there with their teenage daughter Elizabeth and son Willard, who used the homestead site for outdoor recreation such as hunting, hiking and horseback riding. Two man-made ponds were created near the homestead site. A four-acre lake, springs, water easement, and hiking, fire and riding trails were some of the changes the property experienced during this time. Willard L. Johnson, Jr., inherited the property in 1987. A State of California approved timber harvest plan was implemented between 2000-2003.

Sonoma County Regional Parks: 2003-Present

Sonoma County Regional Parks bought the land from Johnson in 2003 with plans to develop the property as a county park with camping
facilities, hiking trails and picnic areas. The new parkland will be accessed from Pythian Road off Highway 12. The Bay Area Ridge Trail, a 500-mile trail that will encircle the San Francisco Bay along the ridge tops connecting parks and preserve open spaces, is slated to pass through the new parkland by the homestead site (Ehret 2005).

HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD: LIVING ON THE LAND

The archaeological remains of homesteads dating from the 1860s well into the 20th century that were once part of the public domain occur throughout the American West. These properties should be understood as elements of larger communities that include public places, such as churches, schools and stores, and circulation systems, such as railways and roads. It is within the larger picture of a site’s history that significance becomes apparent (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service National Register, History and Education 2005). Every rural household was the center of an array of activities associated with farming or another rural lifestyle such as mining, hunting, prospecting, lumbering or railroad tie manufacturing (Hardesty and Little 2000:128). The archaeological property types of Hendrickson Homestead, which includes a domestic house, outbuildings, foundations, cellar, privy, fences and
water sources, provide evidence of the variety of activities associated with the site.

With this in mind, the following section develops a historic context for Hendrickson Homestead by identifying several research themes useful for evaluating the archaeological significance of the site. “Historic contexts are those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within prehistory or history is made clear” (How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, National Register Bulletin 15, 1990:7). This section also identifies several archaeological property types that are associated with the historic context for Hendrickson Homestead as well as several key research themes for evaluating the significance, integrity and information content of the rural household site. By determining the historic context of the property, using the concept of archeological property types to evaluate all components of the site within its connection to the region, and evaluating significance under the National Register Criteria, this last portion of the historical overview for Hendrickson Homestead provides the material needed to evaluate the scientific and scholarly significance of the site for National and California Register of Historic Places eligibility.
HISTORIC CONTEXT

The National Register Bulletin’s guidelines for How to Complete the National Register Registration Form provided the structure for identifying key historic context on the homestead site (NPS How to Complete the National Register Registration Form 2005: Bulletin 15). Historic context is information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in the prehistory or history of a community, State, or the nation during a particular period of time (U.S. Department of the Interior, NPS National Register, History and Education 2005). Historic contexts are organized by theme, place, and time, and link historic properties to important historic trends. This framework proved to be very beneficial in (1) determining the significance of the homestead site and (2) portraying the historic property through the interpretative materials as a product of its time and as an illustration of aspects of heritage that are unique, representative, and pivotal.

Hendrickson Homestead is an important resource eligible to the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR) because it is associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage (Public Resources Code 5024.1; Title 14 CCR, 4850.3). Its history is a classic example of California land
acquisition. Additionally, the historic context for Hendrickson Homestead is centered on the origins and lifestyle of rural living. Although most family farms were market driven since they had to make money to pay for supplies, taxes, and other incidentals, many were small-scale, subsistence-oriented farms. Hendrickson Homestead represents a center of activity mainly associated with subsistence farming. The Hendrickson's were rural agriculturists whose ancestry can be traced to the first homesteaders of the region, arriving in the area after the passing of the Homestead Act of 1862. It was a time when the average settler could make a reasonable living, claiming a piece of land as his own through the Homestead Act.

The sale and subdivisions of Rancho Los Guilicos during the mid- to late-1800s dramatically influenced the occupation patterns with the Los Guilicos Valley. Each parcel, whether a claim on public land or purchased from a private owner, that was carved off the rancho probably came to have a complex of house or cabin, barn and outbuildings as people settled the land. Historic maps indicate that most of the ranch complexes were located close to the main roads. However, some farms were located a few miles off the main road. Squatters, attempting to stake their claim on some land, established many of these farms.
During the Hendrickson years, 1875 to 1905, Los Gillicos Valley experienced a boom with an increase in private land ownership, the development of the railroad and the success of the quarries, mines and fruit farming. The growth of the local population provided a nearby market as well as a ready source of seasonal workers, contributing to the success of the farms in the Los Gillicos Valley. Hendrickson Homestead represents a significant time in Sonoma County history when in the 1880s, with the building of the railroad in the Los Gillicos Valley from Glen Ellen to Santa Rosa, a new historical era began — the days of solely traveling by stage were coming to an end. It was an industrious time, and the railroads provided the vital transportation systems needed to support the products of Sonoma County's varied industries.

Extensive quarries were also located in the Los Gillicos area and the railroad stations on the Santa Rosa branch served as major loading points of cobblestones bound for San Francisco and other areas using these paving blocks (Sand 1988; Futini 1976:63). In these quarries, native basaltic rock was fashioned into cobblestones by workers and picked up by the railroad. The fruit farming industry in the Los Gillicos Valley was also a lucrative pursuit, and the railroad carried many of the fruit products to San Francisco where they were sold (Miller 1976; Futini
1976:61). Also during this time period, Los Guilicos was touted as a resort area north of San Pablo Bay, luring tourists to the area from San Francisco and Oakland on the Santa Rosa-Carquinez branch running through Sonoma and Los Guilicos valleys.

PROPERTY TYPES

The site's historical and archaeological features such as building remains, a domestic house, outbuildings, post and fencing remnants, a cellar, a well, rock retaining walls, privies, stone-lined footpaths, and rock foundations, make up a complex system that reflects the agricultural activity of this historic domestic site during the Hendrickson years (Figure 8). The site is situated adjacent to a meadow, at the foot of south-facing slope, and consists of several extant and collapsed buildings as well as various earthen and rock features. An overstory of oak, Douglas fir, and madrone trees shelter the site but there is very little understory. Water is available from a spring west of the site and from a spring-fed stream that flows east and southeast of the site. An examination of the site's archaeological property types follows.

Main cabin: The homestead's main cabin (Figures 9 and 10) was a
Figure 8
Hendrickson Homestead: This graphic map of the historic site shows the site's layout and historical and archaeological features, such as building and fencing remains. Image courtesy of Sonoma County Regional Parks.

two-story, 14 x 22 feet house primarily used for cooking and eating. The house was built into the side of the slope on a post and pier foundation. It is believed that the house was built in 1875 when David Hendrickson first settled on the property but records indicate that the house may have been there before (Homestead Proof, Testimony of Claimant 1891).
Figures 9 and 10
Front and side view of the homestead cabin before the structure was torn down. Photo taken in the 1960s. Photos courtesy of Willard Johnson of Johnson's Enterprises.
The one-room, one-story house with an attic loft and shed room had a wood frame with wood beveled siding, one-over-one double-hung sashes, a front gable with exposed rafters, and a porch and room extension on the front of the house with a dropped roof. One side of the house had a gable dormer that served as an entrance to the attic loft with stairs leading down to the main floor. A wood ramp leading from outside of the door reportedly dropped down to the top of the slope onto a path, which led to the three detached bunkhouses (Figure 11; Willard 2005).

The rock and brick hearth and chimney stand on the northeast side of a wood platform that is supported by short, wood piers. The lower, exterior part of the fireplace is constructed of dressed stone, and the interior is lined with firebrick (Figure 12). The chimney was made of common brick and had a hole a short distance up from the firebox that was used to a vent an iron wood burning stove used for cooking (Figure 13).

An effort to restore the main cabin by the previous owner was attempted to perhaps keep the buildings in a state of arrested decay, which seeks to “freeze” the form of a building at a specific point in
A side view of the homestead cabin shows the chimney and upstairs door, which at one time had a ramp leading down to a path to the bunkhouse and outhouse. Photo taken in the 1960s. Photo courtesy of Willard Johnson of Johnson's Enterprises.

But the maintenance was to such an extent that eventually the effort was abandoned, and the main cabin deteriorated and collapsed, leaving the foundation, chimney, and a portion of the floor joists and framing.

**Bunkhouses:** The Hendrickson family members and farm workers reportedly slept in the bunkhouses, which were all wood framed structures with beveled siding, unfinished interiors and front gabled (Willard 2005). The windows were one-over-one, double-hung sashes. Two out of the three bunkhouses remain, one of which was rebuilt by a
Figure 12
The rock and brick hearth and chimney, on remnants of a post and pier foundation, are all that is left of the main cabin. Photo taken in 1990. Photo courtesy of Willard Johnson of Johnson's Enterprises.

previous owner. Bunkhouse 1 stands on a post and pier foundation and is built into the slope (Figure 14). A previous owner in an attempt to restore the structure rebuilt Bunkhouse 2 (Figure 15). The remains of Bunkhouse 3 are north of the main cabin. Construction materials scattered in this area suggest that the building was constructed similar to Bunkhouse 1 (Figure 16).
The root cellar, an underground vault, was covered with earth and used for the storage of root crops and other vegetables (Figures 17; Halsted 1977:224-225). It is located directly to the west of the cabin. Although temperatures rarely drop below freezing in Sonoma County, many farms had a root cellar to keep vegetables from possibly freezing in the winter. Root cellars were not only for storing fruits and vegetables, they were also used as storage areas for other things such as...
Figures 14, 15 and 16
Bunkhouse 1 (top), circa 1960, still stands today. Bunkhouse 2 (middle), circa 1990, was rebuilt by a previous owner. Bunkhouse 3 (bottom), circa 1960, has since collapsed. Photos courtesy of Willard Johnson of Johnson’s Enterprises.
preserved meat, milk and cream, fruits and vegetables — anything needed to keep cool.

This rock-lined cellar, built into the slope for dryness and good ventilation, was perhaps used for potatoes and apples, and in the fall of the year, other garden produce. It had dry-laid stone walls with wood and metal beams as a part of a roof structure.

**Outhouse:** The outhouse, with an earthen floor, wood frame and shed roof, was most likely a round, deep, dry-laid, stone privy pit that periodically needed to be emptied and cleaned. The facility was perhaps also used for bathing and at one time there was a water tank on the roof (Figures 18; Willard 2005). Extending away from the southeastern wall of the outhouse is a ditch that empties into what is now an open, semi-circular pit (sump) about 80 feet away.

**Barn:** The barn, a wood framed structure rectangular in shape, was located next to a large fir tree and adjacent to a flat terrace surrounded by a retaining wall. It was small, perhaps 300 square feet, and reportedly provided stanchions for milk cows on the first floor with a ladder leading up to a hayloft and granary storage on the second floor (Willard 2005). Remnants of the foundation are what are left of the barn.
Figure 17
The root cellar, pictured here in 2005, was built into the slope, measuring about 11 feet by 7 feet. The interior walls were dry-laid stone and metal rods appear to be part of a roof structure.

**Cream separator:** A concrete slab adjacent to the barn is believed to have been the foundation of a small building that housed the cream separator, which was invented in 1890 for separating the cream from milk (Figure 19). Formerly the separation was made by the gravity method, allowing the cream to rise to the top of a pan and then skimming it off (Living History Farms 2005:www.lhf.org).

After milking the cows in the barn, the milk was put into a separator and left in a cool place, often in a root cellar, where the cream rose to the top of the mixture. Next, the fatty cream is skimmed off the top, leaving behind “skimmed milk.” The cream is poured into a churn where it is agitated by a wooden dasher that it is pumped up and down.
Figures 18
In contrast to the other buildings on the site, the outhouse, photographed here in 2005, had an earthen floor. Photo courtesy of Willard Johnson of Johnson's Enterprises.

The cream turns into frothy whipped cream and then butter (Explore the History and Making of Butter 2005: http://webexhibits.org/butter).

**Wooden wickets:** Four wooden posts located in front of the main cabin were once part of a small gate known as a wicket or stile, which was used as a barrier to animals but provided a convenient passageway through the fence crossing the footpath to the main cabin (Figure 20; Halsted 1977:117, 164-171). It may have had an ordinary wire or
Figure 19
A concrete slab, pictured here in 2005, is adjacent to the barn location and was once the foundation of a small building that housed the cream separator.

wooden gate, which swung between the two posts set far enough apart to permit the passage of a person.

Retaining walls and rock fences: The rock retaining walls are integral parts of this site, creating a terrace-like platform for the site of the main cabin and bunkhouses (Figure 21). A series of rock walls forms a semi-enclosed, flat terrace southeast of the main cabin and the northern
Figure 20
The wooden post entry (wicket), pictured here in 2005, led up to the main cabin and bunkhouses.

Wall and the partial wall on the east side of the terrace are stopped so as to form benches along their length (Figure 22). A rock fence sections off paths leading to the bathhouse, barn and three bunkhouses (Figure 23). The fences also separate the homestead site from the trail, meadow and orchard. Using surrounding rocks as fencing was a cheap and practical solution for fencing domestic animals and creating retaining walls.
Earthworks: A ditch is located near the outhouse sump in a south and southwesterly direction for a distance of about 300 feet and then intercepts a creek. The depth of the ditch varies from about 2.5 feet near the homestead’s main cabin to as little as six inches in some places. The
Figure 23
Footpaths led from the main cabin to the barn, outhouse and bunkhouses. Remains of the rock walls and fences, pictured here in 2005, distinguish where the paths were once located.

ditch is not rock lined and appears to have been purposefully routed through a rocky section of creek bank to help with erosion. Another pit with a few pieces of lumber is located on the west side of the knoll southwest of the complex, suggesting that this area may have been used for mining.

Springs & cistern: Water is available from a spring west of the homestead site and from a spring-fed stream that flows east and southeast of the site. The circular rock and concrete cistern that captures
Figure 24
A circular, rock and concrete cistern, pictured here in 2005, captured water for the homestead from a spring.

water from a spring is located about 500 feet east of the main cabin, on the south side of the road that runs past the site and is adjacent to a creek. It is estimated to be more than 50 years old (Figure 24; Willard 2005; Ehret 2005).

**Orchard trees:** Walnut, apple, peach and olive trees can be found in scattered orchards southwest of the Hendrickson Homestead. Although fruits and nuts were the main crops, a small vineyard and tilled fields
Figure 25
A view of the orchard and fields southwest of the homestead site shows a cluster of walnut and apple trees. Photo taken in 2005.

produced one-half acre of grapes and one-acre of potatoes a year (Figure 25; U.S Census 1880).

SIGNIFICANCE AND INTEGRITY

Hendrickson Homestead's significance and integrity can be evaluated under the National Register's Criterion D, Information Potential, as a property that may be likely to yield information important in history.
The physical material of this important cultural resource could answer important research questions about rural agriculturists living in Sonoma County at the turn of the 20th century.

The historic context suggests several research topics for assessing the information value of the archaeological resources as contributing elements to the site. A sampling of some of the topics that can be used to evaluate the information values of Hendrickson Homestead include:

- Settlement pattern/spatial organization
- Subsistence/economic organization (Mexican commodities to small-scale subsistence farming to market commodities)
- Self-sufficiency/consumer culture (rancho to family farms to large scale commercial farms)
- Land use and environmental impacts (Native American use to rancho to family farm, industry and recreation)
- Community structure/social organization (the role of women, diversity, social mores, farm workers and residents)

CONCLUSION

The Hendrickson Homestead period, 1875 to 1905, was a period when the Rancho Los Guilicos' holdings were subdivided and used for
diverse agricultural operations. This time period encompasses important historic themes that include the development of and evolution of rural Sonoma County, economic changes from self-sufficiency to consumer culture and land use influences such as agriculture, mining and recreational use, mostly shaped by long-term residential use.

In the 1880s, the average price for land in the Sonoma and Los Guilicos valleys was $100 to $150 per acre on the valley floor and $20 to $50 per acres on the hillsides (Futini 1976:73). Willard Johnson, Jr., listed Panorama Ranch at approximately 367 acres for sale at $6,990,000 in early 2000 before Sonoma County Regional Parks acquired a portion of the saleable acres in 2003.

This increase in land value and the variety of land use Hendrickson Homestead experienced is due to inflation, but more importantly, indicative of the tremendous amount of change that occurred to Sonoma County and Los Guilicos Valley. The overarching theme of the historical overview of Hendrickson Homestead is that people lived with the land. They adapted to their environment in ways that molded their lives and influenced their surroundings, a process that continues today.
INTERPRETIVE PRODUCT BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

When Sonoma County Regional Parks first acquired the new parklands of Hood Mountain Regional Park in 2003, Steve Ehret, Park planner, learned a lot about the area's rich history from the former landowner, Willard Johnson, who lived on the property for more than 45 years.

Ehret soon thereafter requested a cultural resources study, which was conducted by Tom Origer & Associates in December 2003 within the newly acquired parklands of Hood Mountain Regional Park. A cultural resources study inventories and identifies historical and archeological resources that could be affected by an agency project. The identification includes naming properties and determining whether or not they are listed on, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places. Ehret also called for the study because under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), when a project might affect a cultural resource, the project proponent is required to conduct an assessment to determine whether the effect may be one that is significant (Ehret 2005).
Consequently, it is necessary to determine the importance of resources that could be affected.

The study done by Tom Origer & Associates provides the most comprehensive inventory of resources to date. Designed to satisfy environmental issues specified in CEQA and its guidelines (Title 14 CCR 15064.5), the cultural resources survey provides a detailed map and inventory of resources found (Figure 26). However none of the archeological resources recorded have been thoroughly evaluated to determine their significance as cultural resources. Evaluation is the process by which the significance and integrity of a history property are judged and eligibility for the National Register listing is determined. Decisions concerning the significance of a property can be made reliably only when the resource is evaluated within its historic context.

Origer's survey offers only a preliminary significance evaluation of the identified cultural resources and assesses resource vulnerability to effects that could arise from project activities. It also includes recommendations designed to protect resource integrity as warranted. The report suggests excluding the location of the prehistoric site from any Park development, such as new roads, trails and picnic areas.
Figure 26
Sketch map of Hendrickson Homestead by N. Thompson for Tom Origer & Associates' cultural resources study, December 2003.

The report also recommends protecting the four historic-period archaeological sites identified during the survey by keeping park development and potential foot traffic away from the site. If any of these resources cannot be avoided, they should then be evaluated for inclusion
on the California Register of Historical Resources to ensure their protection and preservation. Evaluation could include both site excavation and historical research.

After reviewing the findings and assessing the study’s recommendations, Ehret called for additional historical research on the historic-period sites, specifically the homestead site with the intention of creating a public interpretative product based on the research for Park visitors. Because the remnants of the Hendrickson Homestead date back to the 1870s, they are being preserved as an important historic site. As a result, an interpretive trail will loop around the homestead site with archeological features of the site fenced off from foot traffic.

INTERPRETIVE PLAN

Although Regional Parks has no written policy or formal document regarding interpretation work, outreach efforts are something the agency initiates on a case-by-case basis depending upon the significance of the resource, findings of a cultural resources study and budget. Since interpretation is only recommended but not mandated under CEQA, interpretation is not a priority on all Park projects (Ehret 2005).
Because of the information provided in the cultural resource study by Tom Origer and Associates and Ehret’s own observations of the landscape, Regional Parks thought Hendrickson Homestead’s history would be something worth interpreting for Park visitors.

With this in mind, Ehret sought additional funding for developing and executing an interpretive plan that includes materials, such as photos, maps and historical data, for both a brochure with a numbered map site and interpretive panels. The brochure will be either an 8 1/2”x11” double-sided or 11”x17” double-sided document, black and white for cost efficient reproduction. The brochure will be available at the trailhead, which will loop around the homestead site. The interpretive panels will be 24”x36” full-color and located in two different places at the historic site. The interpretive text is being formatted to meet American with Disabilities Act standards for signage.

The proposed interpretive material will include the cultural history of the site and how it relates to the local community and settlement of the area. The interpretive material will orient the visitor to site features and touch on the systems used for food, water, housing, and waste in this remote location. By providing both a timeline of the site’s history and
a map, the past can be connected to the present and provide an experiential education for the park visitor (Ehret 2005).

SOURCES OF CONTENT

Cultural resources management studies involve the synthesis of information from sources as diverse as historical documents, oral interviews, archeological site records, anthropological theory, policy documents concerning the legislative basis of CRM, and landscape observation. These sources provided the information needed to develop the public interpretive content for the homestead site in Hood Mountain Regional Park.

Rather than relying solely on historical approaches, the research benefits from a cultural landscape approach that encourages an understanding of the spatial arrangement of landscape features, and how both natural and cultural influences have interacted to create the contemporary landscape.

Examining the homestead site’s development over time adds value to the outdoor experience and captures a broader range of people’s interest. A historical approach coupled with a cultural landscape method offers a more dynamic and integrated nature of a landscape changing its
character over time. The research not only uncovered the natural and recreational values of the homestead site and surrounding area, but also revealed extensive histories of human use and modification.

Also, the National Register Bulletin's guidelines for How to Complete the National Register Registration Form provided the structure for identifying key historic context on the homestead site, as outlined in Chapter 3.

The public interpretation product that follows tries to achieve a balance between access and protection in a respectful way. The intent of the outreach materials is to keep the discussion as general as possible to interest the casual reader, while providing some details for people curious about cultural resources. Its purpose is to not only portray the landscape as a dynamic and evolving amalgam of human and natural processes, but to also explain the site's history and identify important historical themes that relate to the broad patterns of history. The homestead site's rich history echoes many of the themes that have contributed to the cultural development of the local community (Sonoma County), California and the nation. The interpretative products introduce these themes and provide a general overview of the site's development in the historic period following the area's settlement by Europeans in the early 1800s.
INTERPRETATIVE PRODUCTS

HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD TIMELINE

Historic Homestead Site on Hood Mountain Regional Park: A Classic Story of California Land Acquisition

From Indians, missionaries, and settlers to squatters, miners, and realtors, the history of California is the story of men and women claiming the land.

How the ruins you see before you came into the hands of Sonoma County Regional Parks is the story to be told here today.

Before 1769

Native California Indian Territory

For thousands of years before Spanish-speaking soldiers, missionaries, and settlers began to arrive in California in 1769, the Southern Pomo, Coast Miwok and Wappo indigenous groups shared access to this region now known as Hood Mountain Regional Park. The Wappo, a Spanish word for brave or courageous, are believed to have controlled the area, stretching from the Napa Valley, west to the hills east of Santa Rosa. The Wappo people lived in permanent villages in the
valley known today as the Valley of the Moon and seasonal campsites along Sonoma Creek, hunting, fishing and gathering plants.

1836-1877

Los Guilicos Rancho

By 1836, this region was part of the northern section of Los Guilicos Valley, named after the indigenous group who signed the peace treaty with General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, paving the way for white settlement.

In 1839 California Governor Juan Batista Alvarado grants Cap. John (Juan) Wilson, a Scottish sea captain, the 18,883-acre Los Guilicos Rancho, where Indian vaqueros tend vast herds needed to produce cowhides.

In the 1850s, William Hood, who built his fortune through construction in San Francisco, purchases the 18,883-acre Los Guilicos Rancho. In 1858 Hood builds the two-story Colonial/Greek revival house known as Hood Mansion for his bride Eliza. Under Hood’s ownership, Los Guilicos Rancho prospers as a cattle ranch and later as a farm with acres of grapes, grains and fruit trees.
Fencing and plowing are necessary to keep off squatters, who settle on Hood's land, claiming it as their own property. Hood's original purchase of 18,883 acres soon dwindles to approximately 1,700 acres. By 1877, financial troubles force Hood to subdivide and sell large sections of the land not already occupied by squatters.

1870s-1905

Hendrickson Homestead

Pioneers David and Martha Hendrickson and their four children migrate to California from Minnesota to stake out "free" land belonging to the old rancheros. Under the Homestead Act of 1862, the Hendrickson family acquires 160 acres on the Los Guilicos Rancho from the United States after proving five years of improvements to the land by establishing a residency and transforming the terrain into a productive farm. The ruins before you are what are left of the Hendrickson family's homestead.

1905-1909

Quicksilver Mine
Miner John W. Minges from Arkansas purchases the 175-acre homestead site and converts the farm into a quicksilver mine. The hillside used for mining the quicksilver ore is located behind the homestead site.

Quicksilver, also known as liquid mercury metal, was used to recover gold from ore in California gold mining. Other uses of quicksilver include the manufacture of fulminate for explosive caps. Quicksilver deposits in Sonoma County are among the oldest known in California.

1909-1918
Kearnes Ranch

U.S. State Senator Thomas Kearns, a mining tycoon from Utah, acquires the homestead site and adjoining property after purchasing Hood Mansion in 1905 as his summer home. Here he entertained Presidents Ulysses S. Grant, William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. By 1910, through acquisition of small ranches located around the property, Kearns increases the size of the ranch to nearly 1,700 acres.

1918-1924
Serck's Subdivision
Land speculator Peter Serck buys Hood Mansion and adjoining acreage, which includes the homestead site, to subdivide the property. He meets little success, selling 1,520 acres a couple of years later. In the years that followed, ownership of the homestead site, Hood Mansion and adjoining lots changes hands numerous times, with acreage being parceled off by each subsequent owner.

1924-1942

Grand Lodge of the Knights of Pythias

The Knights of Pythias, a fraternal organization espousing “Friendship, Charity and Benevolence,” purchase the remaining 111 acres to establish a home for orphaned children and the aged. Hood Mansion serves as the main office, operating the rest home and a farm adjacent to it, which eventually grows to 1,308 acres and includes the hills and watershed behind the buildings. It is believed that the Knights used the homestead site for overnight retreats.

1942-1957

Hunting Clubs
Dwindling membership forces the Knights to sell the property. Entrepreneur A.B. Knowles buys approximately 475 acres of the land, including the homestead site, which he rents out to local hunting clubs. Knowles builds a ranch house overlooking Kenwood and Valley of the Moon and lives there till the late 1950s, when he begins selling off parcels.

1957-2003
Panorama Ranch

Willard L. Johnson, a prominent San Francisco realtor, and his wife Alice purchase approximately 460 acres, including the ranch house that they name Panorama Ranch. They live there with their teenage daughter, Elizabeth, and son, Willard, who use the homestead site for hunting, hiking and horseback riding. Willard L. Johnson, Jr., inherits the property in 1987.

2003-Present
Open Space Preserve

Sonoma County Regional Parks Open Space District acquires the 335-acre Panorama Ranch from Willard L. Johnson, Jr., expanding Hood
Mountain Regional Park with trails, picnic sites and environmental hike-in campsites.

HENDRICKSION HOMESTEAD BROCHURE

Hendrickson Homestead: A Classic Story of California Land Acquisition

LAND IN CALIFORNIA

The succession of California land ownership begins in prehistory, when occupancy and use was the only land tenure recognized by Indians, who established claims to certain hunting, fishing and acorn-gathering areas.

Spain began its occupation of California in 1769 by establishing missions, presidios and pueblos, marking the beginning of European settlers claiming California land as their property.

During the Gold Rush of 1849, land was in demand as settlers came to California where gold was the principal lure. Many newcomers, however, turned from mining to agriculture; squatters and settlers broke down Mexican land grants into smaller acreages where the common person could survive as a farmer or rancher.
By the turn of the 19th century, agriculture in Sonoma County stimulated the railroad to extend a rail line from the Sonoma Valley and Santa Rosa to San Francisco.

Land in California has been a commodity since the early 1800s. The story of California land acquisition continues today, when land is in such demand that it's become a vital resource to preserve and protect for all to enjoy.

The history of the homestead site before you has come full circle, as the establishment of a park returns the land to the people and preserves the natural habitats of the region.

HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD

The standing and collapsed buildings, rock walls and fences are what's left of a small homestead built in the late 1870s by pioneers from Minnesota, David and Martha Hendrickson.

The Hendrickson family and their four children settled here in the foothills of Guilicos Valley, squatting on appropriated public lands. Under the Homestead Act of 1862, Hendrickson filed a Homestead Proof and received from the United States General Land Office in January 1891 a Homestead Patent. This granted him 160 acres from unappropriated
public lands free after proving at least five years of improvements to the land by establishing a residency and transforming the terrain into a productive farm.

The Hendrickson family cultivated potatoes, walnuts, grapes and fruit on 60 acres of the land. Hogs, chickens and milk cows were also raised. The children went to school in Santa Rosa. David and Martha Hendrickson lived here until 1905 upon retiring to Santa Rosa. He died in 1915 from bronchitis and is buried at the Santa Rosa Rural Cemetery.

After the Hendrickson family sold the property and moved to Santa Rosa in 1905, ownership changed hands numerous times. Today the homestead site is owned by Sonoma County Regional Parks and is part of Hood Mountain Regional Park. Visitors are welcome on the trails every day of the year.

NUMBERED SITE MAP

Artifacts — such as glass bottles, ceramic sherds, nails, pails and wagon axles — architectural and archaeological features, and historical research all combine to portray what daily life was like during the late 1800s at Hendrickson Homestead.
National and state laws protect this site. It is illegal to damage the site’s remains and to pick up or remove artifacts. Please report looting or vandalism to SCRP at (707) 565-2041.

1 Main Cabin

The homestead’s main cabin was a small two-story house primarily used for cooking and eating meals. It is believed that the house was built in 1875 when David and Martha Hendrickson first settled on the property. The house was a one-room structure with a loft and a small outside porch. The rock and brick hearth and chimney is constructed of dressed stone and lined with firebrick. The chimney was made of common brick and has a hole a short distance up from the firebox that was used to a vent an iron wood burning stove used for cooking. A ramp from the loft door at the back of the house dropped down to the top of the slope onto a path, which lead to the three detached bunkhouses.

2 Bunkhouses

The Hendrickson family members and farm workers reportedly slept in the bunkhouses, which were all small, wood-framed structures with a door and couple of windows. Out of the three bunkhouses two remain, one of which was rebuilt by a previous owner. Bunkhouse 1 stands on a
post and pier foundation and is built into the slope. A previous owner in an attempt to restore the structure rebuilt Bunkhouse 2. The remains of Bunkhouse 3 are north of the main cabin. Construction materials scattered in this area suggest that the building was constructed similar to Bunkhouse 1.

3 Root cellar

A root cellar is an underground pit or cellar, usually covered with earth, used for the storage of root crops and other vegetables. Although temperatures rarely drop below freezing in Sonoma County, many farms had a root cellar to keep vegetables from possibly freezing in the winter. Root cellars were not only for storing fruits and vegetables, they were also used as storage areas for other things such as preserved meat, milk and cream, fruits and vegetables — anything needed to keep cool. This rock-lined cellar, built into the slope for dryness and good ventilation, was perhaps used for potatoes and apples, and in the fall of the year, other garden produce. It has dry-laid stone walls with wood and metal beams as a part of a roof structure.

4 Outhouse

The outhouse, with an earthen floor, wood frame and shed roof, was most likely a round, deep, dry-laid, stone privy pit that periodically
needed to be emptied and cleaned. The facility was perhaps also used for bathing. Extending away from the southeastern wall of the outhouse is a ditch that empties into what is now an open, semi-circular pit.

5 Barn

The barn, a wood framed structure rectangular in shape, was located next to a large fir tree and adjacent to a flat terrace surrounded by a retaining wall. It was a small, perhaps 300 square feet, wood frame structure and reportedly provided stanchions for milk cows on the first floor with a ladder leading up to a hayloft and granary storage on the second floor. Remnants of the foundation are all that is left of the barn.

6 Cream separator

The concrete slab is believed to have been the foundation of a small building that housed the cream separator, which was invented in 1890 for separating the cream from milk. Formerly the separation was made by the gravity method, allowing the cream to rise to the top of a pan and then skimming it off. After milking the cows in the barn, the milk was put into a separator and left in a cool place, often in a root cellar, where the cream rises to the top of the mixture. Next, the fatty cream is skimmed off the top, leaving behind “skimmed milk.” The cream is poured
into a churn where it is agitated by a wooden dasher that it is pumped up and down. The cream turns into frothy whipped cream and then butter.

In 1879, before the invention of the cream separator, the Hendrickson family produced 300 pounds of butter in one year.

7 Wooden wickets

The four wooden posts located in front of the main cabin were once part of a small gate known as a wicket or stile, which was used as a barrier to animals but provided a convenient passageway through the fence crossing the footpath to the main cabin. It may have had an ordinary wire or wooden gate, which swung between the two posts set far enough apart to permit the passage of a person.

8 Retaining walls and rock fences

The rock retaining walls and fences are integral parts of this site, creating a terrace-like platform for the site of the main cabin and bunkhouses, separating the homestead site from the trail, meadow and orchard, and sectioning off paths leading to the barn, bunkhouses and outhouse. Using surrounding rocks as fencing was a cheap and practical solution for fencing domestic animals and creating retaining walls.
9 Springs & cistern

Water is available from a spring west of the homestead site and from a spring-fed stream that flows east and southeast of the site. The circular rock and concrete cistern that captures water from a spring is located about 500 feet east of the main cabin, on the south side of the road that runs past the site and is adjacent to a creek. It is estimated to be more than 50 years old.

10 Orchard trees

Walnut, apple, peach and olive trees can be found in scattered orchards southwest of the Hendrickson Homestead. Although fruit and nut trees were the main crops, a small vineyard and tilled fields produced one-half acre of grapes and one-acre of potatoes a year.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources are prehistoric/historic archaeological sites and/or the built environment, which includes historic sites, buildings, structures, objects, districts and landscapes (Office of Historic Preservation 1995).

To safeguard Hendrickson Homestead, Sonoma County Regional Parks protects this historic-period site from impacts that could occur
from increased visitor traffic. Part of SCRP's conservation and protection efforts include public interpretation — developing a preservation ethic by helping Park visitors understand the historical value embodied in a cultural resource such as Hendrickson Homestead through informative panels, brochures, exhibits, and maps.
INTRODUCTION

Public interpretation and involvement of cultural resources on public land is a valuable technique for acquainted people with their environment and heritage. Interpretation consists of developing an informed and experienced citizenry in our natural and cultural heritage — no small task. There are many challenges that face interpreters, yet a healthy, informed society depends upon effective methods and mediums of interpretation.

Because of the laws, policies, regulations and guidelines that mandate or recommend public interpretation on CRM projects, the public expects public agencies to make the right decision about how to best care for important cultural resources. According to Barbara Little, archaeologist for the National Park Service, who edited "Public Benefits of Archaeology," a collection of essays that discusses the contributions that archaeology makes beyond research, agencies are not only responsible for managing public lands, but also for incorporating public involvement and interpretation:

Members of the public are increasingly aware of the benefits of archaeology, and they are actively involved in guarding those benefits.
An active, informed public that is supportive of archaeology and archaeological preservation can serve as an invaluable source of political, volunteer and economic backing. If archaeological sites are to be preserved for the very long term, and if archaeological administration, planning, investigations, reporting and curation are to be supported for the long term, more and better public education and interpretation must become an actively pursued and highly regarded part of the discipline of archaeology (Little 2002:7).

Many times, such as the case with Sonoma County Regional Parks, public outreach and participation occur as a result of research efforts on important resources. But this should not be the only reason for generating interpretation products. A strategic plan with specific policies on protecting, preserving and interpreting cultural resources should be the driving force behind outreach efforts. These policies should incorporate the agency’s history, mission, goals and vision with the laws, policies, regulations and guidelines that mandate and recommend public interpretation on CRM work.

The spirit of the legal mandates requires agencies like SCRP to ensure that archaeological information is provided to the public in an informative manner. Because SCRP does not have existing policies or guidelines on the preservation, interpretation and protection of cultural resources, this chapter recommends developing and adopting some kind of policy on cultural resources that includes an interpretive program. The first portion of this chapter suggests revising SCRP’s existing
management framework, which consists of an Outdoor Recreation Plan (ORP) and a personnel Policy and Procedure Manual, to include policies on managing and interpreting cultural resources.

REVISION OF EXISTING PLANS AND POLICIES

The only two existing documents that outline SCRP policies are the Outdoor Recreation Plan and a personnel Policy and Procedure Manual, both of which have no information on managing cultural resources. With this in mind, to comply with CEQA and other legislative mandates, a revision of both documents is highly recommended to incorporate policies on protecting, preserving and interpreting cultural resources.

The ORP was first drafted in 1995. The Board of Supervisors, acting concurrently as the Directors of the Sonoma County Water Agency and the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, directed the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department to develop a County Wide Outdoor Recreation Plan for Sonoma County.

The plan is intended to identify existing and future parkland and recreation needs and recommends specific projects that could address these needs and identifies policies and financing options to assist with implementation of projects. The overarching problem with the ORP is that
it does not identify policies to assist with projects in regards to cultural resources. It also does not include any information on resource protection and interpretation efforts in regards to SCRP's existing outdoor recreation facilities and future parkland.

The ORP is a broad planning document, but it should reflect SCRP's dedication to preserving, protecting and interpreting cultural resources. This could be addressed in Chapter 3 of the ORP, which recommends policies and establishes a policy framework for the ORP. This framework includes goals, objectives and related policies that are recommended for the successful implementation of the plan. SCRP could draft an additional policy in Chapter 3 on resource protection, explaining how the agency will manage activities related to the management and perpetuation of cultural resources in Sonoma County Parks.

For example, SCRP could maintain a current map and written inventory of all cultural features and sites found on parkland to ensure the preservation and protection of cultural features. Other methods for implementing resource protection policy include evaluating significant cultural and historic sites to determine if they should be nominated for State Historic Landmark status or for the National Register of Historic Places; acquiring cultural and historic resource sites when they are within
lands that meet parkland acquisition criteria; and maintaining an active archive of its institutional history and the history of its parklands and trails.

When it comes to interpretation, the ORP could also have a section in Chapter 3 that outlines how and why SCRP will mentor practices to sustain education and interpretation of Sonoma County Park's cultural riches. Also, policies on how to manage facilities such as campsites, trails, roads, water, visitor centers, and restrooms are essential in meeting the demands of protecting resources, educating the public and enabling recreation. Lastly, public safety policies that relate to resource protection should also be mentioned in Chapter 3 of the ORP. It is the obligation of SCRP to ensure that visitors are well informed and that disturbing, looting or destroying cultural resources is a violation of the law. To maintain order, Park employees need to know the protocol of how to handle potential harm to a cultural resource or important site by Park visitors.

The only mention of resource management is in the goals section of the ORP. One out of nine goals suggests reviewing existing and/or establishing policies for resource management, recreation activities, outdoor recreation planning policies, and outdoor recreation classification by type. Because the ORP is a ten-year plan extending from 2000 to
2010, hopefully by the end of that time SCRP will reach their goals and the ORP will reflect established policies for resource management and interpretation.

Another section that needs revision in the ORP is the vision. The vision of the ORP Plan makes no reference to interpretation (Sonoma County Outdoor Recreation Plan 2003: 2). A revised vision statement in the ORP should include a line or two about envisioning a plan that includes guidelines on interpreting Sonoma County's important cultural resources to engage visitors in their cultural heritage.

The other SCRP document that needs revision is the Sonoma County Regional Parks Policy and Procedure Manual. This document really serves as an employee handbook, covering issues such as dress code, first aid and rescue, training policy, payroll, accountability for cash handling, and other Park related procedures such as camping receipt books and logs, recycling, lost and found, boat policy, and volunteer vest policies. Still, a section on park patrol standards and law enforcement policy statements, which include policies on managing cultural resources and the protocol for handling trespassing, looting or destroying important cultural resources, would be useful here. An order describing SCRP's legal charge in regards to cultural resources, as required by the Public
Resources Code, and the California Code of Regulations, would also maintain order and provide Park rangers and personnel the tools and protocol to better administer, protect, and provide for recreational opportunity and resource management.

PROCESS FOR AN INTERPRETATIVE PLAN

Models of interpretation from the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation framework, and concepts and theories of interpretation developed by experts in the cultural resources management field such as James J. Jameson, Freedman Tilden and Ian Hodder, as outlined in Chapter 2, provide valuable insights for developing a cultural resource policy that includes an interpretation program for SCRP.

An interpretive plan or prospectus defines what and how an organization will tackle the task of presenting its stories to the public. It requires thought before action. An interpretative plan defines key themes and strategies to develop and the means for developing and implementing them. A plan guides and coordinates the work of interpretation. The process of planning for interpretation:
1) considers the visitors who come to the site or area, as well as those it serves beyond the property.

2) defines the special value, significance and purpose of the place.

3) sets up key goals, so interpreters know what they're trying to do and evaluators can determine how well they do it.

4) outlines the approaches taken to interpret the site, from themes to the methods and media to use.

5) prescribes the best mix of the methods, media and messages.

6) gives broad, general guidelines for a new or revised exhibit center and arrangements, trail schema and other facilities.

7) considers timing and financing of new developments. (Knudson, Cable and Beck 1995:131-207)

Using these processes, Sonoma County Regional Parks could develop an interpretive plan, deciding when and where to use signs, brochures and exhibits. An interpretive plan would give Sonoma County Regional Parks long-term plans for presenting key messages. An interpretive prospectus, consisting of analysis, identification and prescription of four major components — park story, themes, objectives (i.e., desired outcomes/futures) and media (e.g., visitor center, trails, waysides, brochures) — would provide the outline needed for Regional
Park's to implement interpretative efforts. Although the above structure may appear rigid, many variations can exist from park to park and from the various players involved in the planning and execution of outreach products.

For example, a cultural resources interpretive plan for a specific park should first identify at least three goals that take into account the unique character of the park's physical and cultural environment and the diversity of its visitors. Secondly, the plan should list at least three interpretive themes that explain the cultural history and environment of the park consistent with the interpretive goals. Lastly, the interpretative plan should implement the goals by creating levels of discourse with layers of interpretation. Levels of discourse in interpretation recognize the different characteristics of the audience addressed. By framing interpretive programs within varying levels of difficulty to reach as many visitors as possible, segments of audiences are not ignored and the visitor who wants the most information possible will receive it.

Examples of different levels of discourse include the general question, "what is it?" The next level addresses "how" questions to give audiences more information than just the functional interpretations of artifacts. The highest level of discourse provides answers to the "why"
questions. It requires interaction with the visitor who seeks answers to far-ranging questions concerning culture and ideology (Knudson, Cable and Beck 1995).

These levels of discourse provide solutions to how we communicate with an audience. Accomplishing interpretive goals, however, is best managed through a variety of opportunities and experiences for visitor enjoyment and appreciation (USDA Forest Service 1989). Modes or layers of interpretation overlap and can be combined with levels of discourse in various ways to make interpretive subthemes come alive for diverse audiences (Whittlesey and Farrell 1997). Examples of layers of interpretation include activities and exhibits at the visitor center; on-location interpretation such as outdoor displays, interpretive trails and wayside panels; guided walking tours; public lectures; participatory exhibits in which visitors learn by doing; and informal classes and workshops that serve as teaching tools while offering new skills.

An interpretative plan that incorporates all of the elements mentioned above has defined audiences, identified needs, selected goals and developed strategies for implementation, all geared toward helping people feel they are a part of the landscape. The challenge for SCRP is to carry out a plan such as this and include visitors in the experience, for
they are a part of the human story of Sonoma County. With a strong interpretation plan in place, archaeologists, conservationists, and state and federal agencies can forge a cooperative approach to interpretation that will involve the public, the private sector, and SCRP in fulfilling its recreational, educational and interpretive potential.

PRINCIPLES FOR AN INTERPRETIVE PLAN

Managing lands through public interpretation and involvement is one principle that can be used to guide the development of an interpretive program — an interpretative program that recognizes the integrated nature of the landscape by embracing historical development and local context as crucial factors in understanding any ecological system and accepting that human activity and natural processes are integral to shaping the landscape.

User groups are major agents in landscape interpretation. Since public lands can be the focus of conflicting ideas regarding its history and use, it is important to recognize the public’s right to be involved in interpretation decisions. Because SCRP’s policies do not include any guidelines on generating community input (surveys, public workshops, and citizen advisory committees) on cultural resources and interpretation
topics, management should identify goals related to different groups in their use of the land, instead of viewing the visitor as a problem or something to be controlled. A relationship with local tribes to create protocols on the findings of a prehistoric site should also be established. Advisory groups, public meetings, ethnographic assessments of user attitudes, and land or trail stewardship programs are also all methods for greater public involvement.

Public education is another vital component for managing cultural resources and involving the public. Preparation of pamphlets for public distribution at interpretive displays and during interpretive programs, describing the role of park visitors in the protection of nonrenewable cultural resources, is highly recommended. This elucidated and clarifies both the history of the landscape and current management issues to help inform debates surrounding contemporary land use.

Public interpretation materials often explain the significance of a site or resource, giving it relevance in its larger community. Interpretation is a useful tool that gives people the experiential and informational context in which to value something. It can greatly deepen the public's understanding of the historical evolution of landscapes and the complexity of managing a park such as Hood Mountain Regional Park. It
can also assist the public in making sense of the landscape around them, subtly encouraging greater individual responsibility in preserving and protecting cultural resources. A well-outlined interpretive program that uses examples from a landscape’s natural, cultural and recreational features to portray its historical evolution and contemporary situation is an invaluable method for instilling preservation values in the public.

GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING AN INTERPRETIVE PLAN

The following section translates the principles given above to develop guidelines for incorporating an interpretive program within the existing management framework of Sonoma County Regional Parks. An effective and useful means to achieve Regional Parks’ primary management goals of preservation and protection of cultural resources within the park should include public interpretation. With this in mind, a revision of the agency’s mission statement with the addition of core program areas and a values and vision statement would better reflect their goals of integrating an interpretation program into their management practices.

Mission statement: Understanding the agency’s mission and committing to achieving it are essential elements for success. The mission
describes why agency such as SCRP exists and what it does. SCRP's existing mission statement, stated in Chapter 1, however does not make reference to the work the agency does on public outreach and interpretation. A revised mission statement should include information on their outreach efforts.

**Core program areas:** SCRP should also develop core program areas such as resource protection; education and interpretation; facilities; public safety; and recreation to explain how these areas are the essence of the agency's business and are directly linked to their mission. Each core program area, in turn, has identified outcomes.

**Values statement:** A values statement also developed by SCRP would express the agency's enduring ideals, or shared beliefs, required of Park employees. Identifying these beliefs is really important for providing guidance in achieving the agency's mission.

**Vision statement:** Additionally, a vision statement helps employees have a clear image of the ideal future. A series of strategic initiatives could provide implementation of the agency's vision. For example, strategic initiatives could include increase leadership in parks and recreation, focus on cultural resources by realizing potential of cultural sites and interpretation, develop a new image, and expand
recreational and interpretation opportunities to keep the pace with Sonoma County’s growing, diverse population and changing lifestyles.

By developing a strategic plan that incorporates a mission, core program areas, values and vision, SCRP would be able to update their planning mechanisms to develop effective, long-term integrated management that includes an interpretation and resource management program. A long-term general plan reflective of an interpretation program that values the evolutionary development of a parkland’s landscape and an understating of how parklands are valued by contemporary user groups would also be a start for putting into practice a new management plan.

Management goals can include generating outreach materials on a regular basis by involving the public and acknowledging the historic, natural and recreational values of each park. Operational plans can include budgets for public interpretation products and outreach efforts with strategies for implementing interpretation into resource management plans. And lastly, community-based advisory groups can assist in the publicizing of park developments and restoration efforts to broader user groups. Advisory groups can be valuable in promoting greater community involvement. The group could be comprised of SCRP staff and community
representation drawn from user groups and local government
organizations (Waghorn 2002: 204-206).

There are also several ways to ensure greater public involvement.
Ideas include involvement through advisory groups and stewardship
programs. Sonoma County Regional Parks already operates a program of
volunteers who work regularly under staff supervision to maintain existing
trails within the parks, but the agency could also initiate a stewardship
program that allows specific user groups to take additional responsibilities
to maintain park resources.

Because SCRP has no policy for public involvement, other
recommendations include making management plans, major project plans
and important decisions made by the advisory group more readily
available to the public through meetings, newspaper notices, newsletters,
Web site postings, and park bulletin boards. Although SCRP’s Web site
and various park bulletin boards do post current news of park projects
and developments, an advisory group that organizes community
workshops, surveys and other opportunities for communicating with the
public would streamline public involvement efforts and generate more
community participation in park developments.
Lastly, ethnographic studies, using suitable consultant expertise, of the park’s user and management groups would elucidate the values which different groups hold for a piece of land (Waghorn 2002:207-208).

An interpretative program would help visitors see Sonoma County Regional Parks as an evolving agency, not as a static entity, in which their own actions play a role. Archaeological data, sites and historic research of landscape features in county parks can be used to interpret Sonoma County’s vivid and complex history of landscape evolution. The interpretive plan should take an integrated approach to interpreting the various county parks by considering natural, historical and recreational values. The interpretive plan should also take a landscape method by presenting sites and features as part of a larger landscape, elucidating the history of landscape change through the present day with discussions of management objectives and stimulating discussion of preservation, cultural resources management and land use in Sonoma County.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HENDRICKSON HOMESTEAD

Hendrickson Homestead is part of a larger agricultural landscape that includes Los Guilicos Valley, Sonoma County, the state of California and the nation. Its history illustrates how the establishment of a park can
return the land to the people and preserve the resources of the region. Landscape features and historical and archaeological research on topics such as circulation networks, water systems, vegetation change, fences, foundations, trenches, privy pits, footpaths, glass bottles, tin can dumps, and farmsteads consisting of barns, outbuildings, and houses all reflect the influence of people and their communities and the values they ascribe to the land.

To fully interpret and understand the complexities of human influences on the Hendrickson Homestead landscape, while embracing archaeological values and public interpretive concepts, Sonoma County Regional Parks has a great challenge. Meeting this challenge requires a willingness to develop an interpretative plan that incorporates a more thorough examination of potentially significant prehistoric and historic sites, while conserving natural and archaeological values and responding to the values and concerns of the park's stakeholders.

Historical research, a sufficient method for providing an overview of a site, does not afford the entire scope needed to fully comprehend a site's significance. Instead, combining archaeology, history and ethnography as an interpretive method transforms archeological resources into property types.
To understand the complexities of the site's operations concerning water use as well as farming practices and other domestic routines, a more thorough examination of the site's features are recommended. With this in mind, an archeological excavation of existing privy pits, creek beds, ditches, cellars, and foundations for Hendrickson Homestead in conjunction with the historical research is highly recommended to determine if the site meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Places. This research would provide SCRP substantial evidence to determine whether or not the site is historically significant. This formal evaluation within the criteria of the CRHR of all the archaeological resources identified within the park would provide a whole landscape interpretation of the site and improve upon already existing interpretative materials. The buildings, though ruined, are all over 45 years old and should also be recorded for inclusion in the State of California Office of Historic Preservation filing system.

Because the homestead site may be eligible for listing on the CRHR and NRHP, SCRP may want to consider finding the funds for additional archaeological and historical research on the site. Benefits for being listed on a local register or the CRHR or the NRHP include limited protection where an environmental review may be required under CEQA if the
property is threatened by a project; tax incentives, in some cases, for rehabilitation of depreciable structures; consideration in federally funded or licensed undertakings (Section 106 and the National Historic Preservation Act); and automatic listing in the CRHR with a plaque or marker at the resource site (NPS 2002).

An additional field survey of areas with extreme steep slopes should also be conducted, specifically the area of a reported quicksilver mine. It is likely that archeological materials are obscured on this site by dense ground cover of native and exotic grasses and other vegetation.

CONCLUSION

People have a strong affinity for contact with history. Historical interpretations, through various methods, make history and archaeology come alive. Interpretation develops local support for conservation or historic preservation. It adds value to a park by helping visitors enjoy it more, learn more about it and make it a part of their own lives. Interpretation also serves the agencies managing the land by helping people understand the needs and processes of management and developing empathy with the organization through intelligent, nonpropagandistic explanations.
Still, with the endorsement of interpretation as a necessary management tool, many interpreters feel perplexed by the weak financial support they sometimes get from their organization. Many agencies don’t have the funds to generate interpretative materials and other public outreach efforts. When times are tough, interpretation projects and staff are often the first on the chopping block to be cut.

However, the agencies that recognize the benefits of outreach perhaps think otherwise before making cuts to interpretation efforts. Interpreters meet the higher, more refined needs of a visitor, but they also serve agency survival needs. For the agency, interpreters boost public support by presenting the agency in its best light, portraying parks in their full value and providing the richest possible level of visitor experience. In recent years, agencies have placed new emphasis on the management benefits of interpretation to justify maintaining programs (Knudson, Cable and Beck 1995:82-83).

There are now ways to estimate the quality, benefits and efficiency of interpretation, even as it relates to management. It starts with questions of how to succeed at influencing visitor and park employee attitudes and affecting their behavior. Specific methods for gauging the success of interpretation programs include providing opportunities for the
public and park staff to give feedback through surveys, electronic newsletters, e-mails generated from the agency’s Web site, and comment/complaint boxes available at all park entrances.

Sonoma County Regional Parks could greatly benefit from adopting an interpretive strategy into their existing management framework that reflects past and contemporary social values and practices of a landscape. The development of an interpretative program would provide a forum in which Sonoma County Regional Parks could play a vital role in shaping public perception of not only the agency and their management practices, but also of important cultural resources, recognizing the many different values that managers and the public bring to public land.
CYPRESS REPLACEMENT PROJECT

The Cypress Replacement Project in Oakland, California, where the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in partnership with the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) of Sonoma State University (SSU), produced historical studies in connection with archaeological data recovery, provided an excellent source of material for a range of public outreach efforts that informed a specific community about the results of those studies. The results were so successful that the City of Oakland in 2004 commended SSU and Caltrans for their efforts in preserving and presenting West Oakland's archaeology and the dissemination of its history. Caltrans also got an award from the Society for Historical Archaeology for their efforts.

The following section looks at the Cypress Replacement Project as a case example of a successfully implemented public interpretation program with a state agency and a university cultural resources management firm. It provides the model for future public outreach efforts and illustrates the techniques for developing interpretative products.
In 1989, the Loma Prieta earthquake fiercely shook the Bay Area, and in its wake left behind many destroyed structures, including a section of the I-880 Cypress Freeway in West Oakland, severely damaging the surrounding area of a historic neighborhood, one of the first settlements in Oakland with buildings and artifacts dating back to the 1870s. When Caltrans announced that the freeway would be rebuilt, the community voiced strong opposition and proposed that an alternative route should be selected to bypass most of the residential district.

As a result, Caltrans developed a new route, but the new alignment presented a unique set of problems. It now transversed a part of this historic neighborhood, whose remains were buried by the growing city. Janet Pape, archaeology manager for Caltrans, saw a potential for historical archaeology within the project. She knew that California’s Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) required that the historical areas needed to be investigated by archeologists before they were destroyed by construction. Complying with Section 106 of NHPA usually involves a long, sequential process of identification of cultural resources, followed by evaluation to determine which properties are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), followed in turn by a data-
recovery program for eligible resources. But another approach was necessary with the Cypress Project, as parking lots, buildings and other features of the urbanized landscape masked all evidence of archaeological features (M. Praetzellis and S. Stewart 1997:1-4). Therefore, in consultations with Adrian Praetzellis of the ASC, these issues were addressed by implementing a new approach to complying with the historic preservation regulations that collapsed the normal three-phase process into a single phase and necessitates determination of NRHP eligibly of archeological discoveries in the field.

Not only did this unique approach to Section 106 compliance require the support of Caltrans management, it also needed the approval of the Federal Highway Administration, State Office of Historic Preservation and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (M. Praetzellis and S. Stewart 1997:1-4).

Additionally the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeological Documentation came into play because one of the requirements is that the results of archaeological documentation be made available to the public. Because the Cypress Project was funded in part by the Federal Highway Administration, it was their responsibility to make sure that that public interpretation was carried out. It was also the
Federal Highway Administration’s responsibility to make sure Section 106 was implemented. Section 106 puts the responsibility on the federal officials such as the Federal Highway Administration, not on the contractor or agency such as the ASC and Caltrans. The Federal Highway Administration helped fund the public outreach because it’s part of the law and mitigation is part of Section 106.

It was an arduous effort for Pape to convince Caltrans management to do the historical archeology and outreach efforts because Caltrans didn’t understand the value of doing such work because they were use to doing only prehistoric archaeology on a project (Pape 2002). So Pape persuaded Caltrans to see that they had to do historical archaeology and that the laws and regulations required it. Caltrans finally consented and contracted with the Sonoma State University’s Academic Foundation to have the ASC create a treatment plan and initiate studies for historical archaeology.

When archaeologists first started the project in 1992, they didn’t know how much archaeological data recovery there would be. They didn’t know how disturbed the area was or if it once contained industries that would have produced contaminated soils. But about half way through the first field season, they realized the magnitude of possible historical
cultural resources within the project area. In the process of discussing the whole project and evaluating their findings, the ASC saw the potential for public outreach. Pape then had to convince Caltrans to do the public outreach, explaining that it creates a positive image in the community for the agency. With the final support of Caltrans, the ASC made a case in the treatment plan and research design as part of the second contract that committed Caltrans to initiating a public interpretative program of some kind.

The research design treatment plan, "West Oakland: A Place to Start From," states that "Standard IV of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeological Documentation mandates that the 'results of archaeological documentation are reported and made available to the public'" (48 CFR 44734).

The research design cited options for interpretation, which included:

1. Design a mobile exhibit that could be installed in various local public facilities to showcase the cultural studies. 2. Fund a program to work with Oakland public school officials to develop a teaching unit on aspects of local African American history and archaeology. 3. Sponsor the creation, by a local public school or college, of a video documenting local history, oral history interviews and archaeological remains. 4. Engage a local historical or cultural group, such as the Oakland-based Northern California Center for Afro-American History and Life, to create a public interpretative product. 5. Recast the technical report on the archaeological
investigation into a popularly written monograph highlighting the history and archeology of West Oakland. This monograph would be distributed to local schools, libraries and interested parties. In the research design it also states that copies of the final reports will be provided to the Advisory Council, Caltrans, FHWA, State Office for Historic Preservation, the appropriate State Archaeological Information Center, public libraries, research libraries, and other interested parties (M. Praetzellis 1994:398).

It was also anticipated that articles would be prepared for publication in professional and lay journals that address the findings of the archaeological and historical components of the Cypress Replacement Project.

More than 40 city blocks were researched for their potential to contain National Register-eligible properties. Archaeologists from the ASC, in cooperation with Caltrans and the Federal Highways Administration, spent 78 weeks between April 1994 and May 1996 excavating well over 2,500 archaeological features from wooden-lined pits, privies and wells. More than 500 boxes filled with artifacts came in from the field. Over 120 discrete artifact assemblages were recovered and associated with specific households. A wide variety of groups were represented, from unskilled working-class households to upper-middle-class families, immigrants from numerous countries, and native-born whites and African Americans. Artifacts discovered included china, crystal, ceramics, glass, and food
bones, showing what life was like in 19th-century America, revealing the way people lived and providing a glimpse into West Oakland’s households.

To interpret these archaeological findings, it was essential to also understand the built environment. Structures such as cottages and small houses were analyzed, recorded and evaluated for their architectural importance in terms of National Register criteria. While archaeological and built environment studies are primary tools for examining the history of the area, oral history interviews focused the lifeways of several ethnic populations that lived in this West Oakland neighborhood. While the diversity of ethnic groups’ experiences was a primary focus of the oral-history research, interviews were also used to elicit opinions and facts on topics relating to home, work, family and community.

The more research the practitioners did about the history of the people that lived there, the more they wanted to get the information out to the community. The oral history component inspired them to do more, too, as the first round of interviews was so successful that it warranted additional interviews (M. Praetzellis and S. Steward 1997:1-4). Pape describes it as the “snowball effect:"

I knew we’d be in the field for some time, and here we had this community that was interested in the history and there were so many different ethnic groups that lived in Oakland and in that neighborhood that I felt obligated to let them all know about their own history. It was
an opportunity to really make this a really cohesive community when this freeway had divided it for so long. And once we started the archaeology, so many people would come around and look through the fence and ask questions and the people who lived there seemed very interested in it (Pape 2002).

Because the Cypress Replacement Project was considered a particularly long-term and highly visible project, the historical studies produced in connection with archaeological data recovery provided a wealth of material for a wide range of public outreach efforts that not only created goodwill among the West Oakland community, but also informed them about the results of those studies.

But how would Pape, the ASC and all others involved with the Federal Highway Administration’s funding fulfill its obligation to producing public interpretation materials of this project?

The first year into the project, Pape organized a press day for local newspapers because so many people were coming out to the site, wondering what was going on. She worked internally with Caltrans' public relations department and wrote press releases and articles about the project for media outlets and Caltrans' newsletters. She also had a public information office set up for the project and hired a public relations firm to do outreach work.
Also within that first year, an oral history program was launched by the ASC where 18 interviews were conducted with former West Oakland residents. Thirty interviews on occupational lore were conducted with African American porters, barbers, hairdressers, railroad workers, musicians, dancers and others who formerly lived in West Oakland. All interviews were put on file at the Oakland History Room (A. Praetzellis and M. Praetzellis 2004: Appendix A 3).

Other outreach efforts included tours of the excavations by historical societies, college archaeology classes, and the local community. Pape, when hosting a tour on the project area, would ask visitors to write a letter to the district director stating how they valued being able to come out on the project.

Caltrans also contracted a local filmmaker to produce an educational video called "Privy to the Past" on the historical archaeology of the Cypress Project. Completed in 1999, the video was distributed to Bay Area colleges and universities and made available to institutions and agencies that manage cultural resources. In July 1999 there was a public screening of "Privy to the Past" at Caltrans District 4 office in Oakland (A. Praetzellis and M. Praetzellis 2004: Appendix A 3-4).
Other interpretive products include "Sights & Sounds: Essays in Celebration of West Oakland." This publication fills a position between the practitioners efforts of examining West Oakland’s history — which is the widely distributed research design and treatment plan “West Oakland: A Place to Start From” — and the final reports that detail the study’s findings and interpretations.

However, the outreach materials that generated the most positive feedback and reached the most people were the three mobile exhibits developed from the historical archaeology of the Cypress Replacement Project. One exhibit, entitled “Holding the Fort,” a tribute to the African American labor movement in West Oakland, was created and developed by the African American Museum and Library at Oakland, the ASC and Caltrans. It is a high-quality, three-panel, two-sided mobile exhibit, produced by the museum’s director and an outfit that creates exhibits for the Oakland Museum. From 1996 to 1999, this exhibit traveled to many different venues arranged by Pape and the ASC, including branches of the Oakland Public Library. When the exhibit opened, at a different library, Caltrans and ASC personnel and associates would make presentations and speak about the archaeology. It was also displayed at Oakland City Hall.
after Pape called the curator and asked if it would be possible display the exhibit there.

Pape then took things a step further and asked some of Caltrans management to come and talk about the project in the rotunda of Oakland City Hall. The event was broadcast on the evening news. The exhibit showed at other venues such as the Amtrak station in Oakland and the National Civil Rights Conference in Scottsdale, Ariz., which was sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration and the American Association of State Transportation Officials. This exhibit was eventually gifted to the African American Museum and Library in Oakland and can be viewed there today.

A smaller exhibit focusing on the project and the processes of the archeological investigations made appearances at many county fairs and celebrations such as Earth Day in Alameda County. A third photo exhibit — two-panels, one sided, showing historical archaeology at work and displaying some of the tools they use — debuted at Caltrans headquarters in Sacramento, complementing the other two exhibits.

By 2004, the final product of the Cypress Archaeology Project, "Putting the 'There' There: Historical Archaeologies of West Oakland" was published. This publication presents the how, why, where, and who of the
Cypress Archaeology Project along with a brief narrative history of West Oakland as well as chapters on the material conditions of life in West Oakland and recommendations for future work on archeology projects.

To improve public interpretation outcomes for future cultural resources management efforts, recommendations in this publication include: designating an outreach coordinator to pursue all potential avenues for local cooperation including official citywide and larger-scale organizations such as the news media; resolving public access issues such as safety, health and insurance plans and policies before initiating any visitor tours; and developing a strategy for keeping outreach products, such as CDs, paper reports and exhibits, available to the public after the end of a project (A. Praetzellis and M. Praetzellis 2004:325-328).

Another interpretive tool the Cypress Archaeology Project staff used to reach the public was the Internet, which proved to be an incredible source for disseminating information and receiving public input. While the Internet did not substitute for other forms of outreach since the ASC staff acknowledged that not everyone has access to a computer, it did provide a place for the Cypress Archaeology Project staff to share the project’s various products and outcomes. The Internet also serves as source of permanence for a project’s afterlife.
The public outreach and interpretive efforts such as the information on the Web, exhibits, publications, and video were produced because of the forward thinking, grassroots efforts and committed spirit of Caltrans and the ASC. It was a collaborative and complex effort between a number of other people as well, including curators, filmmakers, photographers, historians, architectural historians, researchers and larger entities, such as the Federal Highway Administration, State Office of Historic Preservation and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, five different railroad companies, the U.S. Army and the Oakland Main Post Office. It’s because of their dedication and entrepreneurial spirit that the Cypress Replacement Project was able to capture forgotten memories and retrieve a part of Oakland history that would have been lost forever.

The Cypress Replacement Project is significant because it’s an excellent example to the nation of how CRM practitioners on a grassroots level have incorporated public interpretation into the compliance process. It’s also a significant project to acknowledge because it was one of the first ASC and Caltrans projects that generated such a wide scope of public outreach materials. The project really tapped into every type of public outreach that there is, using the media — TV and newspapers — as
a venue as well. Other reasons why this project is so special is because of the different approach that the ASC proposed to simplify the three-phase process of Section 106.

Lastly, the Cypress Replacement Project is the culmination of a whole new way of looking at and presenting archaeology, both professionally and to other audiences. Cypress was designed to produce multiple levels of products that were useful to multiple audiences. The ASC and Caltrans decided to split up the different types of products and focus them towards different users with technical reports and popular publications. In the attempt to serve two publics — professional archaeologists and interested community members — the interpretative undertakings for the Cypress Archaeology Project were an overall success. The ASC in partnership with Caltrans not only complied with Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations to create technical reports that fulfill the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, they also used the purpose of the law with the resources they had to make the archaeological site and findings available for long-term public benefit.
APPENDIX B

Homestead Proof.

TESTIMONY OF CLAIMANT.

Full and specific answers must be given to each question. Failure to answer will be fatal to the proof.

David A. Blackwood, being called as a witness in his own behalf in support of Homestead Entry No. 111, Dec. 7, 1870, for lot 12, Sec. 7, T. 33, R. 6, M. D., testifies as follows:

Ques. 1.—What is your name, age and post-office address?
Answer: David Blackwood, 53, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County.

Ques. 2.—Are you a NATIVE BORN citizen of the United States, and if so, in what State or Territory were you born?
Ans. Yes.

Ques. 3.—Are you the identical person who made Homestead Entry No. 111, Dec. 7, 1870, at the San Francisco land office, on the 13th day of August, 1870, and what is the true description of the land now claimed by you?
Ans. Yes; lot 12, Sec. 7, T. 33, R. 6, M. D.

Ques. 4.—When was your house built on the land, and when did you establish actual residence thereon? Describe said house and other improvements which you have placed on the land, giving total value thereof.
Ans. Built there in 1873; some improvements have been added at that time. Whole house was about 3 years afterwards built on addition 18x24. Did not have of said 20 acres of Place — Plum trees.

Ques. 5.—Of whom does your family consist; and have you and your family resided continuously on the land since first establishing residence thereon? If unmarried, state the fact.
Ans. Wife, four daughters, myself. Not at all the time.

Ques. 6.—For what period or periods have you been absent from the Homestead since making settlement, and for what purpose; and if temporarily absent, did your family reside upon and cultivate the land during such absence?
Ans. Temporarily absent on business, was about 8 months in 1871. Satisfied the land myself.

* In case the party is of foreign birth, a certified transcript from the court records of his declaration of intention to become a citizen, or of his naturalization, or a copy thereof certified by the officer taking this proof, must be filed with the case. Evidence of naturalization is only required in cases (few years) Homestead cases.
Ques. 7.—How much of the land have you cultivated each season, and for how many seasons have you raised crops thereon?

Ans. About six acres. About 11 years.

Ques. 8.—Is your present claim within the limits of an incorporated town or selected site of a city or town, or used in any way for trade or business?

Ans. No, sir.

Ques. 9.—What is the character of the land? Is it timber, mountainous, prairie, grazing, or ordinary agricultural land? State its kind and quality, and for what purpose it is most valuable.

Ans. Grazing. Most valuable for grazing stock.

Ques. 10.—Are there any indications of coal, salines, or minerals of any kind on the land? If so, describe what they are, and state whether the land is more valuable for agricultural than for mineral purposes.

Ans. No.

Ques. 11.—Have you ever made any other Homestead entry? If so, describe the same.

Ans. No, sir.

Ques. 12.—Have you sold, conveyed or mortgaged any portion of the land; and if so, to whom and for what purpose?

Ans. No, sir.

Ques. 13.—Have you any personal property of any kind elsewhere than on this claim? If so, describe the same, and state where the same is kept.

Ans. No, sir.

[

Daniel, H. Hendricks

I hereby certify that the foregoing testimony was read to the claimant before being subscribed, and was sworn to before me, this 10 day of January, 1891.

Note.—The officer before whom the testimony is taken should call the attention of the witness to the following section of the Revised Statutes, and state to him that it is the purpose of the Government, if it be ascertained that he testifies falsely, to prosecute him to the full extent of the law.

Title LXXI.—CRIMES.—Ch. 4.

Sec. 120. Every person who, having taken oath before a competent tribunal, officer or person, in any case to which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will certify, declare, depose or certify truly, or that any written testimony, declaration, deposition, or certificate by him subscribed is true, wilfully and knowingly to such oath, visa or certificate any material matter which he does not believe to be true, is guilty of perjury, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment at hard labor, not more than five years, and shall, moreover, thereafter be incapable of giving testimony in any court of the United States until such time as the judgment against him is reversed. (See § 750.)
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