

4.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.2.1 Introduction

This section discusses the potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from implementation of the proposed project. The project area and its vicinity are known to contain numerous traces of past human activity, ranging from early Native American sites and artifacts to the remains of historic-era agricultural and ranching activities. Such materials can be found at many locations on the landscape and are protected under various federal, state, and local statutes, including CEQA.

4.2.2 Methodology

Documenting the presence of cultural resources in the project area and determining their significance per California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) criteria was accomplished through a combination of background documentary research and field investigations. Documentary research included a record search of the study area conducted through the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). Although the NWIC search revealed the presence of a number of cultural resource studies that had been conducted in the general area, the most relevant to the study area was the work conducted directly on the project site by Tom Origer and Associates in 2001 (see below). This study identified a number of prehistoric and historic-era resources situated within the Upper Range Vineyard Project properties.

In order to confirm the locations and character of the sites noted by Origer, EDAW archaeologists conducted a reconnaissance of the property and re-mapped the locations of resources (utilizing GPS equipment) considered to be potentially significant and subject to project related disturbances.

Previous cultural resource investigations identified an abandoned mine and what appeared to be the remains of historic period buildings and structures (RUR-6) which could be impacted by the proposed project (Origer 2001). Other similar sites have been documented within the vicinity of RUR-6, and together constitute a residential/ranching complex dating to the latter decades of the 19th century. These resources were not evaluated during previous investigations in regard to potential eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

As a supplemental investigation to previous studies conducted within the project area, EDAW undertook research including archival studies and oral history interviews. Preliminary background information was obtained from historical Napa County maps,

General Land Office (GLO) Plat maps, Master Title Plat maps and associated historical index. Subsequent historical research then focused on previous owners of the subject property utilizing deed research, state land patent records, Declarations of Homestead, and United States census records. Finally, local historical and biographical materials on Napa County history were obtained from various libraries and repositories, including: the Napa Public Library, the Napa Historical Society, the Napa County Assessor's Office, the Napa County Recorder's Office, the California State Library's California History Room and Government Publications Room, and the Bureau of Land Management, Sacramento Office.

Given the confidentiality requirements of the state and the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), references to the locations of cultural resources sites in this EIR are provided in general rather than specific terms. The cultural resources report, which identifies specific locations of archaeological sites in or near the project area, is on file for review by authorized individuals with the North West Information Center (NWIC). These resources and the results of these investigations are discussed below.

4.2.3 Cultural Setting

The project area has a long record of human occupation, possibly extending as far back as 10,000-12,000 years Before Present (BP). The study area lies within the central portion of the northern Coast Ranges of California and the pre-historic context is defined in part by the region's unique geography. Anthropologists characterize traces of early Native American occupation into a chronological or taxonomic order that is generally based on the physical remains found on archaeological sites. While any culture consists of much more than its material traces alone, archaeologists must rely primarily on artifactual materials to define the development and movements of various cultural groups over time.

Prehistoric Setting

David Fredrickson (1973; 1974) proposed a sequence of cultural patterns for the North Coast Ranges, placing them within a framework of cultural periods that he believed were applicable to California as a whole. He proposed and utilized the concept of the cultural Pattern as an adaptive mode shared in general outline by a number of analytically separable cultures. These different cultural modes could be characterized by similar technological skills and devices, similar economic modes including participation in trade networks and practices surrounding wealth, and similar mortuary and ceremonial practices. The general elements of this framework are briefly outlined below.

The **Paleo-Indian Period** (12,000 to 8,000 B.P.) saw the first demonstrated entry and spread of humans into California. Known sites are situated along lake shores and a developed milling tool technology may exist at this time depth. The social units were not heavily dependent upon exchange of resources, with exchange activities occurring on an ad hoc, individual basis. Most resources were acquired by the group changing habitat. Characteristic artifacts include fluted projectile points and flaked stone crescents. Traditionally, Paleo-Indians are viewed as exclusive big-game hunters. However, more recent research suggests that they pursued much more varied subsistence and economic systems than previously thought.

The beginning of the **Lower Archaic Period** (8,000 to 5,000 B.P.) coincides with that of the middle Holocene climatic change to generally drier conditions and the disappearance of the pluvial lakes that likely influenced earlier land use patterns. Subsistence appears to have been focused on the consumption of plant foods as opposed to those obtained by hunting or trapping. Settlement appears to have been semi-sedentary with little emphasis on wealth. Most tools were manufactured of local materials, and exchange remained on an ad hoc basis. Distinctive artifact types included large dart points and the milling slab and hand stones.

The **Middle Archaic Period** (5,000 to 3,000 B.P.) begins at the end of mid-Holocene climatic conditions when the climate became similar to present-day conditions. Cultural change likely was, in part, a response to changing environmental conditions. Economies were more diversified and possibly included the introduction of acorn processing technology. Hunting remained an important source of food as evidenced by faunal remains recovered from sites from this period. Sedentism appears to have been more developed and a general population growth and expansion occurred. Little evidence is present for development of regularized exchange relations. Artifacts diagnostic of this period include the bowl mortar and pestle, which first appears in the archaeological record during this time, and the continued use of large projectile points.

The growth of sociopolitical complexity marks the **Upper Archaic Period** (3,000 to 1,500 B.P.). The development of status distinctions based upon wealth is well documented, and group-oriented religions emerge. Some indications suggest that these may represent the origins of the Kuksu religious system at the end of the period. Exchange systems grew more complex with evidence of regular sustained exchanges between groups. Shell beads gained in significance as possible indicators of personal status and as important trade items. During this period, large projectile points are still found in lithic assemblages, and the bowl mortar and pestle replaced the milling stone and hand stone throughout most of the state.

Several technological and social changes distinguish the **Emergent Period** (500 to 200 B.P.). The bow and arrow were introduced during this period and ultimately replacing the dart and atlatl. Territorial boundaries between groups became well established and closely resemble those documented in the ethnographic literature. Distinctions in individual social status became increasingly linked to acquired material wealth. Exchange of goods between groups becomes more regularized with more material, including raw materials, entering into the exchange networks. In the latter portion of this period, exchange relations become highly regularized and sophisticated. The clam disk bead became a monetary unit for exchange, and increasing quantities of goods were moved greater distances. Craft specialization arose and individuals or groups of crafts-persons governed various aspects of production and exchange of trade goods in particular.

Historic Setting

Although fur traders and trappers with the Hudson's Bay Company and explorers from Russian and Spanish concerns no doubt made infrequent forays into Napa County during the latter years of the 18th century and the early decades of the 1800s, large-scale European settlement of the region did not take place until Mission San Francisco Solano was established in 1823 in Sonoma. This, the last and northernmost of the Spanish missions, immediately came under the authority of the new Mexican government that split from Spain the previous year. Although the mission was somewhat inaccessible from the Napa Valley, it exerted considerable influence throughout the general region and set the stage for larger and more intensive settlement of the Napa and Sonoma areas. Following the secularization of the missions system in 1833, the awarding of large land grants accelerated, and set the stage for large-scale European and American settlement of the region.

Historic-era developments in the Napa region can primarily be categorized according to three major themes that have had lasting impacts on the natural, cultural, and economic fabric of the region. Settlement, mining, and agriculture/viticulture by Euro-Americans began in earnest in the early decades of the 19th century and today many traces of these early activities can be found on the landscape.

The first non-native people to venture to the Napa Valley were Spanish explorers in search of new mission sites. Padre Jose Altimira and Don Francisco Castro arrived in the Valley in 1823, finding the area similar in many respects to Sonoma. The first long-term Euro-American inhabitant however, was George C. Yount who arrived in 1831, not long after the Spanish explorers (Menefee 1873).

The first land grant awarded to a European in the Napa Valley, Rancho Caymus (11,887 acres), was given to George C. Yount, Napa County's first non-Native settler, in 1836. Yount came from Missouri to Sonoma where he worked for General Vallejo and the Spanish priests repairing the mission roofs. After receiving his land grant, he built a blockhouse and ancillary buildings, which included a saw mill. The earliest viticultural effort in the Napa Valley is attributed to Yount, who planted grapevines obtained from Mexico. Yount planted mission grapes, barley and wheat, and raised cattle and horses.

The availability of land and the natural abundance of resources soon attracted other settlers. By the 1840s, a small community had begun to develop. It was not until 1848 however, that the first public building was erected. This building, a saloon, was 18 x 24 feet and 1 ½ stories in height. Around this time, Nathan Coombs, an early settler, laid out the town-site of Napa. Over the next few years, various buildings and structures, including a crude bridge across the Napa River, were erected (Wallace and Kanaga 1901).

Throughout the Valley, individual communities gave way to the development of formal towns such as St. Helena, which was founded in 1853. In 1855, Yount founded Sebastopol, which was later renamed Yountville two years after his death. Other communities such as Oakville, Rutherford, and Calistoga were eventually established. The population in the valley gradually expanded throughout the middle years of the 19th century, and received a further economic boost with the various mining interests that were discovered throughout the County beginning in the late 1840s.

Other Europeans and Americans, almost exclusively involved in agricultural pursuits, eventually arrived in the area and established small towns such as Yountville. Nathan Coombs, another early planter and rancher, is officially credited with founding the Town of Napa in 1847. Soon after, Napa County was formed as one of California's original counties. The Town of Napa was incorporated in 1872, and reincorporated as the City of Napa in 1874 (Elliott and Smith 1878).

During the 1830s and 1840s, the Mexican government continued to grant large property holdings to other settlers in the Napa County region. Some of the larger Napa County grants or ranchos included Carne Humana (17,962 acres), Chimiles (17,762 acres), Huichicha (18,704 acres), Las Putas (35,516 acres), Malacomes y Plan de Agua Caliente (17,743 acres), and Napa (21,917 acres) (Beck and Haase 1974).

Although ranching and agriculture continued to grow in the Napa region, the Gold Rush of the late 1840s and early 1850s drew many settlers away from the Napa area. However, within a decade, a small silver rush would occur in Napa, attracting a new

breed of would-be miners and entrepreneurs. The silver rush was short lived, but the accompanying geological investigations and mining activities revealed the presence of a more marketable mineral – mercury, which was primarily used at the time for extracting gold from deposits in the Sierra foothills. By 1864, Napa County had become one of the leading producers of mercury in the nation, mainly in the far north of Napa County near Lake County (see below for more on mining).

Once the regional silver rush died out and comparatively few miners made their riches seeking gold in the foothills, many disillusioned treasure seekers discovered far greater profit potential in owning land and growing produce in the Napa area. Many of the early settlers such as George Yount and Nathan Coombs grew fruit trees, wheat and barley, as well as raised cattle and horses. By the late 19th and early 20th century, 500,000 fruit and nut trees were found in the region (www.napavalley.net/history/history3.html).

Although some of the first settlers, such as Yount, grew wine grapes, John Patchett is commonly credited with establishing the first vineyard grown specifically for commercial winemaking in 1859. By the 1870s the number of wineries grew, making the Napa Valley one of the largest viticulture areas in the country. As the region became renowned for the quality of its agricultural products, the wine grapes in particular, community services such as telegraph lines, a water company, roadways such as today's Highway 29 (originally built in 1852) and a railroad (Napa Valley Railroad), were established to serve the growing number of residents and to provide easy transport of agricultural products out of the valley.

The efforts of Napa Valley's early settlers are still visible throughout the landscape, evidenced by the number of wineries and agricultural lands, many of which are located on the historic land grants which comprise part of the project area. Although the Napa region's economy has diversified considerably in recent decades, the agrarian foundations laid down by the early European and American settlers in the middle decades of the 19th century still provide a footing for one of the richest agricultural regions in the world.

Mining

One of the earliest mineral strikes in Napa County occurred in the winter of 1848-9 with the discovery of silver deposits. Thousands of would-be miners flocked to the Napa Valley. One account proclaimed that “every unemployed man from Soscol to Calistoga turned prospector” (Menefee 1873). Gold, copper, iron, and coal were all found in the county; however, it was cinnabar (mercury ore) that proved most profitable. Mercury was a highly valuable commodity in the gold fields as it was an integral element in the

processing of ore extracted from hard-rock mines. Operations for other minerals, however, were never developed to any great extent in Napa County.

The discovery of cinnabar in the Valley was made by John Newman in September of 1861. A company was organized soon after (the Phoenix), and further prospecting commenced. Another large operation, the Redington, was organized in December of that same year upon the discovery of another vein. As the number of prospects increased and the number of working claims grew, their value also rose to significant levels. By 1877, the Napa County Assessor estimated the value of mining claims throughout the county at \$56,575. As news spread of the deposits, people flocked to the county, invigorating the local economy, and in some cases, leading to dramatically inflated prices on the miner's basics such as hammers, picks, blankets, and beans rose to a premium (Wallace and Kanaga 1901).

Mining success in Napa and other parts of northern California (i.e., the Gold Rush) created a great demand, not only for the staples but also for wine. By 1881 there were over 1,000 acres of vines in the vicinity of St. Helena alone. From Yountville to St. Helena vineyards covered an estimated 6,538 acres (Ketteringham 1961). As the mining boom eventually died down, agricultural pursuits, viticulture in particular, remained profitable and set the foundation for the region's economy.

Viticulture and Agriculture

Agriculture in Napa County has long been recognized as profitable. Wheat had been growing in the area since the early 19th century, and was long considered the primary crop for many in the valley (Menefee 1873). Barley also provided a considerable income for area farmers. These crops remained dominant fixtures in the valley until the mid 1880s when low yields and low prices led to the focus on orchards, grains, and vineyards (Ketteringham 1961). A wide variety of orchards were planted successfully in the county including: apple, cherry, plum, pear and olive. Of the latter, 6,000 acres had been laid out by the end of the 19th century.

As techniques in viticulture improved, emphasis was placed on the location of the vineyards. It was discovered early on that certain areas in the county were better suited for particular crops. The soil on either side of the valley along the foothills was gravelly and not well suited for grain. That area, however, worked well for vineyards, which had begun to expand into the previously uncultivated hill slopes. The hillsides also had the added advantage of the lessened danger of frost (Ketteringham 1961).

Other successful economic pursuits in the Valley included poultry and stock raising, and dairying. Although never a large-scale pursuit in Napa, dairying provided a steady

income for some through the sale of milk, butter, and cream. Poultry raising proved a successful enterprise, with turkeys being raised in the mountain valleys in flocks of up to 1,000. With a great portion of the hillsides being covered in wild oats and grasses, large herds of cattle and flocks of sheep were kept upon these areas to graze (Menefee 1873; Ketteringham 1961). The 1877 Napa County Assessor listed 1,842 stock cattle, 134 beef cattle, 44,120 graded sheep, and 16,675 lambs in the county (Wallace and Kanage 1901).

Although dairy products, various crops, and sheep continued to be produced and raised in Napa County throughout the 20th century, its reputation as a world-class wine-growing region continued to grow. Today, agricultural pursuits other than viticulture are minimal throughout the area; however vineyards continue to expand, further establishing wineries and their support industries as the economic foundation in Napa County.

4.2.4 Regulatory Framework

CEQA offers guidelines regarding impacts on historic and prehistoric cultural resources resulting from development projects. CEQA states that if implementation of a project would result in significant impacts on important cultural resources, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered. However, only significant cultural resources need to be addressed.

State CEQA Guidelines define a significant historical resource as “a resource listed or eligible for listing on the CRHR (Public Resources Code §5024.1). A historical resource may be eligible for inclusion on the CRHR if it:

1. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage; or
2. is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; or
3. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The State CEQA Guidelines also require the consideration of unique archaeological sites (15064.5). If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for inclusion on the CRHR, but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource as outlined in the Public Resources Code (21083.2), it may be treated as a historical resource. CEQA also provides for a measure of protection for Native American human remains (Guidelines section 15064.5[d]) and for the accidental discovery of cultural resources

(Guidelines section 15064.5 [e]). These are particularly important provisions in that they take into account the possibility that significant resources not noted as a result of previous research efforts may be present within a project area and need to be treated in a way commensurate with CEQA standards.

The purpose of this section is to discuss cultural resources issues related to the implementation of the Erosion Control Plan measures and subsequent vineyard installation proposed for the Upper Range Vineyard Project. CEQA requires that development projects take into account their potential effects on cultural resources determined to be significant per the criteria outlined in the CRHR. Prehistoric or historic-era traces of human habitation and activities on the landscape determined to be ineligible for listing on the CRHR require no mitigation. However, those resources determined eligible or potentially eligible for listing must be protected from potential adverse project-related effects.

Eligibility Considerations

Historic homesteads and ranches can be significant under Criterion 1 because of their association with the development of ranching/agriculture in Napa County, specifically from the mid to late 19th and the early 20th centuries. An understanding of early settlement and agriculture in the Napa Valley contributes to an understanding of the settlement of California and the evolution of viticulture in the northern part of the state.

To be significant under Criterion 2, a historic homestead/ranch must be associated with persons who were important to the settlement and development of Napa County, or important to the development of technological practices or methods employed in the region. Homesteads/ranches may also be significant if they are linked to individuals whose influence was substantial and extended beyond the boundaries of Napa County.

Because of the dynamic nature of agricultural operations and ranches, significance under Criterion 3 will usually stem from the ability of the ranch, or one of more of its major components, to illustrate a subtype associated with the historic context. Generally, the homestead/ranch would be eligible under other criteria as well, and if eligible under Criterion 3 alone, it is because it is comprised of buildings, structures, or objects that exhibit especially fine style, craftsmanship, or construction methods.

Eligibility under Criterion 4 hinges on the ability of the data, as contained in the artifacts and their association, to further address issues of importance to the period of significance. These data are primarily derived from archaeological sites that are the material byproducts of human activity. Although documentary or oral sources often provide important information regarding complex archaeological sites, sometimes the

artifacts themselves may provide a greater degree of understanding. For example, if a refuse scatter is associated with features, these features may provide a framework for interpreting the site. The features or deposits may also provide new information not available elsewhere regarding kinds of documented or undocumented activities in the area.

Integrity

Generally, homesteads and ranches that meet the registration requirements will retain historic integrity, and will have been in use during the period of significance; in this case, from Gray's 1871 patent through the early 20th century. In this context, integrity refers to the general character and feeling of the site and the degree to which it currently resembles its condition and setting during its period of significance. Assessment of the property in relation to integrity requires an appraisal of whether subsequent changes in the property contribute to its historic evolution or alter its historic integrity from its period of significance.

Because of the importance of land, natural features, and vegetation, the qualities of integrity (setting, feeling, association, design, materials, and workmanship) are applied differently to rural landscapes. This relationship, involving patterns of spatial organization, circulation networks, and clusters, is directly related to design and is strongly influenced by the cohesiveness of the rural landscape. Integrity of setting and design is composed of boundary demarcations, small-scale elements, vegetation, and evidence of responses to the natural environment. Continuing or compatible land uses and activities enhance integrity of feeling and association. Associated archaeological deposits may enhance the integrity if they provide evidence of activities no longer practiced.

Napa County General Plan

The Napa County General Plan Land Use Element includes the following policy regarding cultural resources and the steps that should be taken to preserve and protect these resources throughout the County:

Land Use Element Policy 2.1

The County will encourage interest in the cultural heritage of Napa County for the education and enjoyment of present and future citizens to enhance the individual's sense of identity with the County. For that purpose the County will develop regulations and programs to preserve and utilize historical buildings and area of historic significance, or scenic attractiveness.

4.2.5 Existing Conditions

In anticipation of CEQA requirements related to the proposed project, Rodgers Land and Development Company contracted with Tom Origer and Associates to conduct a cultural resources investigation of the approximately 800-acre Upper Range Ranch property. This study was conducted in 2001 and is detailed in the report *Archaeological Investigations at Rodgers Upper Range Ranch, Napa County, California* (Origer and Thompson 2001). A previous study (Pastron 2001) included 225 acres of the 800-acre property and recorded a number of sites revisited and further documented by Origer and Thompson. In addition, a Native American Heritage Commission database search was conducted in order to identify sacred lands or other cultural properties of significance to local Native Americans. As a result of the Origer and Thompson and Pastron surveys, a total of 14 discrete prehistoric and historic-era sites and features are known to be present within the 800-acre project area. Eleven of these (Table 4.2-1) were found to be directly within the project area and could be impacted by project-related ground disturbances.

**Table 4.2-1
Project Area Cultural Resources**

Resource Number	Site Type	Comments	CRHR Significance
CA-Nap-151 (RUR-11)	prehistoric	midden, artifact scatter, historic disturbance	potentially significant
CA-Nap-551	prehistoric	midden, artifact scatter, possible house pits	not significant
CA-Nap-557 (RUR-13)	prehistoric	obsidian artifact scatter	not significant
RUR-2	historic	stone fence segment	not significant
RUR-3	historic	Ranch/home complex	potentially significant
RUR-5	prehistoric	obsidian artifact scatter	potentially significant
RUR-6	historic	Ranch complex	potentially significant
RUR-8	historic	stone fence segment	not significant
RUR-9	prehistoric	not recorded	not significant
RUR-12	historic	stone fence segment	not significant
RUR-14	prehistoric	not recorded	not significant
RUR-TO-1	historic	stone fence segment	not significant
RUR-TO-2	historic	artifact scatter	not significant
RUR-TO-3	historic	Ranch complex	potentially significant

Source: Origer 2001, EDAW 2004

In order to determine if the vineyard project could impact documented cultural resources, EDAW archaeologists reviewed the available literature related to the project area (Origer and Thompson 2001; Pastron 2001) and conducted a reconnaissance-level survey of the 800-acre property. Although the Origer and Thompson and Pastron reports appeared to adequately document cultural resources within and in the vicinity of

the project area, in general, the prehistoric artifact deposits noted by both studies were difficult to discern or contained fewer constituents than originally described. This discrepancy is likely due to continued livestock grazing and minor surface erosion, both of which can scatter and bury small artifacts over relatively short periods of time.

Although a total of 14 prehistoric and historic-era cultural resources were documented as a result of the Origer and Pastron investigations (Table 4.2-1), only six of those were found to be potentially significant as per CRHR guidelines. Per CRHR guidelines, a significant resource is defined as “a resource listed or eligible for listing on the CRHR (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1). A resource may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR if it:

1. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
2. is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, historical resources eligible for listing in the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be able to convey the reasons for their significance. Such integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (Office of Historic Preservation 1999).

Most of the 14 sites in question, including the prehistoric sites, would not be impacted by the proposed project, which would be located in areas outside the boundaries of these sites. However, a cluster of early farm/ranch complexes (RUR-3, RUR-6, and RUR-TO-3) are located in areas where impacts could occur.

Individually, such small ridge-top homesteads (probable homesteads and accompanying farming/livestock raising facilities) are found throughout the Napa region. In and of themselves they are not necessarily unique or significant cultural resources. However, the sites noted within the project area were of interest due in part to their proximity to one another, as they could have been part of an overall larger historical landscape. Therefore, EDAW historic resource specialists conducted additional archival research and oral interviews to further investigate their potential significance, as discussed below under Section 4.2.6 (EDAW 2005).

Abandoned Mine

An abandoned mine is located about ¼ mile away from the project site. Research did not indicate that this mine played a significant role in local history. The mine is not depicted on the General Land Office Plat Map for Township 7 North, Range 5 West (1869) or the Plat of Mining Surveys (1882). The property owner indicated that quicksilver was reportedly being mined in the vicinity. The historic maps mentioned above substantiated this claim. Prospecting continued in the Napa Valley and beyond well into the 20th century. Because it does not show up on area maps during the period of significance for mining (1848-1890), it is presumed to post date this time period, and therefore does not appear to be associated with early California mining. The lack of information associated with this mine precludes a determination of eligibility for CRHR listing.

4.2.6 Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section examines the potential for significant environmental impacts from the proposed project and determines if mitigation measures are needed.

Significance Criteria

Project impacts would be significant if the project were to cause the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource,
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource,
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature,
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Historic Resources Impacts

Impact 4.2-1: Historic Ranch Complexes (Less than Significant)

Some of the proposed vineyard blocks have the potential to impact the historic ranch complexes (RUR-3, RUR-6, and RUR-TO-3). Site RUR-3 has numerous features, including two groupings of structural remains with retaining walls, historic refuse, and well, a small pit, and stone fence segments, but was determined to not be eligible for listing on the CRHR per CEQA.¹ RUR-6 also has the remains of structures including a stone root cellar, which probably represents the remains of a dwelling, an additional

¹ Brian Ludwig, EDAW Archaeologist, personal communication, October 25, 2006.

small stone foundation, historic material scatter, retaining walls, stone fences, and stone alignments. This site is not considered eligible for listing on the CRHR. Site RUR-TO-3, which is not considered eligible for CRHR listing, consists of a stone-lined, raised building platform, and a dense scatter of historic refuse.

The style and method of construction for these historic features are not unique and when viewed individually are ubiquitous in the region. However, collectively these sites may represent a unique and undocumented 19th to early 20th century cultural adaptation to the poorer farming and ranching conditions of the Napa region ridgetops and slopes. Avoidance and preservation is possible for some of the historic resource sites, as the planned vineyard blocks do not presently impact their integrity or can be slightly altered to avoid the sites altogether. As presently proposed, the vineyard block layout would avoid resources RUR-3, RUR-6 and RUR-TO-3.

Impacts to RUR-6 and associated sites were investigated further by EDAW in 2005. No documentation was found to substantiate an exact construction date for the house and ancillary remains that constitute the RUR-6 site and the other sites in the immediate vicinity. However, an 1890 homestead record does reference a dwelling and appurtenances on the property (Homestead Record of John Dent). A.F. and Charlotte Chandler owned the land from 1871-1878, prior to a homestead being filed by John Dent (Napa County Deed Records). Using those dates for reference, it can be concluded that the historic-era structural remains on the property date from between 1871 and 1890. Based on the surface evidence at the site, in the form of foundations, a cellar hole, and various domestic artifacts, the site of RUR-6 likely represents the remains of the homestead established by Dent. Other sites and features in the area more than likely represent the remains of associated agricultural/ranching features and buildings roughly contemporaneous with the homestead.

Research suggests that the property functioned primarily over the years as a home-site for various individuals and their families, and as pasturage for cattle. Research did not indicate that the property was associated with any individual(s) important in local history (Criterion 2). Neither does the property retain or embody distinctive characteristics in terms of architectural style, materials, or workmanship (Criterion 3).

In terms of Criterion 1, the highest potential for eligibility is the association of the property with early ranching in the Napa Valley. This potential eligibility suffers, however, from two shortcomings: a lack of thorough documentation and a loss of integrity.

Assessment of archaeological values associated with the RUR-6 site and the nearby features, required for eligibility under Criterion 4, was beyond the scope of this study. However, the preliminary indication is that the property was but one of many homesteads established in the Napa Valley during the late 19th century. As research demonstrated, the hilltops in Napa were often used for pasturage, as was the case with the Rodger's property. No archival information was found to indicate that the resources on the property would add previously undocumented or important information to the existing body of knowledge.

The three documented historic-era ranch or farm sites (RUR-3, RUR-6, and RUR-TO-3) all exhibit building and structure remains and scatters or deposits of historic-period refuse. There are no standing structures on any of these sites and none of these complexes retain physical integrity relevant to their potential periods of significance. In addition, archival research has demonstrated that none of these ranching or farm complexes were associated with any historically significant persons or events. Consequently, sites RUR-3, RUR-6 and RUR-TO-3 are not eligible for listing on the CRHR, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Prehistoric Resource Impacts

Impact 4.2-2: Prehistoric Sites (Potentially Significant)

Two prehistoric sites were documented by Origer and Thompson (2001) as potentially significant. However only one (CA-Nap-151) appears potentially significant based on surface and initial subsurface investigations. Although a portion of the site has been covered over by a relatively recently bulldozed building pad, some possible midden deposits were noted along with flaked stone artifacts. This suggests that important stratified subsurface cultural deposits could be present at this site. Grading of the building pad appears to not be a recent occurrence. It is not known why the site was graded, or what occupied the building pad. Prehistoric site RUR-5 appears to be a sparse surface scatter of lithic (stone tool) artifacts that will not require additional field investigation.

As currently planned, the vineyard blocks would not impact the location of prehistoric site RUR-5, and no impacts are anticipated. Two vineyard blocks are proposed along side CA-Nap-151, and therefore could be impacted by project-related ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-2: In order to ensure that prehistoric sites RUR-5 and Ca-Nap-151 are not impacted by the proposed project, the boundaries of these sites as

noted in recent GPS mapping shall be clearly marked prior to project related ground disturbing activities. This shall be done by a qualified archeologist approved by the County. These areas shall be avoided during project implementation

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Impact 4.2-3: Disturbances to Undocumented Cultural Resources (Potentially Significant)

Although documentary and field investigations have identified a number of prehistoric and historic era cultural resources within the project area, there is always the possibility that unrecorded resources or those presently in subsurface contexts could be encountered during project construction. Impacts to such resources could be significant and require mitigation in order to reduce them to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.2-3a: If unrecorded cultural resources are encountered during project-related ground-disturbing activities, a qualified cultural resources specialist shall be contacted to assess the potential significance of the find.

If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, structure/building remains, etc.) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find will be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist will be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per the CRHR and develop an appropriate program of site investigation and recovery.

Mitigation Measure 4.2.3b: Stop Potentially Damaging Work if Human Remains Are Uncovered During Construction, Assess the Significance of the Find, and Pursue Appropriate Management.

California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and California Public Resources Code §5097.

In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are uncovered during ground disturbances, the contractor and/or the project proponent shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the burial and notify the Napa County Coroner and a professional archaeologist. The California Health and Safety Code requires that if human remains are found in any location other

than a dedicated cemetery, excavation is to be halted in the immediate area, and the county coroner is to be notified to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5[b]).

If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (Health and Safety Code Section 7050[c]). Following the coroner's findings, the archaeologist, the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendent (MLD), and the archaeologist shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities of the Agency for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.