3.4 - Cultural Resources

3.4.1 - Introduction

This section describes the existing cultural resources setting and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. This analysis is based on the Cultural Resources Inventory, prepared by Cardno Entrix, provided in Appendix D.

3.4.2 - Environmental Setting

Overview

The term "cultural resources" encompasses historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources, and burial sites. Below is a brief summary of each component:

- **Historic Resources:** Historic resources are associated with the recent past. In California, historic resources are typically associated with the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods in the State's history and are generally less than 200 years old.
- **Archaeological Resources:** Archaeology is the study of prehistoric human activities and cultures. Archaeological resources are generally associated with indigenous cultures.
- **Paleontological Resources:** Paleontology is the study of plant and animal fossils.
- **Burial Sites:** Burial sites are formal or informal locations where human remains, usually associated with indigenous cultures, are interred.

Cultural Setting

Regional Prehistory

In general, archaeological research in the San Francisco Bay area has focused on coastal areas, such as San Francisco Bay and Monterey Bay, where large shellmounds were relatively easily identified on the landscape. Regardless, archaeological research in San Francisco Bay, Monterey Bay, and along the coast is relevant to the prehistory of the lower Napa Valley.

Like much of California cultural chronologies, the San Francisco Bay Area has a complex history. As synthesized recently by Milliken et al. (2007), three major chronologic frameworks exist for the Bay Area: an Archaic-Emergent temporal structure; the Central California Taxonomic System/CCTS and a "hybrid system" which utilizes using the overarching CCTS scheme, while further demarcating time depth/period changes regionally, as used in the Archaic- Emergent temporal structure. Specifically, regional cultural patterns and phases are further defined within the San Francisco Bay Area by Dating Scheme D. Dating Scheme D utilizes dated Olivella shell bead horizons. Previous dating schemes that use shells include Scheme A, developed by Heizer and based on 17 radiocarbon dates (1958); Scheme B, developed by Bennyhoff and Hughes and based off of 180 radiocarbon dates from charcoal, collagen and shell from central California (1987); and Scheme C, which was a synthesis of Schemes A and B. Milliken et al. (2007) recently used the term "bead horizons" to define the passage of short periods of time by the shifts in the trade of specific bead types throughout the Bay area (2007). Specifically, they define it as the Early Period/Middle Period Transition (EMT), followed

by the following bead horizons for the Middle Period: M1, M2, M3 and M4 (Milliken et al. 2007). This is followed by the Middle Period/Late Period Transition (MLT) and Late Period (LT) bead horizons, LI and L2.

Fredrickson (1973) proposed a chronology for the general San Francisco Bay Area region, which includes the Napa Valley. Fredrickson's chronology is based off of material patterns and includes the Windmiller Pattern (2500 B.C. to 1,000 B.C), Berkeley Pattern (2000 B.C.–A.D. 500) and the Augustine Pattern (A.D. 500-1880 A.D.). The Windmiller Pattern is typified by a hunter-gatherer subsistence pattern, which included the exploitation of wild plants, game and fish. Typical artifacts include clay balls, fishing hooks, fishing spears and ground stone tools. Artifacts from the Berkeley Pattern era reflect an increasing reliance on acorns, as mortars and pestles become more prolific. The Augustine Period was a period of increasing social complexity. Acorns continued to be the dominant food source and settlement patterns reflected an increasing sedentary lifestyle (Moratto 1984).

The Lower Archaic, 8000–3500 B.C., is typified in the Bay area by a forager and gatherer lifestyle, as evidenced by the prevalence of millingslabs, handstones, and large wide-stemmed and leaf-shaped projectile points. The Middle Archaic, 3500-500 B.C., saw an increase in the presence of ground stone and cut shell beads, indicating that groups in the Bay area were transitioning to a more sedentary lifestyle, interregional trade was increasing, and as the beads were found in mortuary contexts, that symbolism was becoming a regional identifier. The Early Upper Archaic, 500 B.C. to A.D. 430, saw a shift away from cut beads to Olivella beads, and along the bay, a new emphasis on Haliotis ornaments and bone tools, with net sinkers largely disappearing from assemblages. The Late Upper Archaic, A.D. 430 to 1050, further defined by the bead phases M1-M4, is a another time of transition, as saucer-shaped Olivella beads disappear from the record and Olivella saddle beads became dominant. The appearance of the saddle shaped Olivella beads coincides with the appearance and increase in Meganos complex dorsal extended burials. The Lower Emergent Period, A.D. 1050 to 1550, is characterized by increasing complexity as beads were being produced for collectors as opposed to being produced primarily as mortuary items. Sedentism and increasing social stratification is evidenced by settlement patterns and mortuary practices (Milliken et al. 2007). The Terminal Late Period saw change in the North Bay, as clamshell disk beads became prevalent, along with the toggle harpoon, hopper mortar, plain corner-notched arrow-sized projectile points, and magnesite tube beads; however, this was not the case in the South Bay. By 1650, only Olivella-lipped and spire-lopped beads were present.

Settlement patterns in the North Bay have varied over time. The currently accepted understanding of settlement patterns in this area is that a foraging and hunter-gatherer lifestyle centering on lacustrine resources remained dominant in the region until the Lower to Middle Archaic. At this point, there was a shift from foraging lacustrine resources to developing semi-permanent villages near marshes and grasslands, in order to gather those specific resources. This was followed by a shift to foragers residing in residential camps, with more consistent settlement occurring in "collector villages" during the Upper Archaic. By the Emergent, collectors were living in semi-permanent villages in oak woodlands, which residential camps were now located along marshes.

Regional Ethnography

Patwin

The Project area is within Patwin ethnographic territory. Primary sources on Patwin include the ethnographic accounts of Kroeber (1925, 1932), Powers (1877), McKern (1922, 1923), and the testimony of Princess Isidora, wife of Chief Solano. There are also other secondary publications and overviews discussing Patwin culture. These sources, however, document historic Patwin culture and do not reflect the modern social or political structure of the local Native American community.

Patwin are the southernmost members of a group of Native American cultures (i.e., Wintu, Nomlaki, and Patwin) that share a related set of languages. The Patwin are members of California Penutian linguistic stock, and they occupied the southwest portion of the Sacramento Valley, from the lower hills of the eastern North Coast Ranges to the Sacramento River, and from Princeton south to San Pablo and Suisun Bays. Central California supported some the densest populations of Native Americans in North America. Kroeber (1925:35) states that prior to contact, Patwin peoples (the Wintu, Nomlaki, and Patwin) totaled nearly 12,000 individuals. Cook (1976:8, 19) suggests that at ethnographic contact the banks of the Sacramento River "were studded with a series of villages that held almost the entire population of the region," and the Sacramento Valley had a population density of approximately 3.35 persons per square mile.

Information specifically addressing Patwin political and social organization is relatively scant. Regardless, there is sufficient ethnographic data to provide a description of the Patwin culture. The Patwin were organized into tribelets, which were usually composed of a principal village and a few satellite settlements. Tribelets were small, autonomous, and sometimes bounded by the limits of a small drainage. Each tribelet had a head chief and each village had a chief who administered its economic and ceremonial activities. The position of chief was usually inherited through the male line, but village elders occasionally chose some chiefs. The chief possessed political, ceremonial, and economic powers and enjoyed high prestige. He was the "commissioner" of crops, determined annual harvesting times, allocated lands to family groups, organized resource expeditions (i.e., hunting and wood gathering), and served as the primary distributor of resources.

McKern (1922: 238-240) presented Patwin social structure in terms of three systems: the patrilineal family; the family social group; and the household unit. The patrilineal family and descent were important features of Patwin social life, and the authority bestowed on the headman of each patriarchal family was undisputed, except in matters of tribal authority. Inheritance was determined by paternal descent, and possessions passed between generations included not only property and personal effects, but also nontangible items such as personal names and ritualistic knowledge (i.e., medicine, healing). The family social group is a larger unit that includes the husbands of female patrilineal family members, and is unified by the authority of the family headman.

Matrilocal residence was customary among the Patwin and husbands routinely remained with their wife's families at least until they acquired enough wealth to establish an independent household. This circumstance allowed female family members to maintain their traditional patrilineal family membership, and subjected husbands to the authority of the headman of their wife's family. The household unit consisted of individuals sharing a common residence under the authority of a

household head that may or may not be the family headman. This social unit was relatively fluid because the Patwin did not practice unilocal residence, and sons-in-laws and their wives left the group to establish independent households as soon as it was economically feasible.

Another aspect of Patwin social structure identified by McKern is the "functional family." McKern identified that certain Patwin families possessed an esoteric ritual or medicine, which was owned and inherited by the family rather than the individual and guaranteed success for the family in certain endeavors. McKern identified four categories of functional families according to their "specialty." The four categories of functional families are: ceremonial families; trade families; shamanistic families; and official families. Members of each particular functional family were qualified to participate in certain ceremonies or tasks. For example, members of: ceremonial families were qualified to participate in specific ceremonies; trade families were specialists in economic and subsistence tasks (e.g., manufacture of baskets and/or the trapping of ducks or salmon); shamanistic families were qualified to prepare medicines and influence the supernatural; and officiating families had a single member who was identified as a ceremonial song leader, dance fire-tender, or dance drummer. The purpose of the functional families seems to be to recognize the importance of training and supernatural assistance in all social and economic activities, and also to insure success in these activities.

Patwin subsistence relied on hunting, fishing, and gathering a wide variety of plant resources that were located within their territory. Acorns were a major part of their diet, and were obtained from hill and mountain oaks communally owned by the tribelet. Other easily gathered resources included blackberries, elderberries, wild grapes, new tule shoots, roots and bulbs, honey, salt (acquired from burning salt grass), and tobacco. Kroeber's informants, however, did not report a familiarity with many plants (e.g., buckeye, hazelnut, manzanita, *Brodiaea* sp.) that are dietary staples among other Native American groups.

Ethnographic records indicate that large game (e.g., deer, tule elk, antelope) was captured using nets or were shot using bows-and-arrows. Kroeber reports that two men would hold a wide meshed net while other hunters would drive deer into it, and waterfowl (ducks, geese, mudhens, quail, etc.) were also captured using nets. Fish were also a prime resource, and certain fishing sites were privately owned. Fish (such as salmon, sturgeon, perch, chub, sucker, hardhead, pike, and trout) and other riverine resources (such as turtles and mussels) were caught with bone fishhooks, nets, seines, and weirs. Food resources were generally stored in bins and granaries, which were made of sticks set into the ground and roofed with tules. Regardless of the broad based character of Patwin subsistence practices, they did have taboos regarding the use of certain resources (lampreys, frogs, snakes, dogs, coyotes, badgers, skunks, grasshoppers, angleworms, caterpillars, reptiles, some predator animals, and certain birds of prey).

The Patwin manufactured a variety of utilitarian and ceremonial/luxury items, including baskets, stone tools, mortars and pestles, shell beads, and clothing. Coiled and/or twined baskets of willow and/or split tule were used for various purposes including food collection, preparation, serving and storage, baby carriers, and as grave goods interred with the dead. A variety of tools (i.e., projectile points, bifaces, drills, scrapers, and knives) were manufactured from obsidian, chert, and basalt for

both utilitarian (skinning, butchering, etc.) and ceremonial (such as burial accompaniment) purposes.

Mortars of oak and stone and pestles were used to process both plant and animal resources. Shell beads were also manufactured for personal adornment and as a medium of exchange. Clothing was generally minimal, and "men went without any covering, women wore skirts or aprons of tule or shredded bark." Deer hides served as women's skirts and floor mats. Women also wore highly prized belts of bird feathers wrapped around the waist and "strings of beads (abalorios) wrapped around the body from the breast up as far as the neck." Men had long hair coiled on top of the head and fastened with straight bone hairpins. Other clothing included fur blankets (i.e., rabbit pelts) and leather robes, which were sewn together using bone needles and strings of wild hemp.

The Patwin traded for various commodities and subsistence resources using clamshell disc beads as a medium of exchange. Kroeber referred to Patwin territory as a center for several religious sects among groups of central California Native Americans. These sects were generally based on the organization of male secret societies and are characterized by Kuksu or "bighead" dances. Kuksu emphasized curing and shamanistic functions, and its ceremonies generally consisted of impersonating spirits who journeyed from their home to a village, blessed the village, and then returned home. In addition, the Patwin were unique among California Native Americans in that they participated in two other initiatory societies: the Hesi and Wai saltu. The Hesi was a general dancing society that began with the ceremonial training of boys and was described by Patwin as "gentle" rather than "dangerous." The Hesi had the largest membership and the greatest variety of spirit performers. The Waisaltu society, similar to the Kuksu, was more limited in membership and was described by the Patwin as "powerful" and "dangerous."

Mortuary customs of the ethnographic Patwin involved elaborate mourning ceremonies for the deceased, burial rather than cremation, interment in tightly flexed positions, and the simultaneous burial of one's possessions at death. Less evident is the practice of burning or pre-interment grave pit preparation. Kroeber observed that the Patwin buried their dead in "little graveyards not more than 100 yards from the houses of the living, and often in the village" to prevent grave robbery. Johnson reiterates that cemeteries were usually located within "one end of the community." Property was buried with the dead in large quantities and in some areas burned near the grave. At death, long burial robes of hemp, or sometimes of bear fur, were wrapped around the deceased body.

Wappo

The project site also borders the ethnographic territory of the Wappo, which included two divisions by dialect, along the south edge of Clear Lake, and from just above Napa and Sonoma in the south to Cloverdale and Middletown to the north. The Wappo spoke Wappo, which is a dialect of the Yukian language. The Yukian language family includes the Northern Yukian and the Wappo, with three dialects, including Yuki, Huchnom, and Coast Yuki. Northern Yukian did not differentiate into various dialects until relatively recently, within the last 1,000 years.

Wappo political organization was the village, although population estimates per village vary. Villages tended to located near sources of water and usually included two sweathouses. Dwellings at villages

were consisted of oval shaped dwellings, with grass thatch over a bent pole framework. Smoke-holes were located in the roof of each house. Each village was loosely organized by a chief. The position of chief was not hereditary, or gender specific. The chief could be elected or appointed, and the former chief could train his or her successor. The Wappo imported yellowhammer headbands and bows from the north, magnesite cylinders from what is now Lake County, and abalone shells and clamshell beads from the coast. The Wappo were semi-sedentary, and lived a mobile lifestyle according to the season. Permanent villages were established in higher elevations and groups would move toward rivers to dwell in summer camps. This mobility may have been more common among the Wappo who lived along the Russian River. The Wappo traveled to the coast to obtain coastal resources, such as fish, shellfish, and seaweed, and also traveled to Glass Mountain to obtain obsidian. Dance was associated with shamanistic rituals and was led by a dance leader, who essentially acted as a doctor. The Wappo traveled extensively for this purpose. Wappo religious practices are not well known, although certain social practices regarding taboos appear to have been practiced. The Wappo are said to have a very traditions to the Pomo.

Common resources collected and consumed included ducks, geese, quail, rabbit, and deer. The Wappo would also collect both salt and freshwater fish and shellfish. Seaweed was gathered, dried, and transported back inland. Acorns, buckeye, and roots were all important plant foods. Sweet pitch, honey, and salt were used as seasonings. Material cultural included such objects as wedges, axes, fire drills, shells, animal skins, and basketry.

Historic Background

In 1769, Juan Manuel de Ayla, established the first settlement along San Francisco Bay. The Spanish proceeded to establish a presence in the area by establishing a trifecta of presidios, to maintain control of the colonies, pueblos, or towns for the colonists and ranchos, to employ their stockhands. The entire system worked under a missionary system, with the intent to colonize the Indians. A total of four presidios and twenty-one missions were eventually established in the area by 1821. Mission Dolores and Mission San Jose began actively taking Patwin children from local settlements by 1800. Mission Sonoma was built in 1823 and continued to integrate the Patwin until mission secularization occurred in the 1830s.

After the Mexican Independence in 1822, mission lands became desecularized and were divided into ranchos. Land grants were sold to many British and American entrepreneurs, as they moved into the area. Just prior to the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, which ended the war between the United States and Mexico, gold was discovered by John Sutter on the American River. The gold rush indirectly helped fuel the expansion of coastal California cities.

Local History

In 1823, Francisco Castro, Father Jose Altamira and Jose Sanchez led the first expedition into what is now called Napa County, in order to determine the best locations to construct missions. As in many regions of California, the land eventually became divided into Mexican Land Grants. An early explorer, George C. Yount, traveled to the Napa Valley in the early 1830s. General Mariano Vallejo gave Yount the Rancho Caymus land grant, which is now modern day Yountville. A soldier, Nicolas Higuera, of San Francisco, was granted Rancho Entre Napa and Rancho Rincon de los Carneros by

Governor Mariano Chico in 1836. These areas are now downtown and south Napa and southwestern Napa County, respectively. Cayetano Jaarez was granted the Rancho Tulucay land in 1841, which lies to the east of the City of Napa.

During the mid-1850s, Napa County began to grow, and while gold was being prospected in other areas of the State, Napa County became a center for silver and quicksilver mining. The County's population began to swell as pioneers, prospectors, and entrepreneurs moved in and set up residence. Two of those entrepreneurs were Edward Turner Bale and Samuel Brannan. Bale completed building the Bale Grist Mill a few miles north of St. Helena in 1846. Brannan purchased land in the northern end of the valley at the foot of Mount Saint Helena and founded Calistoga. He also founded the Napa Valley Railroad Company in 1864 with track laid down from Suscol to connect with the California Pacific Railroad at a place called Napa Junction (currently American Canyon). Others settlers turned to agriculture for their livelihood, primarily raising cattle, grain, and fruit crops.

The City of American Canyon was incorporated in 1992 and is located approximately 35 miles northeast of San Francisco at the southern end of Napa County.

The first of the early settlers in American Canyon was Mr. Simpson Thompson, who became one of the pioneer developers in the Suscol region of American Canyon. Mr. Thompson came to California in 1852 when he purchased a tract of land and developed a rancho at Suscal from General Vallejo and General J.B. Frisbie. Mr. Thompson and his two sons operated the Rancho, which gained a reputation from its introduction of fruit culture without irrigation. The Rancho contained 225 acres of orchards, vineyards, and gardens; 250 acres of grain; and 300 acres of meadowland.

Although agriculture and mining shaped the area of Napa County as a whole, American Canyon had its own unique beginnings. By 1900, limestone was being quarried in the American Canyon area, then known as Napa Junction. In 1902, the quarry owner, Augustus Watson, sold the quarry to an intermediary for the Standard Portland Cement Company. A new cement plant was constructed and started full operation in February 1903. A large operation—up to 200 employees—worked 12-hour shifts mining limestone and clay at the quarry. More than 2,000 barrels of cement were produced each day. Eventually, all the usable limestone and clay on-site were mined, and the cost of shipping materials from other locations was too high to warrant maintaining production. The plant shut down sometime in the 1920s or 1930s. In 1946, the Basalt Rock Company moved into the Standard Portland Cement Company site and provided new work buildings and employee housing for the production of aggregate from volcanic rock. The Basalt Rock Company eventually closed down, and today, all that remains are portions of the buildings.

3.4.3 - Regulatory Framework

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended, established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which contains an inventory of the nation's significant prehistoric

and historic properties. Under 36 CFR 60, a property is recommended for possible inclusion on the NRHP if it is at least 50 years old, has integrity, and meets one of the following criteria:

- It is associated with significant events in history, or broad patterns of events.
- It is associated with significant people in the past.
- It embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural type, period, or method of construction; or it is the work of a master or possesses high artistic value; or it represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- It has yielded, or may yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Certain types of properties are usually excluded from consideration for listing in the NRHP, but they can be considered if they meet special requirements in addition to meeting the criteria listed above. Such properties include religious sites, relocated properties, graves and cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years.

State

California Register of Historical Resources

As defined by Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A-D) of the CEQA Guidelines, a resource shall be considered historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CR). The California Register of Historical Resources and many local preservation ordinances have employed the criteria for eligibility to the NRHP as a model, since the NHPA provides the highest standard for evaluating the significance of historic resources. A resource that meets the NRHP criteria is clearly significant. In addition, a resource that does not meet the NRHP standards may still be considered historically significant at a local or state level.

California Environmental Quality Act

The CEQA Guidelines state that a resource need not be listed on any register to be found historically significant. The CEQA Guidelines direct lead agencies to evaluate archaeological sites to determine if they meet the criteria for listing in the California Register. If an archaeological site is a historical resource, in that it is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register, potential adverse impacts to it must be considered. If an archaeological site is considered not to be an historical resource but meets the definition of a "unique archeological resource" as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, then it would be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

Local

City of American Canyon

General Plan

The City of American Canyon General Plan sets forth the following policy relevant to cultural resources:

- **Policy 1.5.1:** Require that development be designed and sited to protect significant environmental resources by adherence to the policies, standards, and programs contained in

the Natural and Historic/Cultural Resources, Geology and Flood Hazards, and Noise Elements of the General Plan, as well as federal (NEPA) and State (CEQA) regulations.

3.4.4 - Methodology

The analysis in this section is based upon the information contained in the Cultural Resources Inventory, prepared by Cardno Entrix. The inventory is provided in its entirety in Appendix D. The methodology of the inventory is described as follows.

Literature Review

Cardno Entrix Cultural Resource Specialist Darren Andolina conducted a cultural resources records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) in Rohnert Park, California on April 12, 2013 (Appendix B—Confidential). A 1-mile radius around the project site was searched for documented cultural resources. A 0.5-mile radius around the project site was searched for previous studies. Materials and documentation included previously conducted survey reports, 1863 General Land Office (GLO) Plat Map for Township 4 North, Range 4 West and 1923 GLO Plat Map for Township 4 North, Range 4 West and listings of resources on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR).

The records search indicates that the project site has been previously surveyed by Strother and Flynn in 1999 (S-22036) and by Jones and Stokes in 2008. Eight previous surveys have been conducted within the 0.5-mile search radius of the project site (Table 3.4-1 and Table 3.4-2). Three previously recorded cultural resources have been identified within 0.5-mile of the project site, and eight previously recorded cultural resources have been identified within 0.5-mile to 1-mile radius of the project site, which include two formally recorded isolates (Table 3.4-3, Table 3.4-4, and Table 3.4-5). No sites have been identified within the project site. Previous report and resource documentation is attached within confidential Appendix C.

Table 3.4-1: Previous Studies within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site

File No.	Author	Title	Date
S-589	Stradford, Richard A. and David A. Fredrickson	An Archaeological Survey of a Proposed Borrow Site in American Canyon near Napa, California	1977
S-647	Hastings, Richard B.	Lombard Street Overcrossing Archaeological Historical Field Survey	1975
S-10780	Hayes, Mick	Department of Transportation Negative Archaeological Survey Report for the Sale of an Excess Parcel of Land, West of State Highway 29 at Post Mile 2.9 in Napa County	1989
S-13464	Roop, William	A Cultural Resources Inventory of a Proposed Expansion of the Chardonnay Club, Inc., Napa County, California	1990
S-16739	Dowdall, Katherine M.	Department of Transportation Negative Archaeological Survey Report for the Construction of a New Caltrans Maintenance Station on Excess Land Parcels 27902-1, 2-7874- 4, and 2783-1, in Napa County, California	1995

Table 3.4-1 (cont.): Previous Studies within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site

File No.	Author	Title	Date
S-28400	Jones, Timothy E.	Petroglyphs in Context: Ritual Functions of Cupule Petroglyphs in the Southern North Coast Ranges, California: A Thesis Submitted to Sonoma State University	2004
S-34252	Origer, Thomas M. and Sharon A. Waechter	An Archaeological Survey of the Green Island Assessment and Reimbursement District, Napa County, California	1988
S-38676	Strother, Eric	A Cultural Resources Survey for the Devlin Road Extension over Fagan Creek Project, Napa County, California	2011
Source: Cardno Entrix, 2014.			

Table 3.4-2: Previous Studies within 0.25-Mile Radius of the Project Site

File No.	Author	Title	Date
S-1200	Ann S. Peak & Associates	Cultural Resource Assessment of the Napa-American Canyon Wastewater Reuse Program	1978
S-12429	Mikkelsen, Pat, John Berg, and Paul Bouey	Archaeological Survey and Evaluation for the Napa Sanitation District Master Plan Update, Napa County, California	1991
S-14137	Loyd, Janine M. and Thomas M. Origer	An Archaeological Survey of Two Sites for a Proposed Solid Waste Transfer Station, Napa County, California	1992
S-16849	King, Gregory	Historic Resource Evaluation Report on Former Napa Valley Railroad Line: 04-NAP-29, P.M. 22.2/28.4, 04226-111330	1986
S-19171	Beard, Vicki R.	A Cultural Resources Study of the Hess Collection Winery- American Canyon Property, Napa County, California	1997
S-22036	Strother, Eric and Katherine Flynn	A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the “Napa 218” Parcel, APN 057-090-59, in the Napa County Airport Industrial Area, Napa, Napa County	1999
S-22041	Flynn, Katherine S., William Roop and Ronald Melander	A Cultural Resource Inventory of the Napa Airport Master Environmental Assessment Area, Napa County, California	1983
S-24768	Flynn, Katherine	Archaeological Evaluation of the Proposed Devlin Road Extension Project, Napa, Napa County, California	1999
None	Jones and Stokes	Cultural Resources Inventory of the Proposed Napa Airport Corporate Center Development Project, Napa County, California	2008
Source: Cardno Entrix, 2014.			

Table 3.4-3: Previously Recorded Sites within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site

Primary No.	Trinomial	Description	Date Recorded
P-28-000361	CA-NAP-467	2 mortar cups, obsidian flakes	1997 (1977)
P-28-000798	CA-NAP-904H	Former late 1800s-1900s homestead	1997
P-28-000799	CA-NAP-905	Midden deposit, mortar cups	1997
Source: Cardno Entrix, 2014.			

Table 3.4-4: Previously Recorded Sites within 0.25-Mile Radius of the Project Site

Primary No.	Trinomial	Description	Date Recorded
P-28-000808	CA-NAP-909H	Scatter of historic-era artifacts, a brick-lined well, and field stone retaining wall that date from 1862 to mid-20th century	1997
P-28-000809	CA-NAP-910	Scatter of obsidian and basalt debitage with one cobble mortar	1997
P-28-001156	None	Scatter of obsidian, quartz, and cryptocrystalline flakes with one basalt “tool”	2001
None	CA-NAP-769	Three obsidian flakes and one fishing net weight	1991
None	CA-NAP-770	Scatter of approximately 20 obsidian flakes	1991
None	CA-NAP-498H	Scatter of glass, ceramics, and cut bone dating from 1850 to 1890	1977
Source: Cardno Entrix, 2014.			

Table 3.4-5: Previously Recorded Isolates within 0.5-Mile to 1-Mile Radius of the Project Site

Primary No.	Trinomial	Description	Date Recorded
P-28-000806	None	Obsidian flake	1997
P-28-000807	None	Obsidian uniface	1997
Source: Cardno Entrix, 2014.			

Native American Correspondence

On April 11, 2013, a sacred lands search and request for a Native American contact list for the area was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Appendix D). On January 24, 2014,

the NAHC responded with a list of Native American contacts, which failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within the immediate project area.

Cardno Entrix drafted contact letters on behalf of the District to all individuals on the contact list provided by the NAHC. On January 28, 2014, letters were mailed to each individual listed on the NAHC contact list.

Paleontological Review

A review of the project site for potential paleontological resources was conducted by assessing the Paleontological database created by the northern California museum repository at the University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology. As a result of the search, no paleontological resources were identified as located within the project site.

Field Visit

A field visit of the entire project site was conducted on April 22, 2013 by Ashley Hallock, Cultural Resources Specialist/Registered Professional Archaeologist. All access routes and the road shoulder were extensively examined. The condition of the project site had not changed since the Cultural Resources Inventory was completed by Jones and Stokes in 2008. Ground surface visibility was extremely low throughout much of the survey area (>1 percent to 5 percent). The majority of vegetation consisted of thick non-native grasses and weeds. Patches of marshy ground were prevalent throughout the survey area. The marshy areas offered better surface visibility (5 percent) but were frequently impassable, due to thick mud and rushes.

3.4.5 - Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, of the CEQA Guidelines, cultural resources impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project would be considered significant if the project would:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

3.4.6 - Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the development of the project and provides mitigation measures where appropriate.

Historic Resources

Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources.

Impact Analysis

The Cultural Resources Inventory indicated that there were no record historic resources within the project site. Additionally, the field survey found no indications of previously undiscovered historic resources.

Although there were no indications of historic resources being present within the project site, there is always the possibility that previously unknown historic resources exist below the ground surface within the project site and the off-site development areas. Therefore, implementation of standard cultural resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-1) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 If prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources are encountered, all construction activities within 100 feet of the find shall halt and the City of American Canyon shall be notified. Prehistoric archaeological materials may include obsidian and chert flakedstone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. A Secretary of the Interior-qualified archaeologist shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery. If it is determined that the project could damage a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines), mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, with a preference for preservation in place. Consistent with Section 15126.4(b)(3), this may be accomplished through planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporating the resource within open space; capping and covering the resource; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. If avoidance is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a detailed treatment plan in consultation with the City of American Canyon. Treatment of unique archaeological resources shall follow the applicable requirements of PRC Section 21083.2. Treatment for most resources would consist of (but would not be not limited to) sample excavation, artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the Project. The treatment

plan shall include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Archaeological Resources

Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological resources.

Impact Analysis

No known prehistoric archaeological resources were found during the field survey; therefore, no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered during construction activities associated with the proposed project. However, it is possible that subsurface excavations may encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources within the project site and the off-site development areas. The implementation of standard cultural resource construction mitigation (Mitigation Measure CUL-1) would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Paleontological Resources

Impact CUL-3: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered paleontological resources.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project area is not located in an area that is considered likely to have paleontological resources present. Fossils of plants, animals, or other organisms of paleontological significance have not been discovered at the project site or within the off-site development areas, nor has the site been identified to be within an area where such discoveries are likely. The type of depositional environment at the project area typically does not present favorable conditions for the discovery of paleontological resources. In this context, the project would not result in impacts to paleontological resources. However, if significant paleontological resources are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. There are no unique geologic features present on the project site or off-site development areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on a unique geologic feature.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-3 If potential fossils are discovered during project implementation, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find shall stop immediately until a qualified professional paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. The paleontologist shall report his or her findings to the City of American Canyon. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist shall either record the find and recommend that the City of American Canyon allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. The paleontologist, if required, shall propose modifications to the stop-work radius based on the nature of the find, site geology, and the activities occurring on the site. If treatment and salvage is required, recommendations will be consistent with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines and currently accepted scientific practice. If required, treatment for fossil remains shall include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection, and, if required, shall also include preparation of a report for publication describing the finds.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

Burial Sites

Impact CUL-4:	**Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project may damage or destroy previously undiscovered human burial sites.**

Impact Analysis

No human remains are known to exist within the project area. However, there is always the possibility that subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project (including off-site development areas), such as trenching and grading, could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. However, if human remains are discovered, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-4 In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease until the Napa County Coroner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be contacted within 24 hours if it is determined that the remains are Native American. The NAHC

will then identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American (PRC Section 5097.98), who in turn would make recommendations to the City of American Canyon for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)).

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.