Reading the Landscape: Managing Cultural Resources
in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park

by

Lacey C. Klopp

A thesis submitted to
Sonoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in
Cultural Resources Management

Adrian Praetzellis, Ph.D, Chair
Laura Watt, Ph.D.
E. Breck Parkman, M.A.
21 April 2015
DATE
Authorization for Reproduction of Masters Thesis

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

Date: 4/27/15

Signature

laceyklopp@gmail.com

Email Address
Reading the Landscape: Managing Cultural Resources in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park

Thesis by
Lacey C. Klopp

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this thesis is to provide Sugarloaf Ridge State Park (SRSP) with a cultural resources management plan for their newly acquired, 637-acre, Stern Ranch property. The Sugarloaf Ridge State Park Final General Plan and Environmental Impact Report identified an increased demand for improved interpretation and outdoor recreation use (Chrisman et al. 2004). Several suggestions were made to meet these demands, including the creation of additional interpretation areas and trail expansion. With the acquisition of Stern Ranch, park managers are planning to put these ideas into action, by extending the High Ridge Trail through the Stern property. Currently, the High Ridge Trail ends at the red barn site, which includes the remains of the Hurd family homestead near the headwaters of Bear Creek. This will be an opportunity for the Park to increase interpretation of the park’s early Euro-American settlement and rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California. Additionally, several standing buildings on the property have been re-used for Park staff housing and for storage. This Cultural Resources Management Plan has considered these impacts to existing cultural resources and has provided recommendations to ensure the protection and preservation of these resources as they are transitioned into SRSP property.

Methods: The data required to fulfill the goals of this thesis were gathered through documentary research, field survey and community engagement. Prior to surveying Stern Ranch, a record, map and literature search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center, the California State Parks archive, the Anthropological Studies Center, the Santa Rosa Library and Annex, the Sonoma County Records Office, and the Glen Ellen Historical Society. Additional documents, including photographs and letters, were given to me by Susan David, the great granddaughter of one of the previous owners of the Stern Ranch property.

Cultural resources and landscapes within Stern Ranch were identified through a controlled-exclusive field survey over most of the property between fall 2013 and fall 2014. Survey crews consisted of between two and eight non-student and student volunteers from the Cultural Resources Management program at Sonoma State University. Resources and features found within the property were recorded on California DPR 523 forms and mapped with a Trimble GeoXT. Of the 637-acre property, a total of 410 acres were surveyed.

Local stories, public thoughts, perspectives and knowledge about the Park were explored through community engagement with Native American tribal members, local community organizations, and Park staff through informal interviews and participation in interpretive
programs. This provided information about community values and prompted recommendations about interpretation at the Park.

**Findings:** One historic-era site was identified and designated the Stern Ranch Complex during the field survey. This resource is considered a cultural landscape with historically associated elements in a definable area recorded according to the *Office of Historic Preservation’s Instructions for Recording Historical Resources* (1995). The Stern ranch complex consists of seven loci spread out over the landscape that are connected by a series of trails and roads, and make up the historic-era ranching and current residential complex. This place is representative of the broader landscapes of this part of Sonoma County, beginning with agriculture and ranching and shifting to a landscape of recreation. Additionally, six isolated artifacts were identified and mapped. Two of the isolates (ISO-1 and ISO-2) are obsidian bifaces and were formally recorded on DPR 523 forms.

**Conclusions:** This thesis identified, mapped and evaluated cultural resources in the newly acquired Stern Ranch property. It addressed the legal obligations associated with the development of recreational trails and adaptive re-use of buildings on the ranch. It contextualized the ranch as a cultural landscape and showed how it fits into the broader socio-historical landscape of the surrounding area through a detailed description of its environment and history. This research provided a basis for an interpretation program that will unite the early Euro-American settlement history into a cohesive narrative. A discussion of future impacts and a set of comprehensive recommendations were provided to continue the management of cultural resources within Stern Ranch and SRSP as a whole.

Chair: Adrian Ruckelh Date: 21 April 2015

M.A. Program: Cultural Resources Management
Sonoma State University
Acknowledgements

It’s a little surreal that this chapter in my life has ended. Looking back, it is astonishing how much has changed, both in my personal and professional life, since I first started this program. While it has been amazing, change isn’t always easy on the people closest to you. I am forever grateful to my husband, for accepting this path and gladly walking with me through it. I appreciate you volunteering your time on several weekends as part of my field crew. Even enduring three weeks of full body poison oak, only to go back out and do it all over again. (That was the last time I promise). This thesis would not have been possible without your endless love and support. Also to my family, it’s been a long journey to get to this point and you all have supported me every step of the way. I hope that I have made you proud. Thank you.

Thanks to all of my committee members and field crews that helped make this possible. My committee chair, Adrian Praetzellis, you gave me guidance when I needed it most, and words of encouragement when things seemed overwhelming. To my other committee members, E. Breck Parkman and Laura Watt, you shared your wealth of knowledge and experience openly and whole-heartedly. To my field crews, I know it wasn’t always easy going but you stuck through it with poison oak on your arms and smiles of your faces. (There was a lot of poison oak out there). To Yesenia, I am forever in your debt for coming out in the field two weeks before your wedding. I’m just glad you were able to cover the poison oak with makeup.

I would also like to thank the Sugarloaf Ridge State Park staff and volunteers. California State Parks for allowing me the opportunity to complete this project at the park and for collaborating with me along the way. Team Sugarloaf Manager John Roney, for facilitating my access to Stern Ranch. Park Historian Larry Maniscalco for joining me in the field and sharing your knowledge. Bill, Kevin and their families, thanks for letting me bring groups of people to take pictures and rummage through your front lawns almost every weekend for the past year and a half.

A special thanks goes to the folks at the Anthropological Studies Center, and the faculty of the Cultural Resource Management program. Your dedication to educating students is remarkable. I am so thankful that I found this program and had the opportunity to work with you all.

Finally, to my fellow cohorts, it is an unwritten truth that to get through this program you need the camaraderie (and bowling… and dance central… and Hop Monk) of the people that are in the trenches with you. People that will believe in you if your confidence waivers. People that will drop everything to read your paper last minute and give you advice. People that will remind you that in the end, this has been a lot of fun. Thank you for being my people.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State of Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Policy Context</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Ridge State Park Final General Plan and EIR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Register of Historical Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC § 5024 and 5024.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Historical Landmarks</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Recreational Trails Plan</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Summary</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Environmental Context</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and Topography</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. History of Land Use Before 1846</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Research</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Research</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukian Language Family</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement within the Wappo Language Area</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Ceremonial Life</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring Groups</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo Linguistic Groups</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement within the Southern Pomo Language Area</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Ceremonial Life</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Culture</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early European Exploration and Missionization</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Period</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. History of Land Use After 1846</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Period ................................................................. 49
Agriculture in Sonoma County ........................................ 51
Mining in Sonoma County .................................................. 55
Charcoal Production in Sonoma County ......................... 55
Rancherias and Federal Recognition ................................. 56
Anticipated Property Types .............................................. 57

V. Landscape Archaeology .................................................. 60
Introduction ........................................................................ 60
Origins of Landscape Archaeology ..................................... 60
The Social Landscape .......................................................... 62
Environmental Perception and Land Use Strategies ............... 64
The Human-Environment Relationship ............................... 69
Land Use and Management Today ....................................... 75

VI. Cultural Resources Inventory ....................................... 79
Introduction ........................................................................ 79
Records and Literature Search ........................................... 79
Previous Research and Recorded Resources ..................... 81
Organizational and Individual Contact .............................. 92
Cultural Resources Survey .................................................. 94
Field Methods .................................................................... 94
Field Work Results ............................................................ 97

VII. Stern Ranch Complex Evaluation ................................. 102
Introduction ........................................................................ 102
Cultural Landscapes ............................................................ 102
Historic Context .................................................................. 106
Rural Agricultural Development in Kenwood, CA Between 1884 and 1957 .......... 106
Rural Recreation in California Between 1957 and 1974 ...................... 108
History of the Stern Ranch ................................................... 111
Application of the California Register Criteria ...................... 123
Criteria Considerations ....................................................... 130
Integrity ............................................................................ 131
Location .......................................................................... 132
Design ............................................................................ 132
Setting ............................................................................ 132
Material .......................................................................... 133
Workmanship ................................................................. 133
Feeling .......................................................................... 133
Association ................................................................. 134
Comparable Properties ...................................................... 134
Summary Evaluation ......................................................... 135

VIII. Interpretation and Public Benefit ................................. 137
Introduction ........................................................................ 137
# A Brief Overview of the Field of Interpretation

- Meaning-Making Paradigm
- Community Engagement and Value Assessment
- Cultural Heritage Management and Archaeology
- Interpretation at California State Parks
- Interpretation at Sugarloaf
- Bringing Stern Ranch into SRSP Interpretive Program
- Future Directions

# IX. Cultural Resources Management Plan

- Introduction
- Anticipated Future Impacts to Cultural Resources in Stern Ranch
- Acquisition and Incorporation of the Ranch into the Park
- Development and Rehabilitation of Trails through the Ranch
- Adaptive Re-use of Buildings
- Natural Occurrences
- Illegal Marijuana Gardens
- Recommendations
- Recommendation #1: Enact a Landscape Management Approach
- Recommendation #2: Initiate Legal Compliance Procedures
- Recommendation #3: Continue to Identify and Record Sites and Features
- Recommendation #4: Rehabilitate Historic Trails Through Stern Ranch
- Recommendation #5: Evaluate and Re-Use Buildings and Structures
- Recommendation #6: Develop a Park Vegetation Management Plan
- Recommendation #7: Implement a Regular Monitoring Program
- Recommendation #8: Involve Stakeholders and Community
- Recommendation #9: Consult with Tribal Governments
- Recommendation #10: Implement an Interpretive Program
- Recommendation #11: Inadvertent Discoveries
- Native American Recommendations
- Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research

# References Cited

# Appendix A

- Hand Drawn Map of Stern Ranch (Sher-Mar-Lin Ranch)
- Gilcrest family and Howard Carpenter’s Photographs and Letters
- Correspondence
- DPR Forms
- Oral History Document (Gresham 1983)
- Stern Ranch Architectural Documents and Photographs
- Caretaker Document
- DPR Permit to Conduct Archaeological Investigations
List of Figures

Figure 01. Vicinity Map.................................................................17
Figure 02. Stern Ranch Property.....................................................18
Figure 03. Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map..........................27
Figure 04. Linguistic Boundaries and Village Sites, Adapted from Barrett (1908) ..... 36
Figure 05. Linguistic Boundaries, Adapted from Heizer (1978) ......................41
Figure 06. Prehistoric Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park ......................87
Figure 07. Historic-era Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park ....................89
Figure 08. Multicomponent Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park .................91
Figure 09. Survey Coverage Map ...................................................96
Figure 10. Isolated Artifacts Location Map ........................................99
Figure 11. Howard Carpenter, Ella Gilcrest, Cora Gilcrest and Murray Gilcrest .....112
Figure 12. Howard Carpenter and William Gilcrest at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro....114
Figure 13. The Gilcrest Family Fishing at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro..............115
Figure 14. 1916 Santa Rosa USGS 15-Minute Topographic Quadrangle ..........116
Figure 15. Flared Roofs on various Buildings in Stern Ranch ....................128
Figure 16. Freeman Tilden’s (1977) six principles of interpretation ...............139
Figure 17. CEQA Process Flow Chart .............................................159
Figure 18. Trail Map 01-Short Loop Trail .........................................162
Figure 19. Trail Map 02-Long Loop Trail ..........................................164
List of Tables

Table 01. Cultural Resource Studies within SRSP ....................................................... 82
Table 02. Previously Recorded Prehistoric Resources within SRSP ......................... 85
Table 03. Previously Recorded Historic-era Resources within SRSP ................. 88
Table 04. Previously Recorded Multicomponent Resources within SRSP ............ 90
Table 05. Isolated Artifacts Found within Stern Ranch ........................................... 98
Table 06. Features Representing the Agricultural Period in Stern Ranch .......... 105
Table 07. Features Representing the Recreational Period in Stern Ranch .......... 106
Table 08. Land Ownership in Stern Ranch .............................................................. 120
Table 09. Other Land Ownership in Stern Ranch ................................................. 122
Table 10. FIGR Native Plants List, Provided by Nick Tipon ............................... 174
Chapter I. Introduction and Background

Introduction

In this thesis, I provide Sugarloaf Ridge State Park (SRSP) with a cultural resources management plan (CRMP) for its newly acquired, 637-acre, Stern Ranch property. CRMPs are tools used to carry out the goals of an agency while complying with various cultural resource laws and best practices. CRMPs include proactive recommendations and procedures for the protection, preservation and interpretation of identified cultural resources. For the purposes of this thesis, the terms cultural resources and cultural resource management are defined as follows:

Cultural resources are all the aspects of the physical and supraphysical environment that human beings and their societies value for reasons having to do with culture. Included are culturally valued sites, buildings, and other places, plants and animals, atmospheric phenomena, sights and sounds, artifacts and other objects, documents, traditions, arts, crafts, ways of life, means of expression and systems of belief. Cultural resource management means actions undertaken to manage such phenomena, or-importantly-to identify and manage the ways in which change affects or may affect them (King and Nissley 2014:14).

This CRMP was conducted in conformance with the goals of the Sugarloaf Ridge State Park Final General Plan and Environmental Impact Report (Sugarloaf EIR) for cultural resources, which are to “identify, protect, preserve, and interpret significant cultural resources identified within the Park” (Chrisman et al. 2004:208). The Sugarloaf EIR also requires newly acquired properties to be surveyed for the purposes of identifying and mapping cultural resources (Chrisman et al. 2004:208). This CRMP has fulfilled these goals and requirements as they pertain to Stern Ranch.

The Sugarloaf EIR identified an increased demand for improved interpretation, specifically the prehistoric and historic past, and outdoor recreation use (Chrisman et al.
Expanding trails and creating additional interpretation areas were a couple of the suggestions made to meet these demands (Chrisman et al. 2004:165, 208). With the acquisition of Stern Ranch, Park managers are planning to put these ideas into action, by extending the High Ridge Trail through the Stern property. Currently, the High Ridge Trail ends at the red barn site, which includes the remains of the Hurd family homestead near the headwaters of Bear Creek. This will be an opportunity for Park management to increase interpretation of the Parks early Euro-American settlement and rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California. Additionally, several standing buildings on the property have been re-used for Park staff housing and storage. This thesis considers these impacts to existing cultural resources and provides recommendations to ensure the protection and preservation of these resources as they are transitioned into SRSP property.

This thesis identifies and maps cultural resources, and addresses management’s legal obligations associated with the development of recreational trails and adaptive re-use of buildings on the ranch. A pedestrian survey and research of archival, primary and secondary documents, that inform both the history of the property and the best management practices to ensure public benefit, were conducted. Protection and preservation measures for identified cultural resources were developed through an assessment of future impacts to these resources. Through this process, this thesis demonstrates how the property fits into the broader socio-historical landscape of the surrounding area, and how to incorporate these resources into the Park’s interpretive and educational programs.
**Current State of Management**

The State of California bought most of what is now SRSP in 1920 to dam Sonoma Creek and provide water for Sonoma State Hospital. In 1942, the land was leased out for grazing, and twenty years later the Park was established. Due to California’s budget problems, Sugarloaf was closed in December 2011. Six months later, a coalition of five nonprofit partners called Team Sugarloaf, developed a 5-year agreement to manage the operations of the Park, while the State maintained ownership (Sonoma Ecology Center 2013a). The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) still retains the responsibility of managing the cultural and natural resources within their Parks as part of the agreement. The newly acquired Stern Ranch property however, is fully managed by DPR at the request of Team Sugarloaf.

Each non-profit in Team Sugarloaf specializes in one facet of the Park’s operations. Taking the lead for the team and overseeing general operations is the Sonoma Ecology Center, whose mission is to protect the beauty and biodiversity within the Sonoma Valley. Other partners include the Robert Ferguson Observatory, which is one of the most popular observatories in Northern California, and is located within SRSP. United Camps, Conferences, and Retreats has taken over the operation of the campground, while the Sonoma County Trails Council is dedicated to maintaining and creating trails within the Park. And lastly, the Valley of the Moon Natural History Association is committed to increasing public interpretation of the natural and historic features within SRSP (Sonoma Ecology Center 2013b).
Legal and Policy Context

The thesis was produced to meet the goals of the Sugarloaf EIR for cultural resources, which are to “identify, protect, preserve, and interpret significant cultural resources identified within the Park” (Chrisman et al. 2004:208). This thesis also seeks to inform SRSP of the legal obligations it may encounter while planning to open up the Stern Ranch property to the public. Numerous laws, regulations and policies govern the management of cultural resources within the California State Park system. Many of these come into effect during the planning of a project. The creation or rehabilitation of trails and adaptive re-use of buildings and structures within SRSP are projects that require compliance to legislation that considers cultural resources.

The primary laws that govern these types of projects are the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5024 and 5024.5. In addition to laws, there are administrative missions and guidelines regarding project planning and cultural resources. One such document is a Memorandum of Understanding between California State Parks, the Natural Resources Agency and the Resources Legacy Fund, which addresses, among other things, the vision, mission and future needs of the State Park System as they relate to cultural resource protection (Park Forward Initiative 2013:3). The mission of the Statewide Trails Office states its goal of “respecting and protecting the integrity of its equally diverse natural and cultural resources” when expanding trails within the California State Park system (Coleman et al. 2002:3). The expansion of the trail system and adaptive re-use of buildings and structures within SRSP would be subject to fulfilling this mission while complying with the State’s laws and guidelines that address historic preservation and protection of cultural resources.
The following is a description of these laws and guidelines, which can be used to assist SRSP in meeting legal obligations during the planning of this project.

Sugarloaf Ridge State Park Final General Plan and Environmental Impact Report

The Sugarloaf EIR expresses the goal of expanding trails to connect the broad areas of the Park (Chrisman et al. 2004:176). Section 2.1.1 lays out the system-wide project planning guidelines, which includes CEQA, PRC § 5024 and 5024.5 and the California Recreational Trails Plan (2002) as guiding factors (Chrisman et al. 2004:39). Trail expansion opportunities have increased due to the acquisition of new land, including Stern Ranch, a 637-acre property located in the middle of the Park. One of the key issues for trail expansion is the identification of cultural resources within these new areas. The Sugarloaf EIR states,

Cultural resources consist of historical, archaeological, and traditional cultural properties that are eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or the California Register of Historical Resources. (Chrisman et al. 2004:207)

The overall goals for managing cultural resources within the Park are protection, preservation and interpretation. Guideline CULT-6 specifically addresses project planning and the need to develop

CEQA documentation providing the environmental evaluation and mitigation measures necessary to avoid, reduce, or minimize potentially significant impacts to cultural resources. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208)

In addition to this guideline, CULT-7 focuses on PRC § 5024.5, which deals with the alteration of historical resources (Chrisman et al. 2004:209). Historical resources are defined as state-owned resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the National
Register of Historic Places or as a California Landmark under PRC 5024 and 5024.5

Expanding trails within the Park would be subject to all of these guidelines.

The inadvertent discovery of human remains is addressed in CULT-8 of the SRSP general plan and is subject to California State Health and Safety Code (CSHSC) § 7050.5. (CSHSC) § 7050.5 states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined…that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code…If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Furthermore, CULT-8 of the SRSP general plan (Chrisman et al. 2004:209) states that if the human remains are determined to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission will identify the most likely descendant (MLD) of the deceased. The MLD can then make recommendations for further action to the landowner.

*California Register of Historical Resources*

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) (PRC § 5024.1) is a guide used to identify the State’s historical resources, which are recognized
as a part of the environment (PRC § 21083.2 and 21084.1) and, therefore, should be considered during CEQA compliance. Under PRC § 5020.1(j) a historical resource includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

The California Register includes California State Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (PRC § 5024.1[d]). Local landmarks and landmark districts that are listed in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for the California Register and should be considered significant for the purposes of CEQA (PRC § 5024.1[e]). The State Historical Resources Commission determines the eligibility of historical resources to the California Register, based on a set of four criteria (PRC § 5024.1[b]).

The four criteria for eligibility are listed in PRC § 5024.1(c) and can be summarized as follows: (1) association with significant events, (2) association with significant people, (3) embodies distinctive characteristics, and (4) has, or could yield important information. A resource does not need to already be identified or listed in the California Register or a local register to be considered significant. It is the responsibility of the lead agency to identify and evaluate resources for their eligibility to the California Register prior to deciding whether a project, like trail expansion, may cause a significant adverse change to a historical resource (PRC § 21084.1).
The California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA (PRC § 21000 et seq.), enacted in 1970, as amended, requires that prior to carrying out projects on non-federal land, the lead agency must identify significant effects on the environment that may be caused by the project. PRC § 21083.2 and 21084.1 recognize that adverse effects to both historical and unique archaeological resources constitute adverse effects to the environment. If significant adverse effects are identified, the lead agency takes action, where feasible, to avoid or mitigate those significant effects. State and local public agencies follow State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR § 15000 et seq.) when going through the review process required by CEQA. The first step in the process is to determine whether the proposed action is a “project” as defined in PRC § 21065. A project is defined as “an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment” (PRC § 21065).

If the action is considered a project, the next step is to determine if the project is exempt from CEQA. There are four reasons why a project may be exempt from CEQA: if the project is ministerial, if there are no possible significant effects to the environment, if the project constitutes a statutory exemption or if the project is a categorical exemption. “Ministerial describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project” (14 CCR § 15369). The public agency involved determines whether or not an action is ministerial (14 CCR § 15268). Statutory exemptions are projects that are excluded from CEQA by the State Legislature, which can be found in 14 CCR § 15260-15285. Categorical exemptions are projects considered not to have a significant effect on the environment.
(14 CCR § 15300). Categorical exemptions can be found in 14 CCR § 15301-15333. However, if a categorical exemption may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource it is not longer considered a categorical exemption (14 CCR § 15300.2).

If the project is not exempt, the lead agency must determine whether the project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (PRC § 21084.1). Historical resources are defined in PRC § 21084.1 as

a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1, or deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1, are presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of this section, unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.

The other types of resources that should be considered are unique archaeological resources. An archaeological artifact, object or site that is not a historical resource could be a unique archaeological resource if it meets any of the following criteria (PRC § 21083.2(g):

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

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

3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

The next step is an Initial Study. The Initial Study requires the lead agency to “determine whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment” (14
Depending on what is found through that process, one of three things may happen. If no effects are expected, then a written statement explaining that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment called a Negative Declaration is prepared and no further review is necessary (PRC § 21064). If significant effects are expected, but the project is changed to avoid the impacts, then a Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is a written statement explaining the changes that have been made to avoid significant effects on the environment (PRC § 21064.5). Lastly, if there is substantial evidence to suggest that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, further review is necessary, in the form of an environmental impact report (EIR) (14 CCR § 15064; Cal OHP 2001). The EIR is a document produced for the public and the lead agency “to analyze the significant environmental effects of a proposed project, to identify alternatives, and to disclose possible ways to reduce or avoid the possible environmental damage” (14 CCR § 15002[f]). Once a final EIR is complete, the lead agency files a Notice of Determination stating how the project will proceed, pursuant to 14 CCR § 15094.

**National Register of Historic Places**

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) (36 CFR § 60) is a planning tool used to identify historic properties and to indicate which of them should be considered for protection when faced with significant impacts (36 CFR § 60.2). Historic properties are those listed in or eligible for the National Register and include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant to American heritage (36 CFR § 60.1). To comply with PRC § 5024, a State agency must prepare an evaluation for their
resources. The SHPO determines the eligibility of the property, but only the Keeper of the National Register has the authority to list the property (36 CFR § 60.6). Much like the California Register, a determination of eligibility is based on a set of four criteria, which are listed in 36 CFR § 60.4. The reason for evaluating properties to either the California or National registers may have to do with legal compliance, but the benefits are far-reaching. Having recognized historic properties/historical resources within a State Park builds community pride in the history of the Park, and serves as an interpretive attraction along its expanding trail system.

**PRC § 5024 and 5024.5**

One of the guiding factors in SRSP’s General Plan is conformity with PRC § 5024, which requires State agencies to evaluate State-owned resources for eligibility to the National Register and the California Historical Landmark (CHL) listing. It also stipulates that State agencies create and maintain a list of historical resources. Both PRC § 5024 and 5024.5 were passed before the establishment of the California Register and, therefore, do not apply to State-owned historical resources that are not on or eligible to the National Register regardless of California Register status. These resources are considered under CEQA. PRC § 5024(f) requires review in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for any project that may affect historical resources that are on or eligible to the National Register or the CHL. The SHPO determines if a project may cause an adverse effect to historical resources (PRC § 5024.5). While planning a project, the State agency must first identify and evaluate potential historical resources within the project area so the SHPO can make an informed determination. If a
project will cause an adverse effect on a historical resource, the SHPO and the head of
the State agency work together to mitigate the effects (PRC § 5024.5(b)). For a more
lengthy discussion on state agency compliance with PRC § 5024 and 5024.5 refer to Cal
OHP (2013).

California Historical Landmarks

The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), the State Historical Resources
Commission (SHRC) and California State Parks, administer the CHL registration
program. CHLs are buildings, structures, sites or places that have statewide historical
significance. A resource that is a CHL or is eligible to be a CHL must be taken into
consideration prior to implementing a project (PRC § 5024(f)). For a resource to be listed
as a CHL it must meet certain criteria: the property owner must approve the designation,
it must be recommended by the SHRC, and be designated by the Director of California
State Parks (Cal OHP 2011). The three criteria for eligibility are summarized as follows:
(1) is the first, last, only or most significant resource of its type, (2) association with
influential people or groups, and (3) is an outstanding example of an architectural
movement or surviving work of a notable person (PRC § 5031(a)). Any CHLs that were
designated under these criteria (#770 and above) will automatically be listed in the
California Register (PRC § 5024.1(d)(2).

California Recreational Trails Plan

The final guiding factor in the Sugarloaf EIR is the California Recreational Trails
Plan (CRTP 2002), which was created in 1978 pursuant to PRC § 5070.7. The Plan
provides insight on the benefits of trails in California, strategies for acquiring funding, and methods of effective stewardship and cooperation among trail users. Phase one of the plan identifies goals and lists guidelines for future trail programs within State Parks. Stated in these many goals is the desire to focus on cultural resources along trials through protection and educational interpretation. PRC § 5070.5 states,

> It is the policy of the State to…increase accessibility and enhance the use, enjoyment, and understanding of California’s scenic, natural, historic, and cultural resources.

The expansion of trials through SRSP would advance these goals.

The creation or rehabilitation of trails and adaptive re-use of buildings or structures within SRSP is guided by several overlapping pieces of legislation and administrative goals and guidelines. CEQA mandates that effects on the environment must be considered when carrying out a project like creating trails. Historical resources and unique archaeological resources are a part of the environment that must be taken into consideration. The California Register is a guide for which historical resources are considered significant under CEQA. During the planning process of creating new trails through SRSP, historical resources should be identified. PRC § 5024 mandates that State agencies evaluate their resources for eligibility to the National Register and the CHL. The National Register and CHL listings are used as planning tools to indicate which properties should be considered for protection when faced with significant impacts. In addition to these laws, the CRTP (2002) states goals and guidelines regarding project planning and cultural resources. The expansion of the trail system within SRSP would be subject to fulfilling these goals while complying with the laws and guidelines that address historic preservation and protection of cultural resources.
Thesis Summary

An environmental context is provided in Chapter II to give the reader an understanding of the landscape within Stern Ranch and the surrounding area. This is important because it is directly related to how people perceived and used the land. Chapters III and IV then describe the history of the area beginning with Native American land use and ending with the inclusion of Stern Ranch into SRSP in 2007. This background information provides the basis for a discussion about property types that could be found within the Park. Chapter V discusses landscape archaeology as a framework for understanding how cultural resources found in the Park are related spatially, temporally and through individual and group perception both past and present. These chapters are provided to contextualize the cultural resources found in Stern Ranch and to inform management strategies moving forward.

Chapter IV is a cultural resources inventory that discusses the methods of this thesis and the results of an archaeological survey conducted in Stern Ranch. A description of the Stern Ranch complex site that was found as a result of the survey is also provided. This site is evaluated for inclusion into the California Register of Historical Resources in Chapter VII. The inclusion of Stern Ranch into SRSP provides an opportunity to expand the interpretation and educational programs in the Park. This is discussed in Chapter VIII. The final chapter discusses potential future impacts to the cultural resources in the Park and recommendations for their management.
Chapter II. Environmental Context

Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the environment within SRSP. A detailed understanding of the environment is useful for archaeologists because it provides a context for interpreting cultural resources located within the Park. The aspects of the environment discussed in this chapter include: location and topography, vegetation, fauna, geology, soils, and climate. This chapter along with a detailed historic context (Chapters III and IV) is used as the basis for a discussion on anticipated property types within Stern Ranch.

Location and Topography

SRSP is in Kenwood, situated between Sonoma and Napa valleys, within the Mayacamas Mountains (see Figure 01). The Park itself is 4,765 acres and includes the top of Bald Mountain at 2,729 feet above mean sea level (amsl) and the Sonoma Creek watershed. Sonoma Creek begins at 2,400 feet amsl and flows across meadow floors, rock outcroppings and into gorges and canyons at the Parks lowest elevation at 640 feet amsl. During the winter, Sonoma Creek boasts a 25-foot waterfall, which can be accessed on the Canyon-Pony Gate Loop trail. The topography of the Park is characterized by steep rocky hillsides, high ridges and sporadic open rolling hills divided by intermittent and perennial creeks and drainages.

The Stern Ranch study area is located in the center of the Park, within section 15 and 16 of Township 7 North, Range 6 West as depicted on the 1954 USGS 7.5-minute
Kenwood, California topographic quadrangle. Stern Ranch contains the headwaters of Pony Gate Gulch and a portion of Bear Creek, which runs the length of the western boundary of the study area. Elevation of the study area ranges between 680 feet amsl in the southwest section in the steep Bear Creek drainage, to 2,600 feet amsl in the northeast section near the top of Bald Mountain. The topography within Stern Ranch includes gentle to very steep mid-slope terraces, broad flat benches, ridges, saddles and steep creek drainages (see Figure 02).
Figure 01. Vicinity Map
Figure 02. Stern Ranch Property
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Veg
etation

Vegetation types within the Park include, native and non-native grasslands, mixed chaparral, white alder riparian woodland, various types of oak woodland, California bay and big leaf maple, mixed hardwood forest, Douglas fir and coast redwood forest (Chrisman et al. 2004:79, Küchler 1977:18-20). Non-native European grasslands occur in patches throughout the Park and are dominated by slender oats (*Avena barbata*), wild oats (*Avena Fatua*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), yellow-star thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*) and soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*). Between 1942 and 1964 the Park’s grasslands were used for grazing, which aided the success of these non-natives (Chrisman et al. 2004:80). Park staff at SRSP used controlled burns to decrease the non-native invasive yellow-star thistle population in the mid 1990s (DiTomaso and Hastings 1996:125-126). This program successfully controlled non-native invasive species and increased natives in the grasslands.

Native grasslands occur on serpentine substrates and are dominated by various needlegrasses (*Nassella spp*), California oatgrass (*Danthonia californica*), and blue wildrye (*Elymus glaucus*). Native wildflowers in this community include California buttercups (*Ranunculus californicus*), blue dicks (*Dichelostemma capitatum*) and blue-eyed grass (*Sisyrinchium bellum*). The white alder riparian woodland occurs along large watercourses within the Park and is dominated by white alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*) in the upper layer and big-leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), Oregon ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*), and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*) in the lower layer (Chrisman et al. 2004:85).
Most of the oak woodlands in the Park are dominated by one species but may include other oaks sporadically. They include: coast live oak woodland, California bay woodland, canyon live oak woodland, black oak woodland, Oregon oak woodland, valley oak woodland and big-leaf maple woodland (Chrisman et al. 2004:85-87). Douglas fir forests may include big-leaf maple, tan oak (*Lithocarpus densiflorus*), madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) or California bay (Chrisman et al. 2004:87-88).

The coast redwood forests within the Park occur along Sonoma Creek and are some of the easternmost in California. According to Chrisman and colleagues (2004:88), “the age of the older coast redwood trees is roughly 120 years, thus it is presumed that the trees were logged circa 1875”.

The two main vegetation communities with Stern Ranch include mixed hardwood forests (*Arbutus-Quercus*) and chaparral (*Adenostoma-Arctostaphylos-Ceanothus*) (Küchler 1977:18-20). Mixed hardwood forests are characterized by low to medium tall, broad leaved evergreen trees, broad leaved deciduous trees and needle-leaved evergreen trees. In higher elevations this vegetation community appears shrubby and includes chaparral. The dominant species in mixed hardwood forests are madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and canyon oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) (Küchler 1977:18). Chaparral communities are characterized by needle-leaved and broad-leaved evergreen sclerophyll shrubs and are dominated by Chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos spp.*), and California lilac (*Ceanothus spp.*) (Küchler 1977:20). The non-native trees observed within Stern Ranch include palm, fig, olive, persimmon, plum, apple, black and English walnut.
Fauna

Fauna within the Park are abundant, varied, and can be categorized by specific environmental communities. Sonoma Creek provides a habitat for a variety of species including steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) salmon. In the mesic herbaceous-marshy areas there are a variety of amphibians including the western toad (*Bufo boreas*) and the Pacific tree frog (*Hyla regilla*). Predators living in these environments include garter snakes (*Thamnophis spp.*), ring neck snakes (*Diadophis punctatus*), and shrews (*Sorex spp.*). Animals living in the grasslands of SRSP include the western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), lark sparrow (*Chondestes grammacus*), the Savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis*), meadow voles (*Microtus californicus*), ground squirrels (*Spermophyllus beecheyi*), and Botta pocket gophers (*Thomomys bottae*) (Chrisman et al. 2004:91-92).

Predators in the grasslands include a variety of amphibians, reptiles and birds, including alligator lizards (*Elgaria spp.*), gopher snakes (*Pitloushish melanoleucus*), red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*), great-horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*) and loggerhead shirke (*Lanius ludovicianus*). Mammalian predators that hunt in the grasslands include the long-tailed weasel (*Mustela frenata*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), coyote (*Canus latrans*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*) and mountain lion (*Felis concolor*) (Chrisman et al. 2004:92).

The scrub and chaparral communities provide a habitat for some species and an area to forage for others. These species include many of the grassland animals as well as the western rattlesnake (*Crotalis viridis*), birds such as the California thrasher (*Toxostoma redivivum*) and the wrentit (*Chamaea fasciata*), and small animals such as
brush rabbits (*Sylvilagus bachmanni*) and deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus*). The various coniferous woodlands are home to the dusky-footed wood rat (*Neotoma fuscipes*) and several migratory songbirds including the ash-throated flycatcher (*Myiarchus cinerascens*), the western flycatcher (*Emipodonax difficilis*) and the orange-crowned warbler (*Vermivora celara*). The sargent cypress in particular is the home of the Muir’s hairstreak (*Mitoura nelsoni muiri*) butterfly (Chrisman et al. 2004: 92-93).

The oak and big-leaf maple woodland provides a habitat for thousands of different species (Chrisman et al. 2004: 93). Many of the above mentioned species live and forage in this community, but also include deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), bobcats (*Lynx rufus*), western gray squirrels (*Sciurus griseus*), and a variety of birds including chestnut-backed chickadees (*Parus rufescens*), oak titmouse (*Parus inoratus*), and the bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*). Douglas fir, coast redwood and mixed evergreen forests are the homes of the California black-tailed deer (*Odocoileus hemionus columbianus*), raptors, and northern spotted owls (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), while riparian woodlands are filled with a variety of songbirds (Chrisman et al. 2004: 93-94). Wild pigs (*Sus scrofa*) and wild turkeys (*Meleagris gallopavo*) are also found within SRSP and are considered ‘pest species’ (Chrisman et al. 2004:94).

**Geology**

The underlying geology of an area is important because landscape evolution can give information about archaeological sensitivity. It has been shown for instance, that there is a positive association between Holocene-age landforms and buried archaeological materials in Sonoma County and surrounding areas (Meyer and Rosenthal 2007:7). Most
of the lowland valleys have underlying geology dating to the Holocene and many contain buried archaeological sites. For example, in the Santa Rosa Valley, a Middle Holocene archaeological deposit (CA-SON-2098) was found over five feet below the surface within Holocene age soils (Meyer and Rosenthal 1992:14). Many of the buried archaeological sites found in this region have very high research potential because they contain the earliest evidence of occupation in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Mayacamas Mountains are part of the larger north-south trending California Coast Ranges, which extend from the Santa Ynez Mountains in the south to the South Fork Mountains in the north (Schoenherr 1992:261). The San Francisco Bay divides these ranges into northern and southern sections. The North Coast Ranges extend from the San Francisco Bay to the Oregon border. Formation of the North Coast Ranges is attributed to the subduction of the Pacific Plate off the coast of North America (Schoenherr 1992:264). The alignment of these valleys and ridges along parallel faults and folds causes the many rivers within the ranges (such as the Russian) to run northward for many miles (Schoenherr 1992:262). A geothermal field exists along the border of Sonoma and Lake counties as a result of continuing tectonic pressure. This pressure creates steam to heat the many hot springs collectively known as The Geysers in this area (Schoenherr 1992:265).

SRSP is composed geologically of two main complexes separated by Adobe Canyon: the Franciscan Core Complex in the northern portion of the Park and Sonoma Volcanics in the southern portion (Chrisman et al. 2004:67; Page 1966:258). The Sonoma Volcanics date to between 2.5 and 9 million years ago and are the largest of the volcanic fields in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Sonoma Volcanics consist of basalt, andesite
and rhyolite and outcrops can be found in the ridges and summits of the Park, interspersed with rolling hills of alluvium (Chrisman et al. 2004:67).

The Stern Ranch property is composed entirely of Franciscan Core Complex, which formed in the uppermost Jurassic to the lower Upper Cretaceous (Page 1966:260). The complex is composed almost entirely of shales and gray-green graywacke sandstones formed by the rapid erosion of volcanics that then settled in deep marine basins (Schoenherr 1992:265). Franciscan sediments also include mafic marine volcanic materials, deep-water sediments, limestone, conglomerate serpentine and chert (Page 1966:258). Serpentine, designated the California state rock, is an igneous, waxy green hydrothermally altered rock that contains several different minerals. The weathering of these rocks produces a variety of soils usually rich in magnesium and iron, but may also contain nickel, cobalt and chromium (Scheonherr 1992:265). This unique substrate supports the growth of native plants species, such as Chamise, that have become accustomed to its particular chemical makeup (Chrisman et al. 2004:89). Shales in this complex produce clay soils that have been associated with the bald hills in the North Coast Ranges (Schoenherr 1992:278). The St. John Mountain Thrust Fault is a major geologic feature within SRSP. It is located in the northeastern portion of the Park.

The age and makeup of the underlying geology in SRSP suggests that the potential for buried archaeological deposits is low because these landforms were created prior to the arrival of humans into California (Meyer and Rosenthal 1992:15). However, this does not discount the potential for archaeological sites to be present on the ground surface on top of the underlying geology. There is also a possibility that buried human remains were deposited into the underlying geology.
Soils

Soil diversity within the Stern Ranch property is quite high, with 11 different soil types present (see Figure 03). The property is dominated by Sobrante loam (ShE), which occurs on hills of 15 to 30 percent slope. This soil is a well-drained, mostly clay loam and is associated with annual grasses, scattered oaks and few gray pines (Chrisman et al. 2004:72; USDA 2014:46). Other soils in the property include Goulding clay loam (GgD and GgF) that occurs on hills with 30 to 50 percent slopes and is a well-drained mostly gravelly clay loam (USDA 2014:31-32). The Goulding series is associated with scattered oaks, gray pine, brush, grasses and forbs (Chrisman et al. 2004:73). Rock land (RoG) occurs at 50 to 75 percent slopes and is formed in material weathered from igneous, metamorphic and sedimentary rock (USDA 2014:45-46). The Laniger series (LaE and LaF) occurs on hills with 15 to 50 percent slopes and consists mostly of well-drained sandy loam (USDA 2014:39-40). This series is associated with blue oaks, live oaks, Manzanita, ceanothus, poison oak, brush and grasses (Chrisman et al. 2004:73).

Henneke gravelly loam (hgE and HgG2) can occur on hills ranging from 5 to 75 percent slopes and is a well-drained mostly gravelly clay loam (USDA 2014:34). This series is associated with serpentinitic soils and sargent cypress vegetation (Chrisman et al. 2004:73). Montara cobbly clay loam (MoE and MoG) occurs on hills that range from 2 to 75 percent slopes and consists mostly of well-drained clay loam that is formed in material weathered from serpentine. This series is associated with annual grasses and few gray pines (Chrisman et al. 2004:68; USDA 2014:43). Lastly, Toomes rocky loam (ToE) occurs on hills with 2 to 30 percent slopes and consists of well drained gravelly clay loam formed in material weathered from igneous rock (USDA 2014:47-48). None of the above
soil series are considered prime farmland except the Goulding clay loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes (GgD), which is considered farmland of state wide importance (USDA 2014:30-31). This series covers approximately 24.9 acres in the southwest portion of the property.
Figure 03. Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map (USDA 2014:8)
Climate

SRSP has a Mediterranean climate characterized by mild temperature fluctuations throughout the year. Summers are dry and warm during the day and cool in the evening, with temperatures ranging from highs in the 90s to lows in the 40s °F (Chrisman et al. 2004:65). Morning fog, due to the proximity of the Pacific Ocean, is essential for vegetation and soil moisture during the long dry summers (Schoenherr 1992:264). Winter temperatures range from the 50s and 60s during the day to 30s at night on average. The rainy season runs from November to April with an average annual precipitation of 40 inches. Bald Mountain receives a significant amount of rainfall during the winter months contributing to the Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Bear, and Calabazas creek watersheds (Chrisman et al. 2004:65).
Chapter III. History of Land Use Before 1846

In each tribal area, children grew up surrounded by an ideology and cosmology that was embodied in and made incarnate by the very form of the land itself. Individuals belonged to - and drew much of their personal identity from - specific places. (Milliken 1995:219)

Introduction

In this chapter, a narrative description of the history of land use before 1846 is provided. SRSP contains numerous recorded historic and prehistoric archaeological resources. Having a solid background of prehistoric and historic land use will help to develop an anticipated property type discussion and will help with interpretation of resources found. In the following sections archaeological, ethnographic and historic data from Sonoma County are explored to provide contextual information about the site types that may be encountered within SRSP today and why.

Archaeological Research

SRSP is located within the Mayacamas Mountains where elevations range from 580 feet to 2,729 feet at the highest point of Bald Mountain. Archaeological investigations in mountainous areas were sporadic until the field of cultural resources management came about as the result of historic preservation and environmental protection laws during the 1960s and 1970s. Prior to this, between 1903 and 1933, Jesse Peter, an affiliate of Santa Rosa Junior College, surveyed and recorded lithic concentrations and large midden deposits in upland regions of Sonoma County, including within SRSP (P-49-000660 and P-49-002016). Later, prehistoric sites along major ridge systems and within upland regions were recorded as a result of large-scale archaeological
surveys throughout Sonoma County (Fredrickson 1984:492). Mark Hylkema (1993:118) found evidence of occupation where subsistence related activities occurred while working in the upland region of the Central Diablo Range in California. Further evidence of upland land use comes from investigations at Pilot Ridge (Hayes and Hildebrandt 1993), Hostler Ridge (Fredrickson and Milburn 1979), and Pine Ridge (Roberts 1975). Upland regions have often been described as areas where seasonal or temporary procurement of resources occurred or were areas of religious significance, rather than permanent settlement (Fredrickson 1984:473).

Patterns of settlement in upland regions changed over time and across the landscape. Mountain range occupation differed regionally and seasonally. According to Hildebrandt (2007:85), “many interior groups moved into the mountains in the summer to collect and hunt for food, often changing settlements five or six times during a season”. This pattern of use would result archaeologically in short-term campsites consisting of subsistence related tools. However, this was not always the pattern of use in all upland regions. The temporal and spatial changes of upland settlement can be best organized using the cultural sequence for the North Coast Ranges introduced by Fredrickson in 1974. The cultural sequence is divided into three broad periods: the Paleoindian period (ca. 11,550-8,550 B.P.), the Archaic period (ca. 8,550-1,100 B.P.), and the Emergent period (ca. 1,000 B.P. to the historic period) (Fredrickson 1974:47). This sequence, with minor revisions to dates, remains the dominant framework for prehistoric archaeological research in the region (Fredrickson 1994).

Humans began to occupy California during the Paleoindian period, which was a time of variable environmental changes. Archaeological remains dating to this period are
The Archaic period is characterized by a population increase, the development of milling stone technology and a large-scale shift toward sedentism (Fredrickson 1974:46, 48; 1994:100). This period is divided into the Lower, Middle and Upper Archaic based on different aspects of cultural changes generally moving toward increased social complexity. By the end of the Archaic period, numerous small villages had been established throughout California. Many archaeological sites in the North Coast Ranges date to the Middle and Upper Archaic.

The Emergent period is characterized by increased social complexity, large central villages with political leaders and specialized activity sites, including sites of ritual significance (Fredrickson 1974:48; 1994:100). Archaeological sites dating to this period are common throughout the North Coast Ranges and often include occupation sites marked by midden soils, bone, shell, various stone tools and other artifacts.

These broad periods are further broken down into patterns, which “represent a basic adaptation generally shared by a number of separate cultures over an appreciable period of time within an appreciable geographic space” (Bennyhoff and Fredrickson 1994:21). Most recently, Hildebrandt (2007:86-95) synthesized a large body of research that supports these patterns. The settlement and land use characteristics for each pattern will be discussed below.

The Post pattern originated in the Pleistocene-Holocene transition (ca. 11,500-8,000 B.P.) and is represented by fluted projectile points. Settlement patterns during this time are unknown. The Borax Lake pattern began in the early Holocene (ca. 8,000-5,000 B.P.) and is associated with a “forager” approach to subsistence–settlement organization (Hildebrandt 2007:89). Residential sites in Humboldt dominated upland regions during
this time. The Early Berkeley pattern began around ca. 6,500 B.P. in Clear Lake and is characterized by the first evidence of stable, long-term settlements and acorn use. During the Mendocino pattern (ca. 3,000-500 B.P.), upland settlements in Humboldt were known for specialized hunting camps, while in the Sonoma area evidence for a mobile system of settlement dominated this period. The Berkeley pattern, during the Late Holocene (ca. 1,200-800 B.P.), showed intensive use of acorns and fish. Settlement in most areas was sedentary, while the upland groups were still practicing the Mendocino pattern. The Gunther pattern (post ca. 500 B.P.) is characterized by a high degree of sedentism, while the Augustine pattern (post ca. 500 B.P.) showed both sedentary systems and mobile adaptations (Hildebrandt 2007:93-95).

These patterns helped with organizing research done by Hildebrandt and Swenson (1982, 1985) in their study of 1,120 sites from Mendocino National Forest and adjacent BLM lands. They found that the later period lowland sites were concentrated in certain locations while the early period upland sites were dispersed broadly over the landscape (Hayes and Hildebrandt 1993:108). Further study was conducted to see if they would get similar results in the Pilot Ridge area. They found that during the Borax Lake pattern (ca. 3,000-6,000 B.P.) the warm climate made upland environments rich in resources (Hayes and Hildebrandt 1993:113). The sites in this period reflect what Binford (1980:5) called a forager approach, where people moved from place to place when resources in one area were depleted. The assemblages from these sites were similar and contained artifacts that are considered generalized or multifunctional. After ca. 2,800 B.P. (Mendocino Pattern) the climate cooled and resource abundance and diversity in the upland area decreased. The use of these upland areas became specialized, as evidenced by the flaked stone tool
assemblages that continued into the Gunther pattern and into historic times (Hayes and Hildebrandt 1993:115).

Archaeological data can also help to establish a shared cultural identity between past groups and modern groups. Patterns of obsidian sources and stylistic differences can correlate with ethnographic boundaries. David Fredrickson (1996:25) used this method to study boundaries at a time depth that goes beyond the available ethnographic data. While tribelets did have definite boundaries, it is assumed that before the formation of tribelets, prehistoric Californians moved more regularly over the landscape in small groups of extended families. As the population grew, competition over territory and resources increased. Territorial boundaries eventually came about as a means of resource management. However, some patterns of data suggest that certain boundaries were maintained even before the formation of tribelet communities. In the northern Sonoma Valley, differing obsidian proportions support the occurrence of a long-lasting social boundary between Oakmont and Kenwood. This is evidenced by the ratios of Annadel and Napa obsidian, which changed over time on both sides of this boundary (Fredrickson 1996:26-27). This long-term boundary is indicative of the interactions and relationships between these social groups.

**Ethnographic Research**

Ethnography is a branch of anthropology that focuses on how contemporary people live their lives. Ethnographies document selected aspects of culture chosen by the researcher, such as political organization, religion and material culture (For example, Kroeber 1976 and Driver 1936). This information is gathered through interviews with
members of the community being studied and participant observation (Van Maneen 1988:3). Some early ethnographic work in California employed little to no participant observation. For example, in the early 20th century Alfred Kroeber and colleagues at the University of California, Berkeley chose a “memory culture” method, which involved interviews with a few elders of each community about what their life was like as a child, and what they remembered about their grandparents (Lightfoot and Parish 2009:77). The memory culture methodology was chosen as an attempt to document what life was like for people living in California prior to European contact. This method is problematic because it underestimates the amount of culture change that occurred in the years after early European exploration (Lightfoot and Parish 2009:78). While much of the information gathered through the U.C. Berkeley program has been useful for understanding traditional Indian lifeways in California, researchers are now critically analyzing these accounts rather than accepting them as fact (Lightfoot and Parish 2009:78). The following is an overview of ethnographic research that has been conducted in the area in and around SRSP.

**Yukian Language Family**

Powers (1877:197) was the first to write extensively about Wappo speakers, whom he referred to as “Ashochimi”. He suggested that the Yuki, Huchnom and Wappo languages were related because of the similarity of several of the words in each language (Powers 1877:197). Building on Powers’ original research, Barrett (1908:247) divided the Yukian speakers into four dialects: Yuki, Huchnom, Coast Yuki and Wappo. The Wappo dialect is further divided into four sub-dialects: Western, Northern, Central and
Southern (Barrett 1908:266). The Yukian language family is now thought to consist of two distinct languages: Northern Yukian, which is divided into Yuki, Huchnom and Coast Yuki dialects, and Wappo (Golla 2007:81). In his work, Barrett (1908) provided a map and detailed descriptions of inhabited and uninhabited villages and campsites in the North Bay Area. This information is based on notes gathered during a survey of California conducted between 1903 and 1906 by the University of California, Berkeley (Barrett 1908:7). According to the map provided by Barrett (1908:333), Stern Ranch is within the ancestral territory of the speakers of the Southern dialect of the Wappo language, near the boundary of the Southern Pomo language area (see Figure 04). The village site closest to SRSP is Wilikos, at the head of Sonoma Creek (Barrett 1908:269). In all, Barrett (1908:268-278) mapped and described 33 inhabited and uninhabited villages and campsites within the Wappo language area.
Figure 04. Linguistic Boundaries and Village Sites, Adapted from Barrett (1908).
Settlement within the Wappo Language Area

When ethnographic data was collected, Wappo speakers lived in the area from the northern extent of Napa and Sonoma, north to Cloverdale and Middletown and included the Mayacamas mountain range (Barrett 1908:333; Driver 1936:181; Heizer 1953:233-235). Some Wappo speaking people also lived on the south edge of Clear Lake. There is linguistic evidence that during the summer months, Wappo speakers would travel outside of their ancestral territory on their way to the Pacific Ocean and to Clear Lake. During these trips, not only was language shared but also a certain amount of material exchange occurred (Sawyer 1978:257). Wappo speakers also traveled outside of their ancestral territory to attend feasts, dances and celebrations (Sawyer 1978:260). Within the Wappo language area, “a minor kind of travel involved moving ones domicile each year from the permanent villages on the high ground to the summer camps along the river” (Sawyer 1978:260). Other researchers suggest that Wappo speakers had two types of settlements: permanent winter villages and temporary summer campsites (Driver 1936:183; Heizer 1953:236). According to Heizer (1953:236), villages typically lie within valleys and contain between 11 and 40 houses and one or two sweathouses.

Subsistence

According to Driver (1936:184), plant resources were the most important food source in the Wappo language area. Plant resources were collected locally and included acorns, buckeye, roots, grass seeds, and clovers (Driver 1936:184; Sawyer 1978:261). Men and women collected acorns in burden baskets. Acorns would then be stored in granaries or ground with a mortar and pestle and made into soup or bread (Driver
1936:187). The next most important food source was from terrestrial animals. Deer was the favored game animal, but ducks, geese, quails, rabbits and other terrestrial animals were eaten more regularly throughout the year (Driver 1936:184; Sawyer 1978:261). Deer were typically driven along a brush fence then clubbed or shot with a bow and arrow (Driver 1936:185). Salmon, seaweed, clams, mussels, crabs, eels, turtles and other saltwater and freshwater food sources were eaten occasionally. Salmon and other large fish were caught using a dam or weir (Driver 1936:184).

**Religion and Ceremonial Life**

Mountainous areas were sometimes used for religious purposes. Wappo speakers much like many Indian groups in north-central California, were part of the Kuksu religious system (Heizer 1953:239). Kuksu is “a religious complex centering around the impersonation of a god or gods, which stressed curing rituals or rites of ‘well-being’ for the entire group” (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:297). Wappo speakers conducted an annual summer ceremony that lasted between four and seven days and included sacred dances performed by both men and women in ceremonial regalia. The ceremonies were performed in brush dance houses and were attended by everyone in the group. The primary deity in the religion of Wappo speakers is Coyote, whose name is used to label several places within the Wappo language area (Heizer 1953:239; Sawyer 1978:261). Other animals were rarely given names, leading some researchers to believe there may have been a taboo on animal names (Sawyer 1978:61). According to Driver (1936:200) Wappo speakers cremated their dead. No tribal ceremony was conducted but relatives and others gathered at the funeral pyre located about a mile from the village, with
offerings for the dead (Driver 1936:200; Sawyer 1978:259-260). This practice is very similar to that of the Southern Pomo linguistic group.

Material Culture

According to Driver (1936:190) the bow and arrow was traded with communities north of the Wappo language area and was the primary tool used for hunting. Other hunting tools include the spear, the sling, clubs and harpoons for fishing (Driver 1936:190). Rabbit nets and deer-head disguises were among the most valued hunting tools (Driver 1936:194). Baskets were also used as traps for fishing. Burden baskets were used for collecting plant resources. Some baskets were elaborately decorated with beads and feathers. Other textiles produced by Wappo speaking people include rabbit skin blankets, woven tule skirts and nets (Driver 1936:191-192). Wappo speakers also made musical instruments, which were played during dances including bone whistles, spilt-stick clappers, cocoon rattles and plank drums (Driver 1936:192; Heizer 1953:236).

Neighboring Groups

Wappo speakers often traveled outside of their ancestral territory to obtain plant and animal resources from the coast and from the Clear Lake area. During these trips material exchange occurred with neighboring communities (Driver 1936:194; Heizer 1953:238). Bows and arrows were traded with groups from Colusa and Stonyford, while tule mats and magnesite cylinders were traded with groups from Lake County. Clamshell disks beads and magnesite cylinders were used as money. Clamshells were obtained through trade or gathered at Bodega Bay, while magnesite cylinders were primarily
traded with Pomo speakers (Driver 1936:194). The value of clamshells was based on the amount of time and effort it took to obtain them (Heizer 1953:238).

Relations between Wappo speakers and their neighbors were often peaceful. Heizer (1953:238) suggested that Wappo speakers often joined other communities for dances in the Pomo language area. This was not always the case however; there were times when conflict arose. Kroeber (1976:219-221) described two conflicts between Wappo speakers and Pomo speakers that began in areas where both groups gathered natural resources in close proximity. The relationship between Wappo speakers and non-Indian groups will be discussed in a later section.

**Pomo Linguistic Groups**

Heizer (1978:ix) provided a map of linguistic boundaries, which places Stern Ranch on the border between the Wappo and Southern Pomo language areas (see Figure 05). Powers (1877:146) suggested that the Pomo language family had many dialects, often differing from valley to valley. Barrett (1908:95) divided the Pomo language family into seven dialects: Northern, Central, Eastern, Southeastern, Southern, Southwestern (Kashaya), and Northeastern. While Barrett (1908:95) describes these groups as dialects, they are now considered to be distinct languages that are classified into four branches, within the Pomo subfamily of the Hokan language family: Southeastern and Eastern Pomo branches spoken around Clear Lake, Northeastern Pomo branch spoken in the Sacramento Valley, and the Western Pomo branch, which includes the Northern, Central, Southern and Southwestern Pomo languages spoken along the Russian River (Golla 2007:78). The Hokan language is thought to have a time depth of 8,000 years ago,
Figure 05. Linguistic Boundaries, Adapted from Heizer (1978).
making it the oldest linguistic relationship in western North America (Golla 2007:78). Because of the age and proximity of both the Hokan and Yukian language families, there has been a considerable amount of borrowing between them (Golla 2007:79).

**Settlement within the Southern Pomo Language Area**

The Southern Pomo language area extends from five miles south of Santa Rosa, north 40 miles almost to the Sonoma County border and from the eastern drainage of the Russian River to the Kashaya Pomo boundary with an extension along the coast ending at the mouth of the Gualala River (McLendon and Oswalt 1978:279). This large area extended over a variety of environments from coast-redwood to valley foothill, within which Southern Pomo speakers adapted. According to Kroeber (1976:234) principal villages were centrally located adjacent to waterways, and hunting camps would radiate out from there. Each village had a range of valley, foothill or mountainous area upon which to occupy (Kroeber 1976:234). The three main types of structures built among Pomo speakers were dwellings, temporary shelters and subterranean houses. The dwellings in the Southern Pomo language area were large multifamily structures constructed with brush and grass. Groups living primarily in the valley built temporary shelters in the summer months up in the foothills. The subterranean houses served as ceremonial dance houses or as sweat lodges for men (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:292-293).
Subsistence

The Southern Pomo language area contains a wide variety of natural resources. Native plant resources used by Southern Pomo speakers include acorns, which were a staple, buckeyes, berries, grasses, roots, bulbs, seeds, and seaweed. Baskets were used for collecting these resources and stone mortars and pestles were used to process them. Basketry techniques included coiled ware and wickerwork and would often incorporate feathers and beads. These baskets are unique because Pomo speakers “are the only people in California to employ lattice twining” (Kroeber 1976:244). Animal resources included big game such as deer, elk and antelope; small game included rabbits and squirrels. These animals were hunted by individuals or in groups. The tools used for hunting included bow and arrow, heavy spears, low fences, nets and snares. Fish were also an important resource and were caught using traps, lines with bone fishhooks, or weirs (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:291).

Religion and Ceremonial Life

Pomo religion was also focused around Kuksu, the ceremonial aspects of which were overseen by professional shamans. According to Bean and Theodoratus (1978:297) there are several types of specialized shamans, including singing doctors and sucking doctors. These positions were often inherited but could also be appointed to a person who had a specific dream. Shamans were paid for their services of healing people from illnesses caused by ghosts or by poisoning. Although poisoning is not thought to have happened often, the threat of it influenced Pomo culture “by inducing isolation, ensuring strict usage of hospitality rules, and inducing strict rules of etiquette (Bean and
Theodoratus 1978:297). Many rituals among Southern Pomo speakers focused on fertility and were associated with specific Kuksu ceremonies. One ceremony held every year included several dances performed within a dance house and served as an initiation of some of the young boys into the Kuksu secret society of ceremonial elites. Another ceremony, one that pre-dates the arrival of Kuksu into the Pomo language area, is the ghost-impersonating ceremony. During this ceremony all boys within the group were initiated into the ghost society (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:297).

Rock art in the North Bay Area region is often interpreted as being associated with ritual and shamanism. Petroglyphs are the most common type of rock art found in the ancestral territories of speakers of Southern Pomo and Wappo languages, although there are a few recorded pictograph sites in the region. There are several types of petroglyphs including cupules, ‘pit-and-groove’, pecked curvilinear nucleated (PCN) and less commonly, animal elements (Parkman 2007c:2). Cupules are shallow depressions, usually defined by size parameters, that are ground, pecked or gorged into rock and can be alone or in groups of several hundred or more on a single boulder (Jones 2004:23-24). When these cupules are found together with angular incisions and grooves they have been referred to a ‘pit-and-groove’ petroglyphs (Parkman 2007c:2). PCNs are characterized by an oval groove element with a raised linear center.

**Material Culture**

Tools used for obtaining animal resources include bow and arrows, heavy spears, nets, and basketry traps. Hunters sometimes wore a deer-head disguise to get closer to
game animals while hinting. Knives and mortars and pestles were used to process plant and animal resources (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:290-291).

Clothing worn by Pomo speaking women included shredded redwood or willow bark skirts and mantles around the neck that hung down to meet the skirt. Men sometimes wore mantles made of shredded tule, redwood bark, willow bark or animal skins. During the winter months, men and women wore rabbit skin blankets that were fastened in the front with wood (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:291-292). Tule sandals and leggings were also worn in some situations (Kroeber 1976:240).

Pomo speakers used clamshell disc beads and magnesite beads as a form of money. Clamshell beads were strung up and the value of them depended on their quality and age. Magnesite beads were more valuable and were sold individually rather than by the string (Kroeber 1976:249). According to Kroeber (1976:249) magnesite was traded from the east. Pomo speakers would sometimes host trade feasts and invite other groups to trade fish for these beads (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:298).

**Early European Exploration and Missionization**

The first contact between the Native American groups in the North Bay Area and non-Indian people may have happened as early as 1579 with the arrival of Sir Francis Drake into the territory of Coast Miwok speaking people (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:299). Several other European expeditions arrived in Sonoma County in the following centuries beginning the process of social and environmental change in this region. In 1769, Spain undertook the colonization of Alta California with the organization of the “sacred expedition” (Castillo 1978:100; Nunis 1997:299). This expedition, led by
Captain Gaspar De Portola and Father President Junipero Serra, was organized to establish military and mission settlements in Alta California as a source of revenue for Spain and to prevent British or Russian rule in California (Castillo 1978:100). Soldiers, settlers and missionaries brought with them parasites, diseases and non-native species, which began changing the environment until it was almost unrecognizable (Preston 1997:281).

By the late 1700s contact between Spanish missionaries in San Francisco and Native American communities in Sonoma County was frequent. Southern Pomo speakers were continually raided and people were taken to the mission to be converted. Missionaries brought European trade goods into the area and as converts began escaping the missions, they brought aspects of Hispanic culture back with them (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:299). The establishment of the missions in San Rafael in 1817 and in Sonoma in 1823 extended the Spanish recruiting territory into the Wappo language area. Although restrictive policies prevented economic development in Alta California, these missions were centers for agriculture and ranching during this time (Nunis 1997:299). Fruit trees, vineyards, wheat and barley were grown, while cattle, horses and sheep roamed vast tracts of land. This shift in land use drastically changed the environment within a short amount of time.

**Mexican Period**

Mexico gained independence from Spain in 1821 and in 1822 California became part of the Mexican Republic. Mexican land grants and colonies were established in Southern Pomo and Wappo language areas soon after. Land grants and settlements
greatly expanded the agricultural and ranching economy in this region. In 1823, Governor Argüello advised Father José Altamira to build a mission in Sonoma as a military expansion campaign to prevent the Russian advance into the region (Hoover et al. 1990:476). Father José Altamira, unhappy with his post at Mission San Francisco quickly organized an expedition to find a place to establish Mission San Francisco Solano that same year (Tays 1937:100-111). This mission, located diagonally across from the northeast corner of Sonoma Plaza, was the last and northernmost mission established in California. The mission at Sonoma greatly expanded agriculture and ranching activities in Sonoma County, requiring more cheap labor.

Between 1824 and 1830 cattle increased from 1,100 to 2,000; horses from 400 to 725; and sheep remained at 4,000, though as few as 1,500 in 1826...crops amounted to 1,875 bushels per year on an average. (Johnson 1889:26)

Father José Altamira planted the first vineyards in Sonoma County at the mission site with cuttings from Spain (Sand 1988:48).

Another attempt to force the Russians out of California was enacted by Governor José Figueroa in 1833. He appointed Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo the task of establishing Mexican settlements in Sonoma and Marin counties to prevent Russian expansion. Vallejo chose Sonoma as one of these settlements, where he secularized Mission San Francisco Solano and founded the Pueblo de Sonoma in 1835 (Hoover et al. 1990:476-477). Once this pueblo was established the town grew rapidly. Several abode buildings were erected around a central plaza, which was used as a training ground for soldiers between 1835 and 1846 (Hoover et al. 1990:477). During this time, the Pomo and Wappo speaking people had suffered through a smallpox epidemic (1838-1839) and a cholera epidemic (1833).
These diseases, plus displacement, enslavement, massacres, raids and the
beginnings of Anglo-American migration set the stage for the ever more
rapid decline of the Pomo [and Wappo] people and their cultural heritage.
(Bean and Theodoratus 1978:299)

The Rancho Los Guilicos land grant is an 18,834-acre rancho that covers a large
part of Sonoma Valley and the surrounding foothills southwest of SRSP. Governor
Alvarado granted it to John Wilson who, after his arrival in California in 1837 married
Ramona Carrillo (Sonoma County Historical Society 2015). In 1866, the rancho was
patented in the name of William Hood who purchased a portion of the property still
owned by Mrs. Wilson. William Hood planted 160 acres of grapes on the Los Guilicos
Rancho and constructed the first winery in Kenwood soon after (Sand 1988:48).

Wine making and grape growing has a long history in this region. Father José
Altamira planted the first vineyards of Spanish grapes in Sonoma County at mission San
Francisco De Solano (Sand 1988:48). General Vallejo continued this tradition using
mission grapes to make his own prizewinning wine. Vallejo and his brother Salvador
expanded the mission vineyards and in 1842 produced 250 gallons of wine (Tays
1938:144). Samuele Sebastiani purchased General Vallejo’s vineyard at mission San
Francisco de Solano around the turn of the century to supply the Sebastiani winery that is
still present on Fourth Street East (Hoover et al. 1990:484).
Chapter IV. History of Land Use After 1846

Introduction

In this chapter a narrative description of the history of land use after 1846 is provided. The majority of cultural resources found within Stern Ranch are from this period. Since most of these cultural resources represent agricultural activities and lifeways, a detailed discussion of agriculture in Sonoma County is provided. A description of Sonoma County mining, charcoal production and Rancherias are also presented in this chapter. Finally, the chapter ends with a discussion of anticipated property types that is based on the information in Chapters III and IV.

American Period

By 1846 tensions had grown between American settlers and the Mexican army over the fear that General José Castro would drive the Americans out of California. To prevent this, Captain John C Frémont of the United States Forces led a group of 33 American men to seize General Vallejo and take possession of the town of Sonoma on June 14, 1846 (Wainwright 1996:1). This was not an official action of the United States government and, therefore, could not be represented by the American flag. The Bear Flag of the California Republic was created to replace the Mexican flag in Sonoma. On July 9, 1846 Lieutenant Joseph Warren Revere representing the United States government raised the American flag in its place, marking the beginning of the American period in California (Hoover et al. 1990:478).

During the first 20 years of the American period, hostilities between Indian and non-Indian people continued to escalate. Reservations were established, some by
executive order, and Indians were taken from their land and forced to move to places like the Mendocino Indian Reserve and the Round Valley Reservation (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:299; Hass 1995:61). These reserved lands were often rocky, remote and inadequate for farming (Hass 1995:61). The newly unpopulated areas were then deeded to the ever-growing population of Americans. Some Southern Pomo and Wappo speaking people established rancherias and worked on land owned by Americans as cheap labor. By 1867 the Mendocino Reserve was discontinued and many Indians found themselves homeless and landless. During this time, many Indians choose to work in agricultural fields seasonally, while continuing their way of life on rancherias (Bean and Theodoratus 1978:299).

Sonoma became a prominent stopping point for people heading to the mountains soon after the discovery of gold in California in 1848. The boom of the California Gold Rush sparked a population increase of over 75,000 people. It wasn’t long however until men became discouraged in the mines and resolved to settle elsewhere to start farming or raising stock. Many single men or men with families out of the state began to settle in Sonoma County. These ‘bachelor ranchos’ were often established on Mexican land grants still recognized in California under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Johnson 1889:111). The dispute over land came to a boiling point as more and more squatters took up residence on private property. The California Land Act of 1851 established the Board of United States Land Commissioners, which would decide on the validity of all land claims, including the previously protected Mexican land grants (Hass 1995:63). Eventually, land in California was determined either public or private, then sold privately or sectioned and divided through homesteads, federal town sites, mining claims, military
bounty warrants, agricultural land warrants, scrip certificates, forest reserves, etc. (Robinson 1948:164).

The Homestead Act of 1862 allowed settlers to file for 160-acre parcels of public domain land, which would be awarded to them only after five years of residence and improvements to the land (Robinson 1948:168). Another way to acquire land in California was established with the Morrill Act of 1862. This law gave each state large tracts of land that could be sold through Agricultural College Land Warrants to fund agricultural and mechanic arts colleges in America (Robinson 1948:183). Many settlers in California used these two avenues to acquire relatively small farms on which to live and work. Early on, in rural areas like Sonoma County settlers typically grew only enough crops to support themselves, and relied on cattle raising for income (Sand 1988:65).

**Agriculture in Sonoma County**

Immigration into Sonoma County had peaked by 1855. Most land suitable for farming and grazing was bought and settled. Sonoma County is most notable for wine grapes, potato, grain, and dairying industries and soon became one of the most agriculturally successful counties in California (Johnson 1889:129-130). During this time, families began settling on large tracts of granted land, building homes, farms, schools and churches. Crops diversified through the years to include wheat, barley, oats, rye, buckwheat, corn, peas, beans, potatoes, pumpkin, turnips, beets, onions, etc., prunes, walnuts, olive, apples, pears, peaches, plums, cherries, figs, apricots, etc., and hops. Farms were also filled with domesticated animals including American cattle, horses,
sheep, hogs, chickens and mules (Johnson 1889:115-116; Sand 1988:67-68). California became a major exporter of agricultural products by the 1860s, expanding further in 1869 with the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad (Johnston and McCalla 2004:10). This attracted wealthy immigrants to the state to settle in places like Sonoma County. Soon, large landowners were buying farms and ranches away from their houses and hiring managers and labors to work there. Laborers were sometimes provided permanent housing on-site, or temporary camps depending on the type of work. These absentee owners often owned several farms or ranches, producing agricultural products for export to other cities and states.

The success of Augston Haraszthy’s Buena Vista vineyard made wine a primary agriculture industry in Sonoma County by the 1860s (Carosso 1951:42-43). Following the grape growing tradition started in the missions, local farmers began growing and making European wine varietals. The *California Farmer and Journal of Useful Sciences* (1871:44) reported on the success of small farms in these counties:

Small lots scattered over Sonoma and Napa, we feel sure that these two counties when closely examined will show a product of One and a half Million Gallons of Wine for the year 1871.

One major setback was the phylloxera epidemic that spread through the area beginning in the 1870s. Phylloxera is an insect of the aphid family that attacked and killed vineyards throughout France as early as 1855. Sonoma and Napa County vineyards, known for there abundant use of European varietals, became a host for these pests who were accustomed to these vines. In the 1870s this infestation caused more than 400,000 vines to be dug up in Sonoma County (Carosso 1951:111). The infestation lasted into the 1890s. Howard Carpenter and John Gilcrest, landowners of Stern Ranch, were listed in an
By the late 19th century, small farms began to rely heavily on hired labor. These laborers, although once thought of a “cheap labor” received on average a higher wage than other regions of the United States (Olmsted and Rhodes 2003:18). The relatively higher wages and thriving agricultural industry in California attracted migrants from around the globe. With this influx of laborers, profit-oriented commercial agriculture expanded in the State creating competition for small family farms like those in rural Sonoma County (Olmsted and Rhodes 2003:20). The back-to-the-land movement and the country-life movement focusing on small scale farming and improving rural lifestyles reflected the growing concern for the social and economic conditions of rural farms. Magazines and newspapers talked about a return to agrarian values, while the Country Life Commission, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 focused on establishing a national agricultural extension program (Roth 2002a:2). A need for increased productivity led to a focus on scientific farming methods and large scale farming, despite the movement’s ideal of small-scale family farms.
Small farms formed cooperatives to keep up with the growing commercial agricultural industry such as the Grange in 1873 and the Farmers’ Alliance (Roth 2002a:1). Eventually the Grange movement led to the formation of the agrarian Independent Party, which opposed the interests of both the Democratic and Republican parties. Through the 1920s, the commercial agricultural boomed and farm labor groups began unionizing, fighting for better wages and working conditions. After the stock market crashed in 1929 and unemployment reached an all time high, small family farms were seen as a way to survive in those harsh economic times (Roth 2002b:1). The New Deal of the 1930s focused on rehabilitating the rural farm economy through government programs, once again reinforcing the agrarian ideology (Roth 2002b:2). However, by this time urban populations had outstripped small farms as they continued their struggle to compete with the commercial agricultural industry. After World War II, national economic recovery became the primary focus of the Federal government, obscuring the plight of rural American farmers (Roth 2002c:1).

Beginning in the 1970s the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) took on a leadership role in rural development under the Nixon and Ford administrations (Effland 2002a:4). After decades of rural to urban migration after World War II, the USDA’s Economic Research Service reported a population increase in nonmetropolitan counties of almost three million people (Effland 2002b:1). The USDA suggested that this increase in population was due not only to a return of agrarian values but also because of the rise in rural employment in the trade and service industries and rural recreation (Effland 2002b:1). Although many rural areas, such as those in Sonoma County continued to thrive on small scale agriculture, there was a nationwide shift in rural
development policy by the 1990s that not only focused on agriculture but also on other areas like telecommunication and transportation (Effland 2002c:13).

**Mining in Sonoma County**

Mining in Sonoma County also flourished during the mid to late 19th century. Deposits of quicksilver in the form of cinnabar, copper, iron, quartz (bloodstone and agate), sulfate of lime and basalt have been found in various regions of the county. Quicksilver mines in Sonoma County are located in the western end of the Mayacamas District (Bradley 1918:181). Quicksilver (mercury) production began in earnest in Sonoma County in the late 1840s to 1850s after the discovery of gold in California (Costello et al. 2007:22). Mercury was a crucial part of gold mining because of a process of extraction called amalgamation. During this process gold ore would be passed through a trough that is coated with mercury. The gold would bind to the mercury and create a gold-mercury amalgam. Once the mercury was scraped off, the purity of the gold would be much higher (Costello et al. 2007:22). Quicksilver mining peaked in the 1870s, with California producing one third of the world’s mercury. The most productive district during this time was the Mayacamas, which included Sonoma, Napa and Lake counties (Costello 2007:22). From the 1880s on, mercury mining began to stagnate as gold amalgamation slowed down.

**Charcoal Production in Sonoma County**

San Francisco’s population grew exponentially in the years after the gold rush. With this population boom, a demand for fuel increased. Wood and coal were the main
sources of energy in California at the time. Wood used for fuel was abundant throughout the state and charcoal production for domestic heating and cooking flourished. In 1881, San Francisco used over 3,500 tons of charcoal that came primarily from Sonoma (Bancroft 1890:77). In Sonoma County, Italian and other immigrants capitalized on the growing demand for charcoal in San Francisco by producing charcoal for export (Bancroft 1890:77). Charcoal producers would often contract with ranch owners to clear trees off the land and use the land temporarily to make charcoal. Italian immigrants, using techniques brought over from Europe, would create temporary surface ovens on leveled flats near water using live trees cut from the surrounding landscape (Zeier 1987:84-85). Typically, black oak, madrone and Douglas fir were used. This process was time consuming, labor intensive and required a high level of skill to be done successfully. Today, evidence of this activity includes grass-covered leveled flats with blackened soil and bits of charcoal, and second growth oak woodlands (Whatford 2000:117).

**Rancherias and Federal Recognition**

In the mid to late 1800s, the U.S. government established rancherias, or Indian land held in trust, for federally recognized tribes. Many Native American tribes received federal recognition during the mid-1800s, but were later stripped of that standing when congress passed a law in 1958 that privatized some of California’s small rancherias (Hart 2010:2). Since that time, many tribes have taken the U.S. government to court to gain back their federal recognition. Graton Rancheria was established in 1920 near Graton to be the ‘village home’ of Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo Indians (FIGR 2014). Graton Rancheria was one of the rancherias privatized in the 1950s. In 2000, the Federated
Indians of Graton Rancheria gained federal recognition when President Clinton signed the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act (FIGR 2014).

The Mishewal Wappo Tribe was a federally recognized tribe from 1851 to 1959. The Alexander Valley Rancheria was established in 1908, but was later sold after the tribe lost their federal recognition (Hart 2010:2). In 2010, the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley took the U.S. government to court to regain their federal recognition (Hart 2010:1). A decision is pending.

The Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians gained federal recognition in 1915 with the establishment of the Dry Creek Rancheria between Healdsburg and Geyserville (DCR 2014). The Kashia Band of Pomo Indians gained federal recognition in 1914 with the establishment of Stewart’s Point Rancheria (KBP 2012). Today the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians has 860 members who live in the region (KBP 2012).

**Anticipated Property Types**

The National Park Service recognizes five different property types: buildings, sites, districts, structures and objects (National Park Service 1995:4). Researchers are able to anticipate the types of properties within a given area because they reflect the history of land use. The first inhabitants in the vicinity of Stern Ranch were speakers of Wappo and Southern Pomo languages. Stern Ranch, being located within the Mayacamas Mountains, may contain property types that conform to an upland settlement pattern. Archaeological sites within upland regions may include permanent settlements or temporary hunting and foraging camps. The upland areas within the Park may have also been viewed as sacred and evidence for this could be rock art. The environment at SRSP
offers a wide array of resources and fresh water, making it an ideal area for many types of land use and settlement. The sites that have been recorded within the Park consist mostly of lithic concentrations or isolated flakes and tools related to subsistence (see Chapter VI for details). This sparse accumulation of artifacts without habitation debris suggests that SRSP was used mainly for temporary camping to obtain resources. Additional sites found in areas that have not been previously surveyed may also fit this pattern. Material evidence may include lithic tools/flakes, milling equipment, midden deposits, and possibly human remains.

Beginning in the 1800s Euro-Americans began to settle in rural Sonoma County. Rural properties have often been categorized as farms or ranches depending on the activities and products produced. Farms are places where people grow crops, while ranches are used for raising animals. Based on documentary and archaeological research, Stern Ranch was used as both a farming and ranching property since the 1870s (Sonoma County Recorder Deed (SCRD) 280:199). Farms and ranches often contain features associated with both domestic and agricultural activities.

Donald Hardesty (1988) developed the “feature system” concept for mining properties and it has since been used for a broad range of property types. A feature system is “a group of archaeologically visible features and objects that are the product of a specific human activity” (Hardesty 2010: 16). Using this system allows researchers to link individual features into a functional process. The approach entails the identification of related features that make up an associated feature system, in this case domestic and agricultural systems, to make sense of the range of features over broad areas (Hardesty 2010:16). Features within a domestic system may include a house or worker housing,
outhouses, domestic tank houses, refuse concentrations, recreational structures and small gardens. Features within the agricultural system may include barns, orchards, animal coops or hutches, farming machinery and implements, water conveyance systems, roads, fencing and fields. These systems come together to make up a cultural landscape, which is discussed in the next chapter on landscape archaeology.
Chapter V. Landscape Archaeology

So comprehensive and powerful has been man’s role in changing the face of the earth that the whole landscape has become an artifact. (Meinig 1979:37)

Introduction

In this chapter, landscape archaeology is discussed as a framework for interpretation and management of cultural resources within SRSP. This discussion is based on the idea that landscapes have social and symbolic meaning and that they are not just “passive backdrops or forcible determinants of culture” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:2). First a background on the history of landscape archaeology and social landscapes are provided to give the reader an understanding of where this framework originated. Then this framework is explored through the following avenues: how people perceive their surrounding environment and how this affects land use and the dynamics of the human-environment relationship. Lastly, land use today and how this framework can be used to manage cultural resources is discussed.

Origins of Landscape Archaeology

Researchers have been theorizing about the relationship between humans and their environment for decades. In anthropology, this research topic was formalized when Julian Steward developed a theoretical framework of cultural ecology in the 1950s (Steward 1955). Cultural ecology focused on how humans adapted to their environment on a broad regional scale (Steward 1955). In contrast, landscape archaeology has roots in cultural ecology, but also spatial archaeology, settlement archaeology, geography, economic and environmental determinism. In the past “the focus was then firmly on
human impacts on and interactions with their physical surroundings…[using] the language of ‘environmental’ or ‘ecological’ archaeology rather than ‘landscape’ archaeology per se” (David and Thomas 2008:28). These early studies aimed to understand the human-environment relationship as an economic or adaptive interaction that determined settlement patterns. It wasn’t until researchers began differentiating between settlement ‘systems’ and ‘patterns’ that the focus turned to how humans organized themselves on the landscape.

With the rise of New Archaeology and processual interests, Lewis Binford (1978, 1980) began to look at settlement-subsistence systems. This led to another shift in archaeological attention from specific locations of human activity to the process of human activity across the landscape (David and Thomas 2008:30). Technological and methodological innovations were catalysts for the refinement of the human-environment relationship through paleoecological studies and ‘off-site’ field surveys. The off-site surveys came about through the realization that archaeological sites tend to be continuous and that environmental conditions influence artifact distribution (Ashmore 2004:260). This led to the regional approach of New Archaeology that looked at large scale settlement and environmental patterns. These studies were centered on economic decision making, without taking into account the role of culture and human-human relationships across on the landscape. This was addressed in The Spatial Organisation of Culture, which suggested that there is a relationship between the spatial distribution of artifacts and human identity (Hodder 1978). This new understanding heralded the rise of social archaeology that now dominates landscape archaeology.
The Social Landscape

Carl Sauer, a cultural geographer in the early 20th century, was among the many researchers dissatisfied with the notion of environmental determinism, which is the notion that the physical environment is the driving factor in human social and cultural development. As a result of his dissatisfaction, he coined the term ‘cultural landscape’ in his seminal work, *The Morphology of Landscape* (Sauer 1925:303). The main premise of this work was that humans had as much of an impact on the environment as it had on them and that the landscape itself should be a main focus of research (Sauer 1925:303, 315). Sauer explained that, “the cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape the result” (Sauer 1925:309). This school of thought continued in the field of cultural geography and was eventually adopted by folklorists, architectural historians, historic preservationists, and eventually cultural resource managers. Peirce Lewis, a cultural geographer, emphasized that the landscape contained cultural meaning and that this meaning could be read like a book. He explained that, “the human landscape is our unwitting autobiography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears in tangible visible form” (Lewis 1979:12). The idea that the landscape contains social meaning is the basis for landscape archaeology today.

Ashmore and Knapp (1999) described three types of social landscapes in which they take slightly different approaches to understanding the human-environment relationship: the constructed landscape, the conceptualized landscape, and the ideational landscape. These landscape types are not mutually exclusive; the categories are merely a way of organizing and thinking about land. Landscapes could potentially embody all of
the aspects of these categories. Constructed landscapes are those that have been physically constructed, and researchers seek to understand how and why the landscape was shaped the way that it was. These include places that have been intentionally designed and created for a purpose, such as industrial or agricultural landscapes. Ashmore and Knapp (1999:10) warn against the re-construction of these landscapes through ascription of contemporary beliefs and values that may have no basis in the past. In other words, constructed landscapes should be interpreted with the perspective of the people who shaped the land in mind. This is because observers run the risk of making assumptions about a place based on their own beliefs and values that have nothing to do with the traditional meaning of that place. While SRSP may contain several types of landscapes, the constructed landscape within Stern Ranch will be the focus of my research.

Conceptualized landscapes are those in which meaning is ascribed and reproduced through social practice. These landscapes are ‘natural’ ones that are mostly devoid of material culture. The Tongariro sacred mountain site in New Zealand and the Buddhist cave temples and mountains are examples of conceptualized landscapes (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:11). Lastly, there is an ideational landscape that “is both ‘imaginative’ (in the sense of being a mental image of something) and emotional (in the sense of cultivating or eliciting some spiritual value or ideal)” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:12). In this way, ideational landscapes are all encompassing and include those that contain moral or historical messages that may not be ideological or sacred. These three broad landscape types encompass most of the contemporary research in social landscape studies.
Social theories applied to landscape archaeology employ certain assumptions about landscapes, for example: that landscapes are socially constructed and conceptualized through value and meaning, which changes through time and between individuals and groups (Ashmore 2004:259; Ashmore and Knapp 1999:10-11). This value and meaning is attached to landscapes through practice, which leads to tradition, which is then continuously changing through practice (Preucel and Meskell 2004:219). Furthermore, cultural meaning can be ‘read’ on the landscape by examining the use of space (Lewis 1979:12). Cultural meaning within the landscape is not always evident and researchers must employ multiple lines of evidence for interpretation. Cultural geographers study how people perceived the environment to infer cultural values that led to certain practices. This is because “with positive and negative consequences, environmental perception influences behavior” (Praetzellis et al. 1985:36). The following is an overview of the ways in which individual or group perception has led to land use over time, which will inform landscape management strategies that can be applied to Stern Ranch today.

Environmental Perception and Land Use Strategies

Environmental perception, as it is used here, describes the myriad of ways in which humans perceive their physical surroundings, including the cultural meaning, values and presumptions they place on the landscape. Researchers have long studied the economic and adaptive reasons for settlement patterns and land use across the landscape (David and Thomas 2008:28). While these studies have proven to be productive, people’s perception of the environment has also had profound effects on how people use the land
and manage the resources within it. Hood (1996:123) explained that “whatever the objective or functional organization of space within a society might mean in terms of rational economic models, this same spatial organization will have cultural meaning that is not necessarily reducible to function”. In other words, humans have many possible ways of settling within and shaping the landscape to suit their needs, but they do so primarily based on their perception of the land.

The Wappo and Southern Pomo speaking people that lived in and around SRSP when ethnographic data was being collected gives some insight to their perception toward the land at the time. Parkman (1996), in a study of traditional Pomo cosmology suggests, “mountains were perceived as holy and powerful places” (Parkman 1996:10). He explained why certain areas are seen as sacred by understanding the worldview of Pomo speaking people. Traditional Pomo cosmology made a distinction between the world they lived in and the supernatural world. The world they lived in was the Middle World and was comprised of communal lands, which were in direct control of people and their cultural laws. The wild lands or wilderness, which were not in their direct control, were subject to supernatural laws. This notion of wilderness is different than traditional Western ideas about wilderness because the wild lands in traditional Pomo cosmology were places that were well understood and managed (Parkman 1994:16). Within the wild lands, “an individual in search of power found an appropriate portal through which to access the supernatural world” which were geographic features including mountains (Parkman 1996:9). Parkman described elevation as a supernatural frontier, where “by climbing higher in elevation, one intentionally accessed the supernatural” (Parkman
If higher elevations in general were perceived in this way, the mountains and high ridges of SRSP should be no exception.

The naming of the landscape and elements within the landscape is another avenue through which group perception of the landscape can be obtained. Praetzellis et al. (1985:27) explained:

Place names can provide evidence of landscape creators and their activities, their values, their fears, and their pleasures; changing place names reflect changing land use, land ownership, and beliefs about the natural environment.

Southern Pomo and Wappo place names demonstrate human perception toward a place by ascribing cultural meaning to it that is then passed on to future generations. ?ohsik wi or ‘at clover field’ is a place in the Alexander Valley, northeast of Healdsburg in northern Sonoma County, that both the Southern Pomo and Wappo speaking people used in the past (McLendon and Oswalt 1978:280). The Southern Pomo and Wappo speaking people have traditionally gathered clovers for food and for making a medicine to treat nausea (Lightfoot and Parish 2009:218). Additionally, “the Wappo sometimes burned fields within their territories to encourage the growth of clovers” (Lightfoot and Parish 2009:218). The ?ohsik wi area was clearly perceived and managed as a resource gathering area. Wilikos is an ethnographic village located at the head of Sonoma Creek in or near SRSP (Barrett 1908:269). While there is no evidence of additional place names in the Park, the abundance of small lithic concentration sites suggests that many places within SRSP were used to obtain resources.

For many early Euro-American settlers, California was the ‘land of opportunity’. In an article from the California Farmer and Journal of Useful Sciences (1878:4) this becomes quite clear:
The very promises of the old prophets seem to be verified, and to make California the "Land of Promise," for the whole land is truly flowing with "Milk and Honey" and it is a "Land of Perpetual Fruits," the land of the Vine, the Fig, the Olive and the Pomegranate, such as was foretold by the old prophets.

The land was viewed in terms of resource yield, whether mining or farming, land was valued for its productivity. In the early 1860s, the land within Stern Ranch was described on General Land Office (GLO) plat maps as an area of “precipitous chemisal mountains unfit for cultivation” (GLO 1866). This description, based on agricultural productivity, speaks to how land in California was perceived at the time. Although the land in Stern Ranch was viewed as ‘unfit for cultivation’, new techniques in irrigation and dry-farming promoted by Agoston Haraszthy, began to change people’s perception of unproductive land (Praetzellis et al. 1985:38). Furthermore, “during the 1860s and 1870s, the demands of agriculture put fertile valley land into crop production and forced ranchers to locate in areas not generally suitable for cultivation” (Praetzellis et al. 1985:40). Mountainous areas provided opportunities for new immigrants like Thomas Peugh, a farmer from Ohio and first landowner of Stern Ranch. The land in Stern Ranch was used for agriculture and raising stock. Evidence of this is found on the land itself where plum, walnut and olive orchards still survive. Additionally, County records show that the land was bought and sold with agricultural products and domestic animals, such as grapes and cattle (SCRD 280:199).

The land owners, ranch managers, and laborers who lived and worked on Stern Ranch created a recognizable ranch landscape, with housing, barns, water conveyance systems, fences, orchards, etc. This was a constructed landscape based on “culturally directed plans” that were familiar to early settlers (Praetzellis et al. 1985:32). The naming
of Stern Ranch further signified the perception of these early settlers. County records show that this place was documented as ‘Peugh’s Mountain Ranch’, ‘Rancho Escaleres Del Oro’, later as ‘Kenwood Mountain Ranch’, then ‘Loma Corona Ranch’, briefly the ‘Sher-Mar-Lin Ranch’ and finally as Stern Ranch in the 1970s (Dewitt 1894:1; SCRD 78:477; Sonoma County Recorder Official Record (SCROR) 63:187; 1521:561). While the name ‘ranch’ is used throughout, perhaps for nostalgic reasons, the ranching operations did not continue past the 1950s. At some point, the value of the land was no longer based on productivity of resources, but on recreation. This is evidenced by the pool and cabana that were built in the 1970s that are still extant and by the place names given to certain areas of the ranch.

Walter and Margaret Clowers lived at the property between 1957-1970 (SCROR 1521:555; 3568:570). A map drawn by the Clowers in the late 1960s when they lived on the ranch depicts several place names revealing their perception of the land (see Appendix A). Place names like ‘picnic hill’, ‘hidden pastures’, ‘kissing rock’, and ‘pow wow rock’ show that leisure may have been the primary activities in these places. Hunting, which was a sport enjoyed by many people in the surrounding area in late 19th and 20th centuries is reflected on the map in place names like ‘deer field’ and ‘wild buck peak’. Other place names given to landscape features on the map include ‘blue stone fields’, ‘baby, momma, and poppa bear creeks’, ‘bear canyon’, ‘wood choppers glen’, ‘timber lake’, ‘spring valley’, ‘alpine lake’ and ‘alpine meadow’. This map likely reflects the period when the landscape changed from a working ranch to a landscape of recreation.
The Human-Environment Relationship

Landscapes reflect past human use, values and interactions with the environment, which includes material evidence, the value ascribed to it and the natural resources in the area that have been shaped by the human experience. Many landscapes that are thought of as ‘natural’ are in fact cultural because the natural world that we see today has been shaped by human use and interaction for thousands of years. Evidence of human impact on the world is not only the material culture left behind but also the vegetation and fauna that now reside in our landscapes. There has for a long time been a conceptual divide between nature and culture based on early American discourse about ‘wilderness’ that perpetuates today (Cronon 1995:471-472). For land managers it is important to understand preconceived notions about the human-environment relationship that affect how natural and cultural resources are managed.

A major theoretical shift that signifies the orientation toward social landscapes is the notion that the landscape is active rather than passive. As Ashmore and Knapp (1999:2) point out, the landscape was once thought of as a “passive backdrop or forcible determinant of culture”, but is now seen as playing a more active and complex role in human lives. This relationship can be explored through historical ecology that moves the discussion beyond naive environmental determinism. Historical ecology in its most basic sense is the study of humankind’s relationship with the natural world. It states that the environment is not the determining factor in the way that people live, and that humans do not simply impose their will over the environment. Historical ecology does not advocate this unidirectional casual relationship. Rather, it looks at the relationship as reciprocal, in which both the landscape and human culture actively shape each other (Bilsky 1980:8).
At the heart of the nature/culture divide is the question of the degree to which humans are detrimental to the environment. In an influential study, Erickson (2010) explored contemporary and ancient, human-caused environmental degradation in Amazonia. Erickson (2010:105) argued that human disturbance today might not be as environmentally degrading as once thought because native Amazonian people have managed the landscape, effectively disturbing the environment, for a very long time. This long history of disturbance created what we think of today as ‘nature’ (Erickson 2010:105). In the past, researchers believed that humans adapt to a fixed environment, and in the case of Amazonia, the unproductive environment led to a simple society. For Erickson, historical ecology provides an alternative interpretation. “Historical ecology focuses on landscape as the medium created by human agents through their interaction with the environment” (Erickson 2010:104). Human agents, purposely managing and disturbing their environment, shape biodiversity and are key factors in environmental health (Anderson 2005:xvi; Erickson 2010:105).

Landscape archaeology has an important role to play in historical ecology because human-environment interactions extend deep into the past. Erickson (2010) used the term “reverse engineering” to describe how archaeologists come to understand the ways in which past landscape management is embedded in the environment (Erickson 2010:106). Recognizing physical patterns in the landscape over time, archaeologists begin to understand how and why people in the past created and maintained their surroundings and how this affects the environment over time. Viewing landscapes through a historical ecology lens allows researchers to see human influence on an environment that would otherwise be thought of as a ‘pristine’ wilderness.
Descriptions of wilderness have ranged over the centuries from wastelands to “Eden itself” (Cronon 1995:473). Constructed ideas developed in the 20th century about wilderness that Cronon described as “the sublime and the frontier” (Cronon 1995:474). The notion of a sublime wilderness romanticizes the environment. The American frontier is a cultural construct advanced by historian Fredrick Jackson Turner in the late 19th century, about the nation’s origin that describes the wilderness in nostalgic terms (Turner 1893). As people settled further west moving into wild land it came to represent independence and freedom. As the wild lands began to deplete, a movement began to preserve the wilderness because “to protect wilderness was in a very real sense to protect the nation’s most sacred myth of origin” (Cronon 1995:475). Inherent in these paradigms are three ideas that are engrained in our discourse about wilderness. They are that wilderness is untouched by humans, that humans are separate from the natural world, and that if left undisturbed the wilderness will flourish. This leads to the idea that human disturbance of the natural environment is inherently bad.

There is no doubt that the influx of humans into California and the cultural practices of early settlers certainly had an impact on the environment. The introduction of plants and animals by immigrants to California as early as the 1700s shaped the landscape in significant ways (Preston 1997:274). An article in the Pacific Rural Press (1871:72) shows that enthusiasm for introducing new species into California continued into the late 1800s:

Game birds do not interfere with the welfare of the farmer, with the exception of the wild pigeon, whose presence should not be encouraged. The birds most desirable to introduce are the varieties of the goose, and partridge families; the European pheasant, and the golden and the silver pheasant of China, and the wild turkey. Many of the song birds should also be introduced — such as are useful in destroying insects and worms.
The effect that these species had on the environment is matched, if not exceeded, by the cultural practices of lumbering, charcoal production and agriculture. These practices resulted in the removal of trees on large tracts of land, altering the ecosystem in some areas. An article in *California Farmer and Journal of Useful Sciences* (1875:1) shows the growing concern for the environment:

> After a century spent in spoiling our woodland, we are, as a people, slowly awakening to the fact that the chief end of man is not to cut down trees. We are beginning to learn also that, so far as being incompatible with forests, permanent civilization is impossible without them, that the tree-slayer's ambition to bring the whole land under tillage would result, if successful, in making tillage a waste of labor though climatic disturbances. Alternations of drouth and deluge, blighting heats and blasting colds, have ever been the penalty for general forest destruction; and many a land once fertile is now a desert for this cause alone. Indeed, woodlands are to climate what the balance wheel is to machinery, the great conservator and regulator, without which all other conditions are wasted.

Oak woodlands throughout Sonoma County have been significantly altered and the environment in SRSP is no exception. Remnants of several charcoal production sites in the Park provide evidence that the second-growth oak woodlands are a result of this practice (Whatford 2000:117). In Stern Ranch, although alteration of the land is limited, evidence suggests that several springs have been dammed, the land has been cleared for the cultivation of various crops and many non-native species introduced.

Traditional ecology and conservation is based on the principle of succession theory, which states that equilibrium and stability is nature’s optimal state. In recent years there has been a paradigm shift in ecology, coined *new ecology*, which accepts that disturbances in nature are not always detrimental but are actually integral to environmental health (Erickson 2010:106-107). Humans disturb the environment in a multitude of ways including burning, cultivation, farming, construction of buildings or
roads, and deforestation. Lightfoot and Parrish (2009) emphasized that California Indian’s interaction with the environment was facilitated by the cultural practice of prescribed burning or pyrodiversity. They explained that:

Pyrodiversity practices were well suited to supporting a political economy comprising networks of small polities, each of which had access to sufficient habitat diversity to buffer local fluctuations in environmental conditions. (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:15)

In other words, rotational prescribed burns of resource patches enabled California Indians to increase resource diversity and production at the regional scale. Prescribed burns in oak woodlands also reduced the risk of wildfires, increased plant productivity, improved the flow of springs and created a favorable environment for deer (Lewis 1993:64). California Indians also employed horticultural techniques such as coppicing, pruning, sowing, weeding and selective harvesting altering the structure and composition of vegetation communities (Anderson 2005:1). This level of land management certainly does not follow the ideal of a pristine wilderness that is often portrayed by the notion of wilderness.

The Wappo and Southern Pomo speaking people managed the SRSP landscape in a variety of ways including the use of pyrodiversity practices. Later use and management of the landscape have obscured the physical remains of these practices, but they are important to understanding the history of land management in the Park. Much like many groups in the region “Wappo groups managed their landscapes through controlled burning of fields” (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:213). This burning increased resource diversity and safeguarded against fluctuations in climate. Climatic conditions changed quite often over the thousands of years that Indians have lived in Sonoma County. They experienced global warming and cooling, earthquakes, floods, droughts, storms and
volcanoes (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:62). Pyrodiversity, or prescribed burns were used to offset resource shortages due to environmental disasters because of the many diverse resource patches at different stages of growth (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:70).

California Indians also used cultivation strategies to increase resource production. These included pruning, removing debris and weeding without domesticating the wild plants of their environment (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:126-128). “It is claimed that the Wappo intentionally scattered seeds from desired plants to increase plant yields in specific locations” (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:213). Wappo speaking people did not rely on one or two main food staples, but rather took advantage of Sonoma and Napa counties’ rich diversity by increasing the production of several resources. One resource that is especially important for Wappo and Southern Pomo speaking groups are oak trees, which are abundant in the many oak woodlands of SRSP. Acorns were harvested communally, then “dried, shelled, and stored in baskets, storerooms, or special acorn granaries for use throughout the rest of the year” (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:227).

The introduction of non-native species into the Park has had an impact on the local environment. One of the key issues addressed in the Sugarloaf EIR is the invasive non-native plant species, specifically Himalaya blackberry, yellow-star thistle and medusa head, which are disrupting wildlife habitats and decreasing native plants (Chrisman et al. 2004:89, 183). Furthermore, certain plant species in the Park create a fire risk during the dry summers. The neighboring Hood Mountain Regional Park addressed this in the Park’s Vegetation Management Plan. It “recommends prescribed burns to reduce fuel loads and describes the expected impacts from the prescribed burns on invasive and rare and endangered species” (Chrisman et al. 2004:41). Between 1993 and
1996 staff at SRSP used controlled burns to decrease the non-native invasive yellow-star thistle population (DiTomaso and Hastings 1996). Although these burns targeted yellow-star thistle, the burn program proved successful for controlling non-native invasive species and increasing natives in the grasslands. SRSP also introduced insects into the Park that successfully targeted and destroyed yellow-star thistle seed production (Chrisman et al. 2004:90). Purposeful disturbance to the environment has been used to improve ecological health and increase native species populations in SRSP.

**Land Use and Management Today**

California State Parks manages large tracts of land that are valuable for their shared cultural and natural histories. Managing these places on a landscape scale will allow Parks to, among other things, gain an understanding of how people interacted with their environment, used and managed resources, and organized themselves within the landscape. In this way, the Stern Ranch landscape is an artifact that represents broad processes that played out in Sonoma County through time. The material culture that exists on the landscape today is representative of the agricultural process of the broader Kenwood landscape. Each feature within the landscape, from buildings to fence lines, is a piece of the whole story. But while landscape archaeology involves understanding what happened in the past, managing this landscape will also be about understanding how it is perceived in the present. Today, SRSP is used as a landscape of recreation catering to thousands of visitors each year (Chrisman et al. 2004:159-160). How these visitors perceive the landscape is not only important for employing successful public interpretation programs but also for the protection of the Park’s many resources.
The concept of ‘wilderness’ persists today in many national wilderness areas. Laura Watt (2002) addressed this issue regarding the concept of pristine wilderness and the values of recreation and aesthetics in preserving land at Point Reyes National Seashore. The Philip Burton Wilderness Area is a landscape managed to seem pristine. However, the reality is that the land had been used and modified for thousands of years by Coast Miwok speakers, and later for ranching and recreational use. Watt argued that there might be value in changing the goals of management to include human history in order to “heal the disconnect between nature and culture” (Watt 2002:57). She suggested using a historic preservation model, which places resources within a continuum from preservation to reconstruction, and treats those resources according to their level of need. Terms such as “restored former ranch lands” and “rehabilitated wilderness” imply former human use and the reality of intervention in creating the landscape (Watt 2002:69). In this way, land managers can assess the natural and cultural values of the landscape without covering up or neglecting either. These concepts would be useful at Stern Ranch where the landscape embodies the multiple uses of ranching and leisure often at the same time in its history.

Today, many California Indians employ traditional land use and management strategies, such as plant gathering, in state and federally owned lands. There have been efforts on the part of California State Parks, the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service to encourage the growth of native, culturally sensitive plants and to allow access to these plants (Anderson 2005:312).

Through programs and agreements that maintain areas for population of native plants…these agencies have taken steps toward becoming advocates of maintaining, tending and encouraging the growth of plants important to Indian people. (Anderson 2005:312)
These programs are typically developed through collaboration with California Indians. An example of this is the Maidu Stewardship Project that was developed at the Plumas and Lassen National Forests to restore the land to pre-settlement condition through traditional knowledge and techniques (Anderson 2005:315). This continuing project promotes ecological sustainability and provides an environment in which the Maidu people can maintain their traditional lifeways (Anderson 2005:316). Culturally sensitive plants are important resources that when protected, encouraged and gathered, build an understanding of past and present land management strategies, restore native environments and allow for the continuation of traditional lifeways.

Understanding the human-environment relationship and how and why the landscape looks the way it does now is also important for protecting archaeological resources. Waghorn (2000) explored this concept as a form of promoting site stewardship at Annadel State Park near Santa Rosa, California. At the time, Annadel State Park had visitor created trails that had damaged archaeological sites and led to erosion. Some lithic sites were looted and trails were created through historic sites (Waghorn 2000:122-123). Because of this, plans to rehabilitate the trails were established in 1998. The trails project used past archaeological survey information to avoid undisturbed sites and to close off trails that were damaging them (Waghorn 2000:123-124). A part of this plan was to change public perception of the Park’s history through education and interpretation. The trails project had to balance the recreational values of visitors with cultural and natural resources. For many, the cultural landscape and past land uses by Native Americans and early Euro-American settlers are invisible. Many visitors see Annadel as ‘natural’ unlike other parks such as Jack London State Historic Park, which is seen as ‘historic’
(Waghorn 2000:125). According to Waghorn (2000:125), a new interpretive theme for the Park that places cultural resources and history within the context of a changing cultural landscape can improve visitor attitudes towards the land. In other words, if managers interpret cultural landscapes in the Park, visitors may understand the natural and cultural role in shaping the landscape and how their own actions could shape the land as well.

SRSP has long promoted an understanding of both the natural and cultural resources in the Park, through interpretive signs, ecology and history walks (Chrisman et al. 2004:116-117). Including Stern Ranch in these programs and taking a landscape management approach will only further this goal. This approach will help to dismantle the notion of pristine wilderness and will promote site stewardship to the many visitors to the Park. These concepts are further explored in the next chapter through public benefit and interpretation.
Chapter VI. Cultural Resources Inventory

Introduction

In this chapter, the methods and data for this thesis are provided. The methods are broken down first into the pre-field records and literature search, which included archival, primary and secondary documents, as well as maps and letters and photos provided by Susan David, the great granddaughter of one of the former ranch owners. Previous studies and recorded resources within SRSP are also provided. Organizational and individual contact information is also provided as part of the pre-field research. Lastly, the cultural resource survey methods and results are discussed.

Records and Literature Search

Prior to surveying Stern Ranch, a records and literature search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System. The NWIC is the official repository for 18 counties in the northwest region including Sonoma County. Additional research was conducted at the California State Parks archive, the Anthropological Studies Center, the Santa Rosa Library and Annex, County Records Office, and the Glen Ellen Historical Society.

This records search was conducted (1) to determine whether SRSP contains any previously recorded resources; (2) to determine whether the Park has been included as part of any cultural resource studies; (3) to assess the likelihood of encountering cultural resources within Stern Ranch and (4) to develop a historic context that will inform an
initial assessment of identified cultural resources and to show how the sites and features within the property fit into the broader socio-historical landscape.

The following literature was reviewed as part of this effort: The State Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory (Cal OHP HPD through April 2012), which includes the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the most recent listings of the California Historical Landmarks and California Points of Historical Interest, *California Inventory of Historical Resources* (California Department of Parks and Recreation 1976), and the State Office of Historic Preservation’s *Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California* (Cal OHP 1988).

In addition to this literature, the following maps were reviewed for information on property ownership and land use: the 1916, 1944 and 1954 USGS 15-minute Santa Rosa quadrangles, the 1954 USGS 7.5-minute Kenwood quadrangle, the 1942 and 1951 USGS 15-minute Sonoma quadrangle, the 1951 USGS 7.5-minute Rutherford quadrangle, General Land Office Plat maps (1866, 1870, 1873, 1884, 1889), historic Maps of Sonoma County (Bowers 1867, Thompson & Co. 1877a, Bell and Heymans 1888, Peugh 1934), *Illustrated Atlas of Sonoma County* (Reynolds and Proctor 1897) and the *Official Map of the County of Sonoma* (McIntire and Lewis 1908).

Susan David, the great granddaughter of John Gilcrest, a former landowner of what is now Stern Ranch, provided additional records, including photographs of John Gilcrest with his family and Howard Carpenter, another former landowner. Letters and other documents written by Gilcrest family members about the ranch were also provided (see Appendix B for these documents).
Previous Research and Recorded Resources

The Stern Ranch property had not been surveyed prior to this investigation. However, the records search indicated that SRSP had been included in 18 previous cultural resource studies, not all of which include field surveys within the Park (see Table 01 for detailed information). The records search indicated that there are 61 previously recorded sites within SRSP. Of those, 38 are prehistoric sites (see Table 02 and Figure 06), 16 date to the historic-era (see Table 03 and Figure 07), and six are multicomponent (see Table 04 and Figure 08). One site has been recorded within Stern Ranch (P-49-000660). Loud and Peter first identified this site as an ‘Indian village’ between 1903 and 1933. No site records were produced at that time. The location of the site was plotted on a 1927 USGS 15-minute Santa Rosa quadrangle. It is located on a mid-slope terrace immediately northeast of the main residential area within Stern Ranch, east of Pony Gulch. A site record form was eventually produced and filed at the NWIC, but the date and recorders are unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-000848 A Summary of Knowledge of the Central and Northern California Coastal Zone and Offshore Areas, Vol. III, Socioeconomic Conditions, Chapter 7: Historical &amp; Archaeological Resources (Fredrickson 1977)</td>
<td>This study provides an in-depth background and archaeological context for 17 coastal and bay area counties including Sonoma. No survey was conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-001800 Archaeological Survey Report of Selected Beaches and Parks from District 2 (Holman et al. 1969)</td>
<td>At SRSP a pedestrian survey was conducted following drainage patterns and springs along the valley floor. Four habitation sites and one rock wall were identified as a result of this survey (P-49-000486, P-49-000487, P-49-000488, P-49-000489 and P-49-000490).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-002458 Overview of Prehistoric Archaeology for the Northwest Region, California Archaeological Sites Survey (Ramiller and Ramiller 1981)</td>
<td>This study provides a summary of archaeological data and research goals for nine northwest counties including Sonoma. No survey was conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-002680 Archaeological Sensitivity Study for the North Sonoma Valley Specific Plan (Mikkelsen 1980)</td>
<td>This study provides a site sensitivity assessment for North Sonoma Valley including SRSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008226 Status of Archeological Resources in the Northern Region, California Department of Parks and Recreation (Parkman 1986)</td>
<td>This study provides a status summary and threat assessment of significant archaeological resources within several northern region parks, including SRSP. No survey was conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-17925 Preliminary Assessment of Subsurface Archaeological Potential for the Santa Rosa Wastewater Project, Sonoma and Marin Counties, California (Meyer 1995)</td>
<td>This study provides a sensitivity assessment for Sonoma and Marin County using information from buried archaeological sites including P-49-001041, which is within SRSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-018409 Site Stabilization Management Plan for Four Archaeological Sites along Sonoma Creek, Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, Sonoma County, California, PCA 12320 (Whatford 1996)</td>
<td>This study provides a plan for the stabilization of four sites within SRSP (P-49-000488, P-49-000489, P-49-001037 and P-49-001807). Field survey was limited to these sites specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-019686 A Cultural Resources Study for the McCormick Sanctuary Project, East of Santa Rosa Sonoma County, California (Beard 1997a)</td>
<td>This study included a pedestrian survey of the McCormick addition of SRSP. One prehistoric site (P-49-001936) and four isolated artifacts (P-49-001937, P-49-001938, P-49-001939 and P-49-001940) were identified and recorded as a result of this survey. Additionally, two previously recorded sites (P-49-000106 and P-49-000030) were re-located and updates were prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024461 Cultural Resources Inventory of Ten Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Cache Creek, Phase III land Exchange Properties Located in Lake, Mendocino and Sonoma Counties, California (Peak &amp; Associates, Inc. 2001)</td>
<td>This study included a pedestrian survey of a small portion of the McCormick addition of SRSP with negative results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-029046 A Note Concerning a Newly-Discovered Paleontological and Geological Locality at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, Sonoma County, California (Parkman 2003)</td>
<td>This study provides a site-specific investigation within SRSP. The discovery of possible fossil plant materials and naturally occurring obsidian were the subjects of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031540 Pricing the Priceless: Assessing Storm Damage to Archaeological Sites in the Diablo Vista and North Bay Districts (Parkman 2006a)</td>
<td>This study assessed the storm damage for several sites including three within SRSP (P-49-000488, P-49-000489 and P-49-001037). Survey was limited to these sites specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-032232 Exploring the Ancient Forests of Sugarloaf Ridge (Parkman 2006b)</td>
<td>This study assessed the storm damage for sites along Sonoma Creek including P-49-000488 and P-49-001037. One paleo-botanical site was discovered as the result of this survey (SRSP-P-06-1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-032596 The Central California Ethnographic Community Distribution Model, Version 2.0, with Special Attention to the San Francisco Bay Area, Cultural Resources Inventory of Caltrans District 4 Rural Conventional Highways (Milliken 2006)</td>
<td>This study provides an ethnographic community distribution model for central California including Sonoma County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033403</td>
<td>Fossil Douglas Fir Remains from Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, Sonoma County, California (Parkman 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033600</td>
<td>Geoarchaeological Overview of the Nine Bay Area Counties in Caltrans District 4 (Meyer and Rosenthal 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035108</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigations in the North Coast Ranges (Parkman 2007b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035929</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment - Fulton to St. Helena Rebuild Project (Pacific Gas and Electric Company 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-038732</td>
<td>A Forgotten History from the Far Side of the Ridge (Parkman 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 02. Previously Recorded Prehistoric Resources within SRSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Recording Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-28-000405</td>
<td>CA-NAP-000521</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Larry Felton 1977a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000025</td>
<td>AP16 (Other) - isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>Kathy Dowdall 1993a, ASC, SSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000026</td>
<td>AP16 (Other) - isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>Kathy Dowdall 1993b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000027</td>
<td>AP16 (Other) – isolate / obsidian projectile point</td>
<td>Sue Ann Schroeder 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000028</td>
<td>AP16 (Other) – isolate / two obsidian bifaces</td>
<td>Kathy Dowdall and Thompson, SSU 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000030</td>
<td>CA-SON-002134</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>L. Krieler and D. White 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000053</td>
<td>AH16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1994a, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000056</td>
<td>CA-SON-002275</td>
<td>AP15 (Habitation debris); AP16 (Other)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995a, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000109</td>
<td>CA-SON-000078</td>
<td>AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>H. T. 1960a; Larry Felton 1977b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000110</td>
<td>CA-SON-000081</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>H. T. 1960b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000111</td>
<td>CA-SON-000082</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Larry Felton 1977c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000366</td>
<td>CA-SON-000396</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>H. T. 1960c; Larry Felton 1977d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000486</td>
<td>CA-SON-000521</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>Melander 1969a; Larry Felton 1977e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000487</td>
<td>CA-SON-000522</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>Melander 1969b; Larry Felton 1977f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000488</td>
<td>CA-SON-000523</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>Holman 1969a; Larry Felton 1977g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000489</td>
<td>CA-SON-000524</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP04 (Bedrock milling feature)</td>
<td>Woolfenden 1969; Larry Felton 1977h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000660</td>
<td>CA-SON-000717</td>
<td>“Indian village site”</td>
<td>Loud and Peter 1927a; This site is mapped within Stern Ranch but was not re-located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001037</td>
<td>CA-SON-001109</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Larry Felton 1977i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001038</td>
<td>CA-SON-001110</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Larry Felton 1977j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001040</td>
<td>CA-SON-001112</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP04 (Bedrock milling feature); AP09 (Burials); AP16 (Other)</td>
<td>Claudine Young 1977; E. Breck Parkman 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>Recording Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001041</td>
<td>CA-SON-001113</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP04 (Bedrock milling feature); AP11 (Hearth/pits); AP15 (Habitation debris)</td>
<td>Larry Felton 1977k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001334</td>
<td>CA-SON-001429</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP12 (Quarry)</td>
<td>E. Breck Parkman and Shapiro 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001342</td>
<td>CA-SON-001437</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter); AP12 (Quarry)</td>
<td>E. Breck Parkman 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001804</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian flake tool</td>
<td>R. Leis, M. Solomon and B. Stillman 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001806</td>
<td>CA-SON-002202</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>B. Stillman, R. Leis and S. Gray 1996a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001807</td>
<td>CA-SON-002203</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>B. Stillman, R. Leis, S. Gray and M. Solomon 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001808</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other) - isolate / flake tool</td>
<td>B. Stillman, R. Leis and S. Gray 1996b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001809</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other) - isolate / obsidian flake</td>
<td>B. Stillman, R. Leis and S. Gray 1996c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001810</td>
<td>CA-SON-002204</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>B. Stillman, R. Leis and S. Gray 1996d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001811</td>
<td>CA-SON-002205</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>B. Stillman and M. Solomon 1996a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001812</td>
<td>CA-SON-002206</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>R. Leis, B. Stillman, B. Cate, S. Moore and M. Solomon 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001936</td>
<td>CA-SON-002228</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Tom Origer 1997a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001937</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>Tom Origer 1997b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001938</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian flake</td>
<td>Tom Origer 1997c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001939</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>Tom Origer 1997d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001940</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian flake</td>
<td>Tom Origer 1997e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002016</td>
<td>CA-SON-000074</td>
<td>“Indian village site”</td>
<td>Loud and Peter 1927b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002271</td>
<td>CA-SON-001762</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1988, docent, Valley of the Moon Natural History Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002638</td>
<td>CA-SON-002292</td>
<td>AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>Pulcheon and Ward 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002660</td>
<td></td>
<td>AP16 (Other)- isolate / obsidian biface</td>
<td>Lafever 1998, Origer &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 06. Prehistoric Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.
Table 03. Previously Recorded Historic-era Resources Within SRSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Recording Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000029</td>
<td>CA-SON-002133H</td>
<td>AH02 (Foundations/structure pads); AH04 (Privies/dumps/trash scatters); AH15 (Standing structures) - barn</td>
<td>Lisa Krieler 1993, Santa Rosa Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000054</td>
<td>CA-SON-002139H</td>
<td>AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1994b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000055</td>
<td>CA-SON-002140H</td>
<td>AH06 (Water conveyance system); AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000057</td>
<td>CA-SON-002141H</td>
<td>AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000058</td>
<td></td>
<td>AH10 (Machinery) - chassis</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford and Bill Knill 1995, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000061</td>
<td>CA-SON-002144H</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) - Charcoal scatters</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995e, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000062</td>
<td>CA-SON-002145H</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) - Charcoal scatters</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995f, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000063</td>
<td>CA-SON-002146H</td>
<td>AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995g, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec, Silverado District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000064</td>
<td>CA-SON-002147H</td>
<td>AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001604</td>
<td>CA-SON-002154H</td>
<td>AH16 (Other)- Remnants of a mine</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995i, Dept. of Park &amp; Rec, Silverado District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002398</td>
<td>CA-SON-001984</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) – re-deposited quarry stone</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1992a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002399</td>
<td>CA-SON-001985</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) - re-deposited quarry stone</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002400</td>
<td>CA-SON-001986</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) - re-deposited quarry stone</td>
<td>J. Chuck Whatford, Emily Whatford 1992a, Anthropological Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-002401</td>
<td>CA-SON-001987</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) – re-deposited quarry stone</td>
<td>J. Chuck Whatford, Emily Whatford 1992b, Anthropological Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-004081</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP11 (Engineering structure) - electrical transmission line</td>
<td>William Zukosky and D.J. Allison 2008, Opus Environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 07. Historic-era Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Recording Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000031</td>
<td>CA-SON-002135/H</td>
<td>AH03 (Landscaping/orchard) - apple trees; AH04 (Privies/dumps/trash scatters); AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>V. Beard, D. White and N. Thompson 1993; J. Charles Whatford 1994c, Dept. Park &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000060</td>
<td>CA-SON-002143/H</td>
<td>AH03 (Landscaping/orchard); AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades); AH16 (Other); AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995j; B. Stillman and M. Solomon 1996b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000065</td>
<td>CA-SON-002148/H</td>
<td>AH03 (Landscaping/orchard); AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995k; B. Stillman 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000066</td>
<td>CA-SON-002149/H</td>
<td>AH03 (Landscaping/orchard); AH07 (Roads/trails/railroad grades); AH16 (Other); AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>J. Charles Whatford 1995l; B. Stillman and M. Solomon 1996c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-000490</td>
<td>CA-SON-000525</td>
<td>AP01 (Unknown); Rock wall - could either be historic or prehistoric</td>
<td>Holman 1969b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-49-001803</td>
<td>CA-SON-002200</td>
<td>AH16 (Other) - rusty ax head; AP02 (Lithic scatter)</td>
<td>R. Leis, B. Stillman 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 08. Multicomponent Sites in Sugarloaf Ridge State Park

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.
Organizational and Individual Contact

E. Breck Parkman, Senior State Archaeologist for the Department of Parks and Recreation’s Diablo Vista District, met with me several times at the beginning of this process to work out the details of this thesis. During one of these meetings we discussed working with local communities early in the process and throughout. Mr. Parkman advised me to contact Nick Tipon of the Sacred Sites Protection Committee for the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and Scott Gabaldon, tribal chair of the Mishewal Wappo tribe of the Alexander Valley. On 3 September 2013 I contacted Nick Tipon and Scott Gabaldon via email regarding the commencement of this thesis project. Both responded soon after expressing interest in being involved in the project. On 13 September 2013 Nick Tipon and I met to discuss the details of the project. On 23 September 2013 Scott Gabaldon joined our survey crew in the field to discuss the details of the project. Through these meetings it was decided that I would notify them before going out on any formal surveys of the project area, and provide results of any formal survey days.

On 25 September 2013 I contacted the State of California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and asked them to review the Sacred Land Files for information on Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the Stern Ranch property. On 10 October 2013 the NAHC responded with a letter stating that the Sacred Land Files failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the property. The NAHC also provided a list of people and organizations that may have knowledge about cultural resources in the vicinity of the property (see Appendix C for correspondence).
Between 26 September 2013 and 16 October 2013, the people on the NAHC’s list were contacted either by email or by telephone regarding this project. On 26 September 2013, I spoke with Reginald Elgin, a representative of the Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians. Mr. Elgin expressed interest in being informed about the results of the survey. On 1 October 2013, Brenda Tomaras, a representative of the Lytton Band of Pomo Indians informed me that the tribe would like to make recommendations for the management of any Native American cultural resources found within the project area. On 16 October 2013, Otis Parish the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria replied suggesting that we set up a meeting. During this meeting Mr. Parish expressed interest in being informed about the results of the survey. Mr. Parish also expressed that he would like to make recommendations for the management of Native American cultural resources within the project area. On 16 September 2014 I spoke with Mr. Parish and Brenda Tomaras on the phone and they gave final recommendations for the management of cultural resources within Stern Ranch, which can be found in Chapter IX.

The Glen Ellen Historical Society and the Sonoma County Historical Society were contacted on 30 June 2014 regarding this project. On 4 October 2014, Jim Shere, the Director of the Glen Ellen Historical Society, and I had a meeting to discuss his interest, suggestions, and knowledge about the project area. Additional people consulted during this process were Peter Stern (in October 2014), Marjorie and Carl Stern’s son, Rocky Rohwedder (on 14 October 2014) and Diane Besida (on 26 September 2014), former caretakers of Stern Ranch, all of whom discussed what they remembered about their time living on the ranch.
Cultural Resources Survey

Field Methods

Cultural resources and landscapes within Stern Ranch were identified through a controlled-exclusive field survey over most of the property between fall 2013 and fall 2014. A controlled-exclusive survey is defined as a

Systematic focus on specific landforms and contexts, such as streamside terraces or flat topped ridges. Reduced coverage on other landforms and contexts (King and White 2007:88).

This strategy was chosen based on the safety of the crew, access restrictions, and the location of previously recorded sites in the area. The terrain in Stern Ranch ranged from gentle sloping terraces to treacherously steep terrain, covered in thick vegetation. Areas that were excluded from survey include areas that were excessively steep, covered in inaccessible vegetation, or fenced off with barbed wire fencing.

Survey crews consisted of between two and eight non-student and student volunteers from the Cultural Resources Management program at Sonoma State University. Crewmembers included Chris Klopp, Whitney McClellan, Kyle Harris, Mark Castro, Jennifer Lucido, Yesenia Chavez, Kate Green, Yessica Parra, David Price, Scott McGaughey, Evan Zufah, Julia Franco, Jennifer Cassady and Victor Salazar. The elevation within the property ranges from 680 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 2,600 feet amsl near the top of Bald Mountain and includes some very steep terrain. Based on previously recorded site locations within the Park, this survey focused on gentle to moderately steep mid-slope terraces, broad flat benches, ridges, areas with extensive view sheds, saddles, and the areas around creeks and drainages.
Survey crews were spaced at 30-40 feet (10-20 meters) apart depending on the topography and vegetation of the area. Ground visibility was poor to moderate over most of the survey area due to dense vegetation, tall grass and duff. Areas where the ground surface was exposed, such as rodent burrows, man-made and game trails, were inspected carefully for soil changes. Vegetation was cleared with hoes every 30-40 feet (10-20 meters) to expose the ground surface. Resources and features found within the property were recorded on California DPR 523 forms and mapped with a Trimble GeoXT. Of the 637-acre property, a total of 410 acres were surveyed (see Figure 09 for survey coverage area).

Evidence of illegal marijuana growing was abundant throughout the survey area. Survey crews came across black hosing, small constructed dams on prominent drainages, fertilizer, and small marijuana plants. When this happened, surveyors immediately turned around, walked out of the area and John Rooney, the Team Sugarloaf manager, was notified. The impacts of illegal marijuana gardens within the Stern Ranch property will be discussed further in Chapter IX.
Field Work Results

One historic-era site was identified and designated the Stern Ranch Complex during the field survey (see Appendix D for detailed site records). This resource is considered a cultural landscape with historically associated elements in a definable area recorded according to the Office of Historic Preservation’s Instructions for Recording Historical Resources (1995). This document explains succinctly the approach to recording such resources as follows:

The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) encourages a comprehensive approach to identifying historical resources. In that approach all historically associated and/or physically superimposed resources are documented together as elements of California’s cultural landscape. Even if you lack the expertise needed to record all aspects of a resource in detail, you are urged to provide a brief summary of the full range of values that may be present whenever feasible in Fields P3b and B11. (CAL OHP 1995:3)

Although there are several buildings and structures in this complex, detailed DPR 523B Building, Structure, Object forms were not filled out for these resources. These buildings are considered features associated with this complex and are described in detail in a DPR 523C Archaeological Site Record form. In the future these buildings should be recorded and evaluated by a qualified architectural historian (for additional recommendations see Chapter IX). Additionally, five isolated artifacts were identified and mapped (see Table 05 and Figure 10). Two of the isolated artifacts (ISO-1 and ISO-2) were obsidian bifaces and were formally recorded on DPR 523A Primary Record and DPR 523J Location Map forms (see Appendix D).
Table 05. Isolated Artifacts Found within Stern Ranch

This table has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.

The Stern Ranch complex consists of seven loci spread out over the landscape that are connected by a series of trails and roads, and make up the historic-era ranching and current residential complex. This place is representative of the broader landscapes of this part of Sonoma County, beginning with agriculture and ranching and shifting to a landscape of recreation.

Locus 1 is the main residential complex and is approximately four acres in size, and contains historic-era buildings and structures from various phases of occupation. The complex is situated on a relatively flat mid-slope terrace that contains both non-native and dense native vegetation. This complex consists of 29 features, including four houses, two barns, a root cellar, a chicken coop, a wagon, two large historic-era artifact concentrations and several other outbuildings. Other features noted in the complex are modifications to the landscape and include, a road that continues from Mountain Trails Lane and goes through the complex with an associated stone retaining wall, two palm trees, a terraced garden and stone staircase, and fig trees. Some of the buildings have been remodeled or updated during different phases of occupation.
Figure 10. Isolated Artifacts Location Map

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.
Locus 2 is a large fenced-in field north and west of the residential complex that is approximately 2.9 acres. The field has been heavily modified by years of agricultural work. An earthen dam and holding pond is located on the north side of the field at the toe of a slope and is associated with a prominent drainage that bisects the field. Two trails begin in this field. One leads north upslope for approximately one half mile to a large washed out earthen bridge and large concrete culvert, then north and east out of the Stern Ranch property. The other trail, designated the ‘Olive Trail’, starts at the residential complex and runs northwest through the field and heads west over an earthen bridge.

Locus 3 is a 15-acre clearing that contains a large north south oriented olive orchard. The clearing is covered with short grass and thistle and contains evidence of animal burrowing. The Olive Trail runs roughly southwest into the clearing, past a large mostly dead fruit orchard, through the olive orchard and into the next clearing, ending at a large ravine. The ravine is filled with a massive debris pile consisting of milled wood, metal pipes, wooden furniture, windows, and other domestic items. The clearing west of the olive orchard consists of another trail, designated the ‘North Trail’, that splits off and heads northwest through the clearing, over a man-made drainage with a metal culvert and upslope. An old fence follows this trail and ends at a wooden gate. The North Trail continues past the gate up slope into another clearing where it is unclear where it continues.

Locus 4 is the pool area that is south of the main residential complex and can be accessed on a road that splits off from Mountain Trails Lane. This locus consists of a pool with a large wooden deck surrounding it, a pool house with a kitchen, three
changing rooms, an open air shower and an attached cabana. This locus represents the recreational landscape that was created in the 1960s with the establishment of SRSP.

Locus 5 consists of a concrete staircase and platform, two dirt roads, an outhouse, and a historic-era artifact concentration. One dirt road is the main road that runs south from the Stern Ranch complex and one runs downslope into the site from the main road. The stairs and artifact concentration lie northeast, upslope from the wooden outhouse. There is a small depression south of the stairs, along with a series of poured concrete slabs.

Locus 6 is situated in a clearing within an oak woodland area, southwest of the main residential complex. It consists of a stone fence that has mostly collapsed, several fruit trees that made up an orchard, and a large flat next to a large oak tree. The stone fence runs along a portion of a modern steel fence and lines up with the original Stern Ranch property line.

Locus 7 consists of an earthen dam and holding pond with a concrete platform, which is likely the remains of a pump, two rock alignments with intermittent wooden fence posts, an old fruit tree orchard, a ditch with a metal culvert, and the body of what appears to be a 1920s Ford Model T touring car. The site also contains a diffuse concentration of historic-era artifacts including metal cans, milled wood, barded wire and various sheet metals. This site is evaluated for its potential to be included on the California Register of Historical Resources in the next chapter.
Chapter VII. Stern Ranch Complex Evaluation

Introduction

In this chapter, the Stern Ranch Complex is evaluated for its eligibility to the California Register. The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) (PRC § 5024.1) is a guide used to identify the State’s historical resources (PRC § 21083.2 and 21084.1). It is the responsibility of a CEQA lead agency to evaluate resources for their eligibility to the California Register prior to deciding whether a project, such as the creation and rehabilitation of trails, will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (PRC § 21084.1). For a detailed discussion on the California Register refer to Chapter I. The following sections include a discussion of Stern Ranch as a cultural landscape, a historic context, and a history of Stern Ranch. The California Register Criteria are then applied, including a Criteria Consideration. The integrity of the complex is considered and comparable properties are discussed.

Cultural Landscapes

California State Parks has recently begun to recognize cultural landscapes as significant cultural resources. The department has stated that it will seek Cultural landscapes or corridors that are closely associated with an era or theme for which there is an identified deficiency in the public preservation of California’s history, or that reflect under-represented cultural themes that collectively allow for broad statewide interpretation of the human experience in California history (California State Parks 2014).

One such property type is the historic vernacular landscape, which is defined as:
A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm, or a collection of properties such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include: rural villages; industrial complexes and agricultural landscapes (Birnbaum 1994:2).

California State Parks refers to National Register bulletins 18 and 30 for guidance on how to identify and evaluate cultural landscapes (National Park Service 1999). National Register Bulletin 30 gives information about identifying, documenting and evaluating historic landscapes. These property types can either be sites or historic districts that are understood through the development of a historic context and organized into landscape characteristics.

Landscape characteristics are the tangible evidence of the activities and habits of the people who occupied, developed, used, and shaped the land to serve human needs; they may reflect the beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and values of these people. (National Park Service 1999:3)

Landscape characteristics include processes that shaped the land: land uses and activities, patterns of spatial organization, response to the natural environment, cultural traditions; and physical components of the landscape: circulation networks, boundary demarcations, vegetation related to land use, buildings, structures and objects, clusters, archaeological sites, and small-scale elements (National Park Service 1999:3).

When considering the potential eligibility of a historical resource to the California Register, one must develop a historic context, or “an organizational format which groups information about related historical resources based on theme, geographic limits, and chronological period” (Cal OHP 1997:11). The Stern Ranch Complex is significant within the historic context of rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California and
rural recreation in Sonoma County, California. This is further refined through defining a period of significance, which “refers to a chronological period as it relates to the historic context and is defined as a year or range of years” (Cal OHP 1997:11). The Stern Ranch Complex has two periods of significance: the agricultural period (1884-1957) at the local level and the recreational period (1957-1974) at the state level.

Both periods of significance are represented by certain landscape characteristics (described in Tables 08 and 09). The following landscape characteristics represent the agricultural period (1884-1957): buildings, structures, circulation networks, vegetation related to land use, boundary demarcations, isolated features, small-scale elements, and archaeological features. The following landscape characteristics represent the recreational period (1957-1974): buildings, structures, circulation networks, vegetation related to land use, and isolated features and small-scale elements. Additionally, features within the landscape are either contributing or non-contributing features. Contributing features are those that retain historic integrity and association with the period and area of significance that make the site eligible for the California Register. Non-contributing features are “those not present during the historic period, not part of the property’s documented significance, or no longer reflect their historic character” (National Park Service 1999:24). Tables 06 and 07 describe the landscape characteristics that are associated with each period of significance and whether they are contributing and non-contributing features of each landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape characteristics</th>
<th>Feature #</th>
<th>Contributing or non-contributing features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>F2: Ranch house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3: Privy 1</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F8: Privy 2</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F11: Cellar</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F14: Outbuilding 4</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F15: Barn 1</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F16: Barn 2</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F21: Chicken house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F24: Domestic tank house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F57: Privy 3</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>F23: Stone retaining wall</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F29, F66: Dams and ponds</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F32: Concrete culvert</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F41: Earthen bridge</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F71: Ditch and culvert</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation networks</td>
<td>F30: Pony gulch trail</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F42: Olive trail</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F47: North trail</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F56: Main dirt road</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F61: Dirt road into site</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation related to land use</td>
<td>F18: Palm trees</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F20: Terraced garden</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F25: Kitchen garden</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F26: Fig trees</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F34: Walnut orchard</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F35: Plum and apple trees</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F38: Olive orchard</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F39, F63, F69: Fruit orchards</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary demarcation</td>
<td>F17: White fence</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F27: Fence and cattle grate</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F46: Fence line and gate</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F62: Stone fence</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated features or small-scale elements</td>
<td>F7: Wagon</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F31: Prospect pit</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F33: Water tub</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F37: Wooden water trough</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F40: Depression and ditch</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F64: Large flat</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F65: Large oak tree</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F67, F68: Rock alignments</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F72: 1920s car</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological features</td>
<td>F6, F58, F71, F73: Art. concentration</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F60: Possible artifact deposit</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F55: Concrete stairs</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F59: Concrete slabs</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape characteristics</td>
<td>Feature #</td>
<td>Contributing or non-contributing features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>F1: Stern house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4, F5, F10, F22: Outbuildings</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F13: Caretakers house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F24: Domestic tank house</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F53: Pool house and cabana</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>F48: Metal culvert and drainage</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F51: Metal culvert</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F52: Pool</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation networks</td>
<td>F19: Road and retaining wall</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F50: Paved road to pool</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation related to land use</td>
<td>F28: Designed landscape</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F36: Persimmon tree and grape vine</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F54: Designed pool landscape</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated features or small-scale elements</td>
<td>F9: Trench</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F12, F45: Wooden decks</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F43: Debris piles</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F44: Wooden poles</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F49: Debris pile in ravine</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Context**

*Rural Agricultural Development in Kenwood, California Between 1884 and 1957*

Rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California between 1884 and 1957 is a process that began with the rising population in Sonoma County after the discovery of gold on the American River in 1848. Rural valleys in Sonoma began to fill with hopeful settlers and by 1855 immigration into the County had peaked. Soon after, the agriculture industry boomed making Sonoma County one of the most agriculturally successful counties in California (Johnson 1889:129-130). Any available land left after this initial boom was sold or granted through various land laws. The Homestead Act of 1862 allowed settlers to file for 160 acre parcels of free land, the certificate of which would be awarded after five years of residence and improvements to the land (Robinson 1948:168). The Morrill Act of 1862 gave each state large tracts of land that could be sold through Agricultural College Land Warrants to fund agricultural and mechanic arts colleges in
America (Robinson 1948:183). Many settlers in Sonoma used these two avenues to acquire relatively small farms on which to live and work (Sand 1988:65).

By the 1870s, large landowners began buying farms and ranches away from their homes and hiring managers and labors to work the land. These absentee owners often owned several farms or ranches, producing agricultural products for export to other cities and states. Export of agricultural products increased after the expansion of the railroad into rural Sonoma County. In 1878, the Sonoma Valley Railroad ran from the mouth of Petaluma Creek northeast to Wingo, continuing north to Sonoma Plaza for cargo exchange from Petaluma and San Francisco. Peter Donahue took control of the Sonoma Valley Railroad and extended the line to Glen Ellen by 1881 (Glen Ellen Historical Society 2012:2). This line was further extended in 1888 to Santa Rosa and included several stops through Sonoma Valley (Sand 1988:24). With the news that the railroad would be coming into the area local residents set out to form the Sonoma County Land and Improvement Company. Their efforts resulted in the founding of what is now Kenwood in 1888, and included the construction of hotels, stores, churches, schools, street lamps and parks (Sand 1988:25). With access to a whole new market of buyers, the agricultural economy in Kenwood expanded and flourished.

Rural agricultural settlement began as the land in the rich, fertile valleys of Sonoma and Napa began to fill. Settlers began buying land further into rural and mountainous areas that were thought to be “unfit for cultivation” (General Land Office (GLO) 1866). However, this perception was changing with advances in farming techniques promoted by Agoston Haraszhty. Agoston is often considered the ‘father of wine making in California’, and was a proponent of growing wine grapes on hillsides
using a dry farming technique. This technique was practiced in Agoston’s home country of Hungary, where the axiom *Bacchus colles amat*, or ‘Bacchus loves the hills”, attained special meaning for wine producers. This is because irrigation is almost impossible in the foothills of the Carpathians where vineyards have been growing in Hungary for centuries, but the dry farming technique used there produced exceptional wines (McGinty 1998:314-315).

Dry farming involves no irrigation relying only on yearly rainfall, which is usually plentiful in Sonoma County for much of the year, but almost non-existent during the summer months. The lack of water during the dry season forces the vine to produce fewer but more intensely flavored grapes, which are perfect for winemaking. Growing grapes on hillsides was also advantageous because they were protected from frosts, slopes varied the vines sun and wind exposure, and the hills allow the vines to get early morning sun exposure in the summer (McGinty 1998:314-315). This technique was slow to be accepted by the farmers in the surrounding valleys. “Old-timers in the valley shook their heads disapprovingly as [Agoston] sent his Chinese laborers up the hillsides with plows” (McGinty 1998:315). But as Agoston began winning first place prizes in County fairs for his Buena Vista Vineyard wines, local farmers realized the potential of dry farming in the hills. Slowly, the hills around Kenwood were settled and the small fledgling town flourished into a thriving city built on agriculture.

*Rural Recreation in California Between 1957 and 1974*

This period begins in 1957 because this is when the property shifted to a place primarily used for recreation, rather than a working ranch. This period of significance is
rooted in a long tradition of rural recreation in California, which rose in popularity during the American period as the population increased and wilderness areas that were once feared were being settled. The American West attracted wealthy hunters, naturalists and sportsmen who travelled with fur traders, railroad surveyors or military troops in search of adventure (Allmendinger and Matsumoto 1999:18-19). Many of these sportsmen returned home but many also settled in the west on ranches with permanent hunting lodges (Pomeroy 1957:78). The transcontinental railroad built in 1869 and the expansion of luxury travel, allowed easy access for wealthy Easterners to go west on recreational trips (Allmendinger and Matsumoto 1999:20). Despite the population boom in California during this time, eastern tourists actually outnumbered settlers in the Yosemite Valley. Pomeroy (1957:88) explained “those who had fought the elements across the continent for a home were relatively less interested in climbing mountains for amusement”. This disinterest would not last long though; by the 1880s California was becoming more urbanized and many middle class families had money and time to spend on leisure. The tourist industry in the West no longer catered to rich Easterners but also to families in California.

The expensive luxury hotels and resorts that were visited by wealthy hunters and sportsmen did not appeal to middle class Californian families who choose instead to camp or buy summer homes in rural areas outside of the city (Lvfgren 1999:57; Pomeroy 1957:113-115). Camping areas and rental cottages also attracted middle class families from outside of the State. Railroad rates to California dropped to all time lows in 1906 and became regular summer tourist fares thereafter (Pomeroy 1957:123). Transportation became the main impetus for tourism in California (Lvfgren 1999:58). The rise of
automobiles in the United States only amplified this industry with wealthy tourists and later in the 1920s, with the middle class. The 1920s and 30s saw an exponential increase in the amount of tourists with their own cars in California (Allmendinger and Matsumoto 1999:22). The increase in the tourist industry in California began to raise concern for dwindling outdoor recreation and wilderness areas, which gave rise to the conservation movement decades earlier.

The conservation movement began in part as a response to mass urbanization by advocates like John Muir, which heralded a new appreciation for wilderness areas. Muir played a key role in the establishment of Yosemite National Park and fought hard to keep this place free of dams and other man-made amenities (Krog 1984:208). This would eventually be an impossible task as the officials of the National Park Service realized that they needed to attract visitors to the Park and shifted to a place of recreation. The balance between providing recreation for visitors and land conservation is a struggle that continues today (Allmendinger and Matsumoto 1999:23). Herbert Hoover was one advocate of this recreation movement who saw it as a part of land conservation.

Herbert Hoover was a champion of land conservation and outdoor recreation as the Secretary of Commerce in charge of the Bureau of Fisheries and later as the President of the United States of America. Like many adult Americans in the 1920s, Hoover grew up on a farm and later moved into the city. This instilled in him, as well as many others, a longing for a traditional way of life (Krog 1984:203).

He seriously believed that fishing (and lesser forms of out-door recreation) helped bond Man with Nat-ure and conferred upon its practitioners a measure of grace and humility that was not to be found in the city or in day-to-day com-merce. (Krog 1984:201).
Hoover was concerned about the effects of urban-industrial society on people and promoted outdoor activities outside the urban core (Krog 1984:202). The increasing availability of cars in the 1920s allowed more people to travel to rural areas, to camp, hunt or fish.

The desire to retreat to the country, the leisure, and the mobility for travel and extended vacations—formerly a luxury primarily of the upper class—were now shared by a growing segment of the middle class. (Krog 1984:207)

This was reflected in the increased popularity of National and State Parks for rural recreation as opposed to museums of pristine wilderness. Hoover increased the National Parks and forests by 3,000,000 acres during his Presidency, putting some 5,500 unemployed men to work in the Park system (Krog 1984:218).

Taking trips out of the city and into the rural hinterlands became the preferred vacation for many families. “For many Americans, nature beyond the city limits increasingly promised an antidote to the ills of urban life” (Turner 2002:464). The rural areas around Kenwood were used for agriculture well into the 20th century. This shifted in the 1960s with the establishment of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park and Hood Mountain Regional Park. This rural area continues to accommodate thousands of visitors each year for recreation.

**History of the Stern Ranch**

James A. Peugh, a farmer from Ohio, came to California in 1850 during the height of the Gold Rush. By 1856 he had settled in Santa Rosa. His older brother, Thomas M. Peugh moved to Sonoma County in 1868 (Thompson & Co. 1877b:98). One year later, James bought a piece of land (NW ¼ of SW ¼ of Section 16) in SRSP that he
would later develop into a quicksilver mine (SCRD 26:355; 56:482). Between 1870 and 1871 Thomas M. Peugh bought land from the State of California (SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16) and, through an Agricultural College Land Warrant, bought land from the state of New York (SW ¼ of Section 15) (SCRD 32:379). The Morrill Act of 1862 gave each state large tracts of land that could be sold through Agricultural College Land Warrants to fund agricultural and mechanic arts colleges in America (Robinson 1948:183). These parcels came to be known as ‘Peugh’s Mountain Ranch’ and as it expanded through the years, Stern Ranch (SCRD 78:477).

Figure 11. Howard Carpenter, Ella Gilcrest, Cora Gilcrest and Murray Gilcrest
Photo provided by Susan David 2015
John Gilcrest, from Oakland, California and Howard B. Carpenter, from Sonoma County (later Ada County, Idaho), owned ‘Peugh’s Mountain Ranch’, later known as ‘Rancho Escalares Del Oro’, between 1884-1910 (Dewitt 1894:1; SCRD 93:58; 104:12; 267:292). In a letter written by Howard to Ella Gilcrest (John Gilcrest’s sister-in-law) in 1885, Carpenter expressed his desire to grow vineyards and make wine (Carpenter 1885, see Appendix B for full letter). They purchased an additional parcel (NW ¼ of Section 15), which expanded the ranch in 1889 (SCRD 123:418). By this time, Carpenter was growing wine grapes and had built the first documented building on the property in the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16 (GLO 1889). Carpenter was listed in several wine grower directories, including the Directory of the Grape Growers and Wine Makers of California—the Sonoma Viticultural District in 1888, Wines and Vines of California in 1889 and the Directory of the Grape Growers, Wine Makers and Distillers of California—the Sonoma Viticultural District in 1891, First District, 1893 Directory (Peninou et al. 1998:318-338, 361). The latter record showed that he was growing 50 acres of Zinfandel grapes, producing 60 tons of 1889 vintage wine (Peninou et al. 1998:338).
John Gilcrest and Howard Carpenter worked as surveyors in Sonoma County when they purchased this property in the 1880s (David 2015). Carpenter raised stock and grew apricots, prunes, apples, and wine grapes. The property was also used as a summer retreat for the Gilcrest family, including John’s wife Cora, their children Mary, Evelyn and John jr., his brother William Murray Gilcrest and his wife Ella (Dewitt 1894:1). There was a house that some of the family could stay and cook in by 1894, but family members mostly stay in carpeted tents, and lounged on hammocks and in rocking chairs during the day (Dewitt 1894:2). They would also go on long walks through the rolling hills and fish in the nearby creeks (Dewitt 1894:2).
When the ranch was sold in 1911 to C.D. Bowles, a resident of Seattle, Washington, the property included “buildings, improvements and outhouses” (SCRD 280:199). This may be a reference to this original building, built by Carpenter by 1888; by 1914, it is no longer depicted on maps (Santa Rosa USGS 1916). The 1916 (surveyed in 1914) Santa Rosa USGS 15-minute topographic quadrangle depicts one building: the ranch house that is still extant on Stern Ranch (see Figure 14). It is unknown who built this house, but the landowners between 1910 and 1914 include John Gilcrest and Howard Carpenter (1884-1910) (SCRD 93:58; 104:12; 267:292; 123:418), Grace Burch, a resident of Santa Rosa (1910) (SCRD 272:319), George and Anna Burch, residents of San Francisco (1910-1911) (SCRD 279:343; 279:344), C.D. Bowles (1911-1914) (SRCD 280:199) and E. Fluer, a resident of Los Angeles County (1914-1917) (SCRD 323:174).
Figure 14. 1916 Santa Rosa USGS 15-Minute Topographic Quadrangle

Legend
- Stern Ranch boundary
The land in and around Stern Ranch was bought and sold by several landowners whom almost all had residences elsewhere (see Tables 08 and 09 for details). Any one owner owned the land from less than one year to 14 years. The only exceptions are the NE ¼ of Section 16 that was owned by H.W. McCormick for 38 years (1933 to 1971) and Walter and Margaret Clowers who owned and lived at what is now Stern Ranch from 1957-1970 (SCROR 345:372; 1521:555; 3568:569; 3568:570). The main farming and ranch complex (W ½ of Section 15, SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16) was first known as ‘Peugh’s Mountain Ranch’, ‘Rancho Escalares Del Oro’, later as ‘Kenwood Mountain Ranch’, then ‘Loma Corona Ranch’, briefly the ‘Sher-Mar-Lin Ranch’ and finally as Stern Ranch (Dewitt 1894:1; SCRD 78:477; SCROR 63:187; 1521:561).

In 1911, George A. Burch and Anna M. Burch (his wife), of San Francisco sold the ranch to C.D. Bowles, a resident of Seattle, Washington, as well as one wagon, one cart, all the oak wine barrels and casks, with the wine and cider therein, and all the timber and wood, and all the hay and feed for horses and cattle, and all the boxes for grapes, and all vineyards, buildings, improvements and outhouses situate upon the real estate herein described. (SCRD 280:199)

In 1923, Bertha P. Garrett and L.R. Garrett sold to Samuel H. Garrett the ‘Loma Corona Ranch’ including “all the personal property, farming tools, implements, machinery and equipment, horses, cattle, and other livestock” (SCROR 63:187). This attests to the farming and ranching activities taking place here in the early 20th century.

The farming and ranching operations at Stern Ranch must have required ranch managers and laborers, since the landowners often lived outside of Sonoma County. Evidence of this comes from a grant of ½ interest in the quicksilver mine owned by James A. Peugh to William Bolds and A.C. Ellis in 1876 “for work and labor and
performed in the developing of the certain mine” (SCRD 56:482). Additionally, in 1917 E. Fluer, a widower, of L.A. County sold the ranch to L.A Tyce and Emma Tyce also of L.A. County “subject to a lease dated March 31, 1916, between E. Fluer, lessor, and F.J.B. Knoll, of Sonoma California, lessee, for the term of five years” (SCRD 347:287). Furthermore, in 1926 Samuel H. Garrett sold the Loma Corona Ranch to James F. Reynolds and Robert Douglas “subject to lease to Alfred F. Harding…and excluding the current 1926 crops, the prunes and grapes having already been picked” (SRCOR 150:109). Alfred F. Harding came to California from New Jersey when he was only a teenager. He landed in San Francisco first and saw an ad in the newspaper that Doc Johnson was working on the Garrett Ranch (later owned by Reynolds) in Kenwood and needed laborers (Gresham 1983:10, see Appendix E). While working there he met Hazel Hurd, a neighbor whose family homesteaded 160 acres near Bear Creek between 1914 and 1930. Alfred and Hazel were married soon after they met and eventually drove cattle up to Healdsburg where they settled (Gresham 1983:10).

Farming and ranching ended in 1957 when Walter and Margaret Clowers bought the property. Dr. Clowers was listed on the Santa Rosa City Directory as the director of the Sonoma County Department of Public Health in 1966 (City of Santa Rosa 1966:98). Carl and Marjorie Stern bought the property that is now called Stern Ranch in 1970-1971 (SCROR 3568:569; 3568:570). In 1972, they hired architect Germano Milono to design their house and Thomas D. Church to design their garden on the ranch (see Appendix F for architectural photos and documents). They also built a swimming pool that is situated south of their home on a separate road. Marjorie Stern had caretakers living on the ranch conducting duties for free rent and utilities in the “old ranch house” (Besida 2014;
Rohwedder 2014). Her primary residence was in San Francisco and would visit the ranch on weekends (Rohwedder 2014; SCROR 3568:570). Hand drawn maps and caretaker documents for the ranch and main residential complex reveal the layout and land use while the Stern family owned the property. Caretakers carefully maintained several springs for watering the many plants, including Marjorie Stern’s coveted Peruvian Lilies (Alstroemeria). From a document written by the caretakers hired by Marjorie, one gets a sense of how the land was used and maintained by the people living there:

Aside from this list of specific responsibilities, there are some general responsibilities that are just as much a part of the job. Ownership goes beyond legal definition. Act as though this was your land, it is. A nurturing sense of responsibility will no doubt develop. Listen to this sense and be guided by it. The backbone of our agreement with Mrs. Stern is, “The ranch comes first.” Ask, “What is best for the land?” (Anonymous:2; see Appendix G for full document).

Carl Stern passed away in 1976 and Marjorie began giving portions of her land to the Trust for Public Lands in 1978 (SCROR 3503:271). Her sons, Carl and Peter, gifted the final portions of Stern Ranch in 2007 (SCROR Doc. No. 2007129946). Tables 08 and 09 show the succession of landowners in and around Stern Ranch beginning in the 1860s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Land Owned</th>
<th>Dates Owned</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas M. Peugh</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1870-1871</td>
<td>SCRD 32:379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas M. Peugh</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>SW ¼ of Section 15</td>
<td>1871-1871</td>
<td>SCRD 32:379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Peugh</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16; SW ¼ of Section 15</td>
<td>1871-1878</td>
<td>SCRD 32:379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry C. Bowman</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16; SW ¼ of Section 15; NW ¼ of SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1878-1884</td>
<td>SCRD 64:371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Southard</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Peugh’s Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>1884-1884/85</td>
<td>SCRD 93:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gilcrest</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>SW ¼ of Section 15; SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1884-1910</td>
<td>SCRD 93:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gilcrest and Howard B.</td>
<td>Oakland; Sonoma County</td>
<td>Peugh’s Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>1886-1910</td>
<td>SCRD 104:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gilcrest and Howard B.</td>
<td>Oakland; Sonoma County,</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1889-1910</td>
<td>SCRD 123:418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>later Ada County, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Burch</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>W ½ of Section 15; SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1910-1910</td>
<td>SCRD 267:292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Burch</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>W ½ of Section 15; SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>SCRD 279:343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred A. and Mary Adeline</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>S ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1888-pre 1900</td>
<td>SCRD 113:602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry and Hannah Schwartz</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>E ½ of the SW ¼ , the SW ¼ of the SW ¼ , N ½ of the SE ¼ , and the SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>Pre 1910</td>
<td>SCRD 269-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. and Hetty Warboys</td>
<td>Kenwood</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>SCRD 269:129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Burch</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1911-1911</td>
<td>SCRD 272:319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George and Anna Burch</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1911-1911</td>
<td>SCRD 279:344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td>Land Owned</td>
<td>Dates Owned</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D. Bowles</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>W ½ of Section 15; SE ¼ of Section 16; E ½ of the SW ¼, the SW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1911-1914</td>
<td>SCRD 280:199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fleur</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1914-1917</td>
<td>SCRD 323:174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. and Emma Tyce</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1917-1918</td>
<td>SCRD 347:287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha P. Garrett</td>
<td>Eagle Rock, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>1918-1923</td>
<td>SCRD 363:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel H. Garrett</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>W ½ of Section 15; S ½ of Section 16 except NW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1923-1926</td>
<td>SCOR 63:187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. Reynolds and Robert Douglas</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1926-1929</td>
<td>SCOR 150:109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Reynolds, E.W. Beebe and Elijah W. Beebe Jr.</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1929-1936</td>
<td>SCOR 245:269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Reynolds, C. Gertrude Beebe and Elijah W. Beebe Jr.</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1936-1938</td>
<td>SCOR 417:498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry John and Helen Margaret Templeton</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1938-1941</td>
<td>SCOR 463:341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1941-1944</td>
<td>SCRD 476:524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Fulford</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1944-1945</td>
<td>SCOR 594:477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.M.L. and Myrtle Wheeler</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1945-1951</td>
<td>SCOR 634:370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank and Virginia Monnich</td>
<td>Rio Linda</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>SCOR 1050:303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest and Anita Ongaro</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1952-1957</td>
<td>SCOR 1163:575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter and Margaret Clowers</td>
<td>3405 Adobe Canyon Road, Kenwood</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch</td>
<td>1957-1970</td>
<td>SCOR 1521:555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl and Marjorie Stern</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Loma Corona Ranch and N ½ of Section 16 *Stern Ranch</td>
<td>1970/1971-2007</td>
<td>SCOR 3568:569; SCOR 3568:570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td>Land Owned</td>
<td>Dates Owned</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Peugh</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>NW ¼ of SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1869-1878</td>
<td>SCRD 26:355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Clayton</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>NW ¼ of SW ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1885-1894</td>
<td>SCRD 96:189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.M. Aguirre and Matilda Aguirre</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>Pre 1904</td>
<td>SCRD 201:117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.G. McKerron</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1904-1910</td>
<td>SCRD 201:117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W. Gibson</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1910-1911</td>
<td>SCRD 268:62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Meddock and Thomas Weyburn</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1911-1922</td>
<td>SCRD 282:132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Huntington</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1922-1922</td>
<td>SCOR 14:234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Martin</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1922-1929</td>
<td>SCOR 11:246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikran Topalian</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1929-1930</td>
<td>SCOR 248:406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.G. Metz</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>N ½ of Section 16</td>
<td>1930-1933</td>
<td>SCOR 271:327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W. McCormick and R.V. Harr</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>NE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1933-1953</td>
<td>SCOR 345:372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W. McCormick</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>NE ¼ of Section 16</td>
<td>1953-1971</td>
<td>SCRD 1220:46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application of the California Register of Historical Resources Criteria

The Stern Ranch Complex was evaluated for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources, within the context of rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California, an important local process, with a period of significance between 1884 and 1957 and within the context of rural recreation within Sonoma County, an important state-wide process, with a period of significance between 1957 and 1974. The four criteria for eligibility listed in PRC § 5024.1(c) are:

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

Criterion 1: This ranch complex is associated with rural agricultural development, which contributed to the expansion, growth and economy of Kenwood, California between 1884 and 1957. During this period, Kenwood officially became a town after the arrival of the Sonoma Valley Railroad. This was the catalyst for Kenwood’s development and agricultural expansion. The collective efforts of the farmers and ranchers in the fledgling town of Kenwood all contributed to its agricultural development. The Stern Ranch Complex, as a rural, historic-era ranch and farm, represents this critical time in Kenwood’s history. Howard Carpenter, the first of many successful farmers on Stern Ranch, was listed in several grape grower directories through the decades that he owned the property (Peninou et al. 1998:318-338). These directories tracked the total grape acreage of each town in the Sonoma viticultural district. Between 1877 and 1890, wine
grape acreage in Sonoma County rose from 7,060 to 22,351 acres (Peninou 1998: 258-259). The Sonoma valley had only 541 acres of vineyards in 1880 (Peninou 1998: 297). Eleven years later, Kenwood alone nearly doubled that with 982 acres of wine grapes, 50 of which were on Stern Ranch (Peninou 1998: 338). This demonstrates the expansion of Kenwood’s agricultural industry from its establishment and the role Stern Ranch played in this process. Through this association the Stern Ranch complex meets Criterion (1) for the period of significance between 1884 and 1957.

Furthermore, this ranch complex is important in the development of rural recreation, which is an industry that continues to flourish in the hills around Kenwood. In the 1880s when recreation in California shifted toward middle class families rather than wealthy tourists, many people living in urban areas bought summer homes in rural areas (Lvfgren 1999: 57; Pomeroy 1957: 113-115). It was during this time that John Gilcrest, a resident in Oakland, and Howard Carpenter bought Stern Ranch. Although Carpenter lived and worked at the ranch full time, the Gilcrest family only visited in the summer months for recreation (Dewitt 1894: 1). The tradition of Stern Ranch being both a working farm and a place of recreation continued through the 1950s, evidenced by the list of landowners who almost all lived in urban areas outside of the ranch (see Tables 08 and 09). In 1957 though, when Walter and Margaret Clowers bought the property it was no longer a working ranch. In 1970, Carl and Marjorie Stern, residents of San Francisco, bought Stern Ranch as a rural recreation getaway. The Stern Ranch Complex, with its history of rural recreation represents this aspect of Kenwood’s history. Through this association the Stern Ranch Complex meets Criterion 1 for the period of significance between 1957 and 1974.
Criterion 2: Since none of the features associated with the agricultural period (1884-1957) can be directly associated with any one person, the site does not appear to have the potential to be eligible under Criterion 2. However, the features associated with the recreational period (1957-1974) are directly associated with productive periods in the lives of important people. The Stern house, the remodeled domestic tank house, the pool and pool house were all built or remodeled by architect Germano Milono; landscape architect Thomas Church, designed the landscapes near the Stern house and the pool area; and Marjorie Stern was a prominent San Francisco philanthropist. Milono was an Italian born architect who received his license to design buildings in California in 1947. He was appointed membership into several architectural boards and associations including the State Board of Architectural Examiners, the American Institute of Architects, and the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco. Milono’s body of work is expansive with hundreds of residential and commercial buildings in California, often collaborating with landscape architect Thomas Church. One of his most notable projects is his work on Sonoma State’s College library (Irving 2003:3, see Appendix F for document).

Thomas Church was a very popular, innovative landscape architect in California who is often credited for being the creator of the ‘modern garden’ (Crabtree et al. 1999:3). He was one of the pioneers of the ‘California style’ of landscape design, which drew from modernism as opposed to the Neoclassical style that was popular when he started his career (Boults and Sullivan 2010:215). This innovative style was meant for the laid-back Californian lifestyle whose residents increasingly made use of the outdoor and recreational areas. Church taught landscape architecture at the University of California,
Berkeley for a short while before opening his own office in 1929 (Crabtree et al. 1999:3). He focused primarily on residential landscape design and one of his most notable works is at the Donnell Gardens in Sonoma County (Boults and Sullivan 2010:215). Church’s designs were publicized and praised in home and garden journals including Sunset magazine. For his work throughout his long and abundant career he was awarded the Gold Medal of the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Fine Arts Medal of the American Institute of Architects (Crabtree et al. 1999:3).

Marjorie Stern, who owned Stern Ranch from the 1970s to the 2000s, played a large role in establishing San Francisco’s new Main Library, the Asian Art Museum and Annadel State Park. She was also a founder of the Friends of the San Francisco Public library and the society for Asian Art. Through this direct association with three people who are important in our past, the Stern Ranch Complex meets Criterion (2) for the period of significance between 1957 and 1974.

Criterion 3: The ranch house (F2), privy 2 (F8), outbuilding 4 (F14), the domestic tank house (F24) and barn 2 (F16) all exhibit distinctive flared roofs. The porch roof on the ranch house was added to the house after its original construction. This roof style embodies Japanese influences and craftsman style building traditions. Flared roofs are sometimes a feature of craftsman style buildings and hipped roof buildings, which marked the transition in the early 20th century from the Victorian style with its verticality aesthetic (Lancaster 1986:97; McAlester and McAlester 1984:239). In the late 19th century, World’s Fairs began featuring Japanese architecture, which influenced American architects into the 20th century. Frank Lloyd Wright, an influential American architect
“espoused a special interest in and regard for the architecture of Japan since seeing the Ho-o-den at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893” (Hearn 1991:70). The Ho-o-den, like many traditional Japanese houses, exhibited a flared roofline and exposed structural timbers, inspiring the Japanese style American bungalow (Lancaster 1995:99-100). It appears that this could have also been the inspiration for the buildings on the Stern Ranch Complex. These features embody a specific type of roof style and method of construction, and therefore meet Criterion 3 for the period of significance between 1884 and 1957 (see Figure 16).

The Stern Ranch Complex also features two designed landscapes created by Thomas Church, an important landscape architect in California. Furthermore, the Stern house, the remodeled domestic tank house, the pool and pool house represent the work of an important creative individual, Germano Milono, a prominent California architect. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex meets Criterion 3 for the period of significance between 1957 and 1974 because these features represent the work of two important creative individuals.
Figure 15. Flared Roofs on various Buildings in Stern Ranch
Criterion 4: Some of the features within the Stern Ranch Complex could yield data that could contribute to our understanding of rural agriculture in Kenwood, California from 1884 to 1957. There are three privies (F3, F8, F57) on the site, which may contain archaeological deposits. Sealed features, such as privies, often contain a collection of artifacts, which have yielded data important to history in the past (Wheeler 2000:3). Such features are spatially distinct from the other features and artifacts within them can often be associated with specific datable discard events (LeeDecker 1994:345). The formation of privy deposits is a process that has three main parts that correlate with human activities and behaviors. They are: constriction, use and abandonment, which are evident through stratification within the deposit (Wheeler 2000:3). Abandonment is often associated with a filling event, where refuse is discarded into the privy pit to fill the abandoned hole. There can also be several filling events that coincide with deaths in the family, the succession of landowners or even just cleaning events (Wheeler 2000:11-12). A range of dates for these events is calculated through dating the artifacts that are within each stratigraphic layer (LeeDecker 1994:357). Charles Cheek (1998) in a study of regional foodways in the Massachusetts Bay used faunal bones collected from privy deposits in both rural and urban settings to answer questions about class differences in foodways over time. These features also have the potential to address specific research themes, including site structure and development, land use patterns, agricultural innovations and technology, economic pursuits, and household lifeways. Therefore, this site appears to be eligible under Criterion 4 for the period of significance between 1884 and 1957.
Criteria Considerations

Criteria Considerations are exceptions made for properties that are normally excluded from the California Register. Several Criteria Considerations account for the broad range of property types that can be considered eligible for inclusion in the California Register. One consideration is for historical resources that achieve significance within the past 50 years. The period of significance for Rural Recreation extends into an era that is less than 50 years old because many of the features that contribute to this period of significance were built between 1972 and 1974. The Office of Historic Preservation’s Criteria Consideration states:

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than fifty years old may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance. (Cal OHP 2001b:12)

National Register Bulletin 15 (1995) also addresses properties that have achieved significance within the last 50 years under Criteria Consideration G. This Criteria Consideration states, “The National Register Criteria for Evaluation exclude properties that achieved significance within the last fifty years unless they are of exceptional importance” (National Park Service 1995:41).

The features within the Stern Ranch Complex that have achieved significance within the last 50 years are the Stern house, the designed landscapes, the remodeled domestic tank house, the pool and pool house, which were built between 1972 and 1974. These features were over 42 years old at the time of writing, and since the buildings are within a California State Park, these features will continue to gain significance for years to come. These features are associated with people important to California history.
including: architect Germano Milono, who built the Stern house, pool, pool house and remodeled the domestic tank house; landscape architect Thomas Church, who designed the landscapes near the Stern house and the pool area; and Marjorie Stern, a prominent San Francisco philanthropist. The lives and careers of these important people have been extensively documented allowing for a “scholarly perspective” of these individuals (Cal OHP 2001b). Because of the association with these three important people and the fact that enough time has passed to understand their historical importance through documentary records, the Stern Ranch Complex meets the California Register Criteria Consideration for historical resources achieving significance within the past 50 years.

**Integrity**

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, a resource must also retain aspects of integrity that are relevant to its significance in order to be eligible to the California Register. Integrity is “the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance” (Cal OHP 2001b:11). There are seven aspects of integrity to consider: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Furthermore, a historical resource “must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility” (Cal OHP 2001b:11). When considering the integrity of a cultural landscape, it is important to understand the changes that have occurred from both natural and cultural processes and how this may affect a property’s integrity. In other words, the Stern Ranch Complex must retain the essential physical features that made up its characteristics during its two periods of significance.
Location

The many features within the Stern Ranch Complex were constructed on site and have not moved since the original construction. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex retains integrity of location.

Design

The Stern Ranch Complex was designed with a specific plan in mind, whether that was to create a working ranch or a recreational retreat. None of the features have moved since their original construction and so the lay out of the landscape is still intact. The cluster of agricultural buildings and structures were laid out in such a way to ensure function and efficiency of use. This cluster is centered and surrounded by agricultural fields and orchards. The domestic tank house was set back, on the top of a small hill and rose high above the trees to fill the tank effectively. The storage cellar was constructed into the side of a hill facing the back lot, where vineyards once grew. Later on, Thomas Church and Germano Milono intentionally designed a landscape of recreation that was enjoyed by the Stern family and the ranches many caretakers. The Stern house, the domestic tank house, the designed landscapes, the pool and pool house were all constructed to contribute to this style of landscape. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex retains integrity of design.

Setting

The Stern Ranch Complex is nestled in the rural hills above Kenwood, among scattered oaks, fruit and nut orchards and most of the original buildings of the ranch.
Although changes have occurred in the setting, with the addition of several buildings and the remodeling of the domestic tank house during the recreational period of significance, they kept the characteristics of rural mountain ambiance, retaining its integrity of setting.

**Material**

The materials used by Germano Milono on the Stern house, the pool and pool house are original to those buildings. The Stern house and pool house exhibit a natural wood cladding that suits the ambiance of the surrounding forest setting. Although availability of materials may have been unlimited, these materials were chosen to create a certain sense of place. Therefore, these buildings retain integrity of material.

**Workmanship**

The ranch house (F2), privy 2 (F8), outbuilding 4 (F14), the domestic tank house (F24) and barn 2 (F16) with their distinctive flared roofs, embody the skill of a master craftsman. Together, these roofs represent a specific type and method of construction that were innovative during this period. Additionally, architects, Germano Milono and Thomas Church were innovative in their construction of the Stern house, the domestic tank house, the designed landscapes, and the pool and pool house. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex retains integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling**

Walking through the Stern Ranch Complex, one gets the feeling of a long history of land use in this rural mountainous area of Kenwood, California, from agricultural life
at the turn of the century, to a life of leisure beginning in the mid 20th century. The complex retains the original design of a working ranch, the original materials and workmanship applied to the ranch buildings and the location within a rural mountainous area. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex retains the integrity of feeling of agricultural life in the 19th and 20th centuries. Furthermore, the complex retains the original design, materials and workmanship of the recreational period. Therefore, the Stern Ranch Complex also retains the integrity of feeling of recreational life in the mid 20th century.

**Association**

The Stern Ranch Complex is significant for its historic association with rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California between 1884 and 1957 and its historic association with rural recreation in Sonoma County between 1957 and 1974. It is also significant for its association with Marjorie Stern, Germano Milono, and Thomas Church. This association has been clearly demonstrated and because of this, the Stern Ranch Complex retains integrity of association.

**Comparable Properties**

Several properties within SRSP and the surrounding area are also representative of rural agricultural settlement during this era. Of these properties, the Stern Ranch Complex is the only site with extant dwellings.

**Hurd family homestead (P-49-000029)**: The Hurd family homesteaded near the headwaters of Bear Creek between 1914 and 1930. The only standing structure at this site
is the barn. The site also consists of a collapsed building and the foundation of the Hurd dwelling (Chrisman et al. 2004:108).

**The Luttrell family farm**- The Luttrell family settled into an area across a creek from the current ranger residence in the 1860s where they raised stock and grew walnuts and grapes. No buildings or structures built by the Luttrells are still standing. In 1910, W.D. Reynolds bought the property and built a ranch complex, of which only one barn remains standing (Chrisman et al. 2004:107).

**Bear Creek ranch property**- This property was owned by the Warboys in the early 1900s. They used the property for a small-scale farm and for hunting. The ranch house they built burned down some time after 1968 leaving only the fireplace and foundation (Chrisman et al. 2004:108).

**Mills family homestead (P-49-000106)**- This site consists of the remains of a cabin, a rock-lined well, an artifact concentration, remains of a walnut orchard and a collapsed picket fence. The Mills settled this area on Hood Mountain appropriately named Homestead Meadows in the late 19th century (Origer 1998).

**Summary Evaluation**

The Stern Ranch Complex appears to meet Criterion 1 for the role it played in both the rural agricultural development in Kenwood, California between 1884 and 1957, and in the tradition and growth of rural recreation in Kenwood, California between 1957 and 1974. The complex also appears to meet Criterion 2 for its association within the lives of people important to our past: Germano Milono, Thomas Church and Marjorie Stern. The site also appears to meet Criterion 3 for the embodiment of a specific roof
style and method of construction on several of the buildings built during the agricultural period of significance and the work of two important creative individuals, Milono and Church, during the recreational period of significance. Finally, the complex appears to meet Criterion 4 for the three privy features that have the potential to yield data that could contribute to our understanding of rural agricultural life in Kenwood, California between 1884 and 1957.

The period of significance for Rural Recreation extends into an era that is less than 50 years old because many of the features that contribute to this period of significance were built between 1972 and 1974. These features appear to meet the California Register Criteria Consideration for historical resources achieving significance within the past 50 years. This is because of its association with three important people (Germano Milono, Thomas Church and Marjorie Stern) and the fact that enough time has passed to understand their historical importance through documentary records.

In addition to meeting the above criteria, the Stern Ranch Complex also retains aspects of integrity that are relevant to its significance. They are: location, design, setting, material, workmanship, feeling and association. Based on all of this information, the Stern Ranch Complex appears eligible to the California Register.
Chapter VIII. Interpretation and Public Benefit

To interpret is to translate the language of the scientist, the voices of the past, and the significance of the places to create meaning and connections with the people of the present. (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:15)

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss interpretation and public benefit at California State Parks, SRSP and Stern Ranch. The chapter begins by explaining what interpretation is, the history of the field and what the focus and goals of interpretation are today. Then, interpretation at California State Parks is discussed, including the goals, tools and types of programs. These programs are currently applied at SRSP and a detailed description of this program is provided. Lastly, I explain how Stern Ranch can be included into the SRSP interpretive program, the possible themes that can be employed and future directions in SRSP interpretation.

A Brief Overview of the Field of Interpretation

Defining the word interpretation has been problematic for interpreters for some time. The problem is that one definition does not fully capture what interpretation is and what an interpreter does. Because of this, there are multiple definitions of the field. In the 1950s, Tilden (1957:8) described interpretation as

An educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information.

Beck and Cable (2002:1) explain that to interpret is to give meaning to a “foreign” place or event. Russell (2014:3) describes interpretation as a social and cultural process. This
term has several meanings that have evolved through the personal experience of interpreters since the 1800s. The field of interpretation in the United States began in the mid 19th century with the rising popularity of National Parks. Between the 1860s and 1880s Galen Clark and Enos Mills, both founders of the interpretive profession, began taking groups of people on nature walks through what is now Rocky Mountain National Park (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:4-6). Mills later developed several principles for effective interpretation based on his personal experience as a nature guide. His philosophy has often been described as poetic interpretation that draws inspiration from the natural world (Beck and Cable 2002:xi). Freeman Tilden built on Mills’ work in his book *Interpreting Our Heritage* by developing six principles of interpretation that are still widely used today (Tilden 1957). More recently, Beck and Cable (2002) have updated and added to Tilden’s principles to reflect the needs and issues faced in the 21st century.
Freeman Tilden’s six principles of interpretation (adapted from Tilden 1977:9)

- Interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor will be sterile.

- Information, as such is not interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based on information. But they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.

- Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether the materials presented are scientific, historical or architectural. Any art is in some degree teachable.

- The chief aim of interpretation is not instruction, but provocation.

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

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

Meaning-Making Paradigm

One major focus of the field of interpretation today is how people ascribe meaning to certain objects or sites. There is a communication paradigm called “meaning-making” which conceptualizes information as being created rather than merely transmitted (Beck and Cable 2002:15). Russell (2014:31) suggests that not too long ago, objects or sites were seen as having intrinsic meaning and interpretation was a tool used to extrapolate the meaning already within them. The meaning-making paradigm states that meaning is created outside of the objects of the past through an active cultural and
social process. Because of this, there is no definitive meaning embedded in any object or site. Within the parameters of some shared cultural experiences, people continuously create and re-create meaning based on their own education, background, feelings etc. Interpreters must therefore accept that people may not accept their version of what an object or site means, and that there may be multiple meanings within any object or site. What interpreters can do is facilitate the active process of creating and re-creating meaning (Russell 2014:33). Presenting multiple stories and meanings of the past is one way of doing this. The other useful way is through community engagement because people create meaning based on their past experiences and personal interest (Beck and Cable 2002:15).

Community Engagement and Value Assessment

Beck and Cable (2002:15) placed “knowing the audience” as the first principle of interpretation. More specifically, knowing your audience’s motivations allows interpreters to present more focused information that targets the visitor’s specific interests. For example, visitors may be interested in Stern Ranch because of their own interest in rural agricultural history in the state. They may also be interested in the history of rural recreation and the rising popularity of leisure around the turn of the 20th century. Knowing the reason why a visitor is interested in a certain place allows interpreters to structure the content of interpretation to fit those interests. Gathering this information requires engaging with visitors in one way or another. There are many methods for engaging with the community about what is meaningful to them including formal and informal interviews, and questionnaires. These methods were employed at Malakoff
Diggins State Historic Park (Malakoff) as part of the development of an Interpretation Master Plan and Action Plan (Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) 2015). The following is an overview of the methods and results of the Malakoff Plan as an example of how to engage with the community effectively.

The researchers involved in developing the Malakoff Plan compiled regional demographic data and employed direct visitor surveys to gather visitor information (ASC 2015:31). A direct visitor survey involves approaching visitors of the Park and interviewing them based on a set of predetermined questions. Most of the questions were yes/no or multiple choice to avoid ambiguity. These methods were conducted to: profile the current visitor population, understand how visitors found out about the Park and how they planned their trip, what visitors expected from their trip, what they did while at the Park, how long they stayed, and whether they would come back (ASC 2015:31-35). This information was used to identify target and potential audiences, and plan appropriate interpretation based on visitor interest and needs (ASC 2015:31). The Sugarloaf EIR reported changing demographics in the region, which was taken into account when considering potential visitors of the Park (Chrisman et al. 2004:168). The approach employed at Malakoff could be used at SRSP to update information on the changing demographics of the current visitor population and focus interpretation based on this data.

Cultural Heritage Management and Archaeology

The term ‘heritage’ refers to tangible and intangible elements that are valuable to an individual or a group of people including places, traditions and knowledge (Jameson 2008:57). Tangible elements are physical objects that can be seen and touched, like a
building or an orchard. “Interpretation involves connecting these tangible resources to the concepts and ideas they represent- to their intangible meanings” (National Parks 2007:6). Intangible elements are the values, beliefs, ideas and processes that are evoked by material culture; examples include freedom, independence, and social equality. Connecting tangible elements with these types of intangible core concepts makes objects and sites more meaningful for visitors. For example, Michelangelo’s statue *David* is an aesthetically pleasing work of art that most people can appreciate for that simple fact. However, when this statue is linked to the ideals of the Renaissance and heroism it becomes more meaningful to visitors. Connecting intangible meaning to tangible resources is also a very important part of interpretation in the field of archaeology.

Public interpretation is one goal of the field of archaeology that has become increasingly important due to: historic preservation and conservation movements in the early 20th century, environmental concerns after World War II and the rise in educational archaeology through the 1980s. Interpretation of archaeological sites has come to play a crucial role in the conservation and protection of cultural resources (Jameson 2008:427). This is because when people ascribe value to sites through education they become stewards of those resources. Another catalyst for the rise in public presentation of archaeology was cultural resource legislation enacted in the 1960s and 70s in the United States that led to a rapid accumulation of archaeological data and artifacts. Stakeholders and other constituents became concerned about how this information was being used and whether or not it was being shared with the public (Jameson 2008:427). As a result, education, outreach and stewardship became crucial to the publicly funded field of cultural resources management. Archaeologists began reaching out to museums and
universities to navigate this new territory and around the world interpretation programs were established (Jameson 2008:429).

Archaeologists are in a unique position when it comes to interpretation of archaeological sites because many sites are vulnerable to looters, or ‘plothunters’ who steal artifacts for their own collection or to sell on the black market. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended (ARPA) established civil and criminal penalties for unauthorized looting and trafficking archaeological resources (16 U.S.C. § 470ee(a)(b)(c)). The law states that these offenses are punishable by fines or imprisonment as follows (16 U.S.C. § 470ee(d):

Any person who knowingly violates, or counsels, procures, solicits, or employs any other person to violate, any prohibition contained in subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both

The amount of the fine and imprisonment increase if the value of the archaeological resource or the repair of the resource exceeds $500, or upon subsequent offenses (16 U.S.C. § 470ee(d)). Because of the vulnerability of many archaeological sites to looting, locational information is often confidential. Archaeologists must find a balance between protecting resources and interpretation of the material culture of the past. Interpretation of resources in many cases is relegated to museums or displays where artifacts can be protected. Other times, artifacts are replicated so that real artifacts can be protected elsewhere. These options remove the public from the authentic past. Lipe (2002:21) explained that the public benefits from archaeology through an engagement with the authentic material culture of the past and the credible interpretation of that past. The emphasis on authenticity is a critical component in bringing archaeological information to the public.
Contact with the authentic things of the past can spark in the general public an empathy with the past that enhances reflection on the meaning of history and on the connections between now and then. (Lipe 2002:21)

Because authenticity is so important, archaeologists determine which sites could be interpreted successfully without needing further protection.

**Interpretation at California State Parks**

Ward and Wilkinson (2012:35) in the California State Parks guidebook *Basic Interpretation Learning System*, explain that above all, interpretation is done because the law mandates it. PRC § 5003 states that, “the department shall administer, protect, develop and interpret the property under its jurisdiction for the use and enjoyment of the public”. This is not the only reason why interpretation is important to the State Parks system of course. California State Parks highlights the importance of interpretation with its interpretive mission statement:

> Interpretation is a special form of communication that helps people understand, appreciate, and emotionally connect with the rich natural and cultural heritage preserved in parks. It is the mission of interpretation in California State Parks to convey messages that initially will help visitors value their experience, and that ultimately will foster a conservation ethic and promote a dedicated park constituency. (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2010:9-2)

The California State Park and Recreation Commission Statements of Policy, further guides interpretation as follows:

> The primary interpretive policy of the Department of Parks and Recreation is to heighten and increase public understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of the natural, cultural, historic and recreational values of California as represented in the State Park System; to increase public understanding and concern for people’s place in their environment, and thereby provide an increased desire to protect and enjoy the natural and cultural heritage of this state. (State Park and Recreation Commission 2005:43)
Interpretation is also important because it is vital to the protection of natural and cultural landscapes in Parks. Interpreting resources to visitors brings intangible meaning to tangible resources, creating a sense of stewardship. After all, “when visitors ‘care’ about your resource, they are less likely to damage it” (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:35). Furthermore, interpretation is about inspiring curiosity and cultivating an emotional response that will connect visitors to resources for years to come.

The State Parks system recognizes communication as the foundation of interpretation. Communication is seen as a process that starts with the interpreter and the message that she/he wants to convey. The message is encoded through a communication medium, which is then received by the visitor. The visitor then decodes the message and brings it back to the interpreter in a feedback process (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:73). The feedback received from the visitor is the most useful tool for interpreters to determine whether the communication process has been effective. Another tool used by State Parks to assess communication effectiveness is an acronym system called RAPPORT. This system is a set of standards used to promote successful interpretation programs (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:83). It stands for:

- **Relevant**- Related to the audience
- **Accurate**- Well prepared and researched
- **Provocative/Enjoyable**- Interesting and fun
- **Programmatically accessible**- Accommodating for all visitors
- **Organized**- Logical sequence of ideas presented
- **Retained**- Memorable
- **Thematic**- A central message throughout

Knowing your audience is the first step to making interpretation relevant. The message must relate to the people who are receiving the message. This means that sufficient research should be done prior to interpretation to ensure that several relevant elements
will be available to multiple audiences. This can be done through the use of analogies, metaphors or universal concepts, which are ideas that many people can connect with (Ward and Wilkinson 2012:83). Examples include love, joy, loss and family. Another important reason for knowing the audience is to ensure safety. Interpretive programs should be accessible to the general public and should accommodate visitors with wheelchairs, walkers etc. Planning ahead for these circumstances by addressing accessibility before each program will lead to a more organized presentation.

A method for organizing an effective presentation of information is through the use of a cognitive map. A cognitive map is a way of conveying to the public what is going to happen during an interpretive program. Cognitive maps are summary descriptions of the entire interpretive program that provides visitors at the beginning of a presentation with information about what to expect.

Cognitive map theory suggests that providing an initial structure through which the listener can organize the information helps facilitate understanding and comprehension of the message. (Ward and Wilkinson 2012: 88)

By giving visitors a mental orientation of what to expect upfront they will mentally organize the information given to them later into this cognitive map. A cognitive map can be repeated throughout the journey to reinforce themes and improve retention. Choosing relevant themes is also vital to making the connection between tangible resources and intangible meaning.

Interpretive themes are useful tools for interpreters because visitors often retain thematic concepts, while specific facts may be lost (Beck and Cable 2002:49). A theme is a statement that describes the core concept of what the interpreter intends to convey to the audience. It is an organizing tool that focuses an interpretive program around the most
important and relevant topics associated with tangible elements. Themes are supported by subthemes, which expand on certain aspects of the main theme. Ward and Wilkinson (2012:90) give the following example of a theme with two subthemes:

Theme: The forest provides, so you could survive if lost in the woods
Subtheme 1: Find water first, as it is essential to survival
Subtheme 2: Food is as easy to find as turning over a rock

Themes are developed in the planning stages through research of the tangible elements within a proposed interpretive program. The Interpretation Planning Workbook is a guide for creating interpretation programs at California State Parks (Schimandle et al. 2013).

The Interpretation Planning Workbook identifies the State Park General Plan as the primary management document that describes a park’s purpose, management direction and future development (Schimandle 2012:iii). The State Park General Plan provides a broad framework for interpretive programming, which can be further developed through Interpretation Master Plans (IMPs) and Interpretation Action Plans (IAPs) (Schimandle 2012:iv). An IMP is a planning document that identifies current programs, analyzes how they meet visitor needs and goals of the park, and provides a set of recommendations for improving these programs (Schimandle 2013:55). IMPs are developed through collaboration with all possible stakeholders both within and outside of Park staff. Once an IMP is developed, an IAP may be created to identify tasks and priorities for implementing what is laid out in the IMP. Together, these documents provide a long-term plan for successful, inclusive, interpretation and education programs within the Park.
Interpretation at Sugarloaf

Interpretation at SRSP is currently guided by the Sugarloaf EIR and General Plan (Chrisman et al. 2004) and follows the structure of the California State Park interpretation program. The Park offers a variety of programs that are both guided and self-guided (Chrisman et al. 2004:222-223). The Park’s visitor center includes several displays focusing on the history, plant communities, wildlife, and topography of SRSP. Guided walks through the Park’s many trails highlight the ecological and cultural landscapes in the Park. Despite these programs, the SRSP general plan (Chrisman et al. 2004:179) had this to say about the future of interpretation in the Park:

Demographic trends suggest that the park visitor of the future will be older and more educated, which would likely increase demand for interpretation and classroom activities…many visitors leave the park without getting a complete picture of [SRSP’s] prehistoric and historic past…however, the opportunity exists to increase interpretive programs to meet growing demand.

Assessing the interpretive needs of this changing demographic will require successful communication with the public, much like the work done at Malakoff Diggins State Historic Park, which was discussed previously in this chapter.

The SRSP general plan (Chrisman et al. 2004) addresses interpretation of both natural and cultural resources in the Park through broad interpretive themes. The goal of Park wide interpretation is to:

Develop interpretive materials to emphasize central themes that respond to the area’s spirit of place, history, and meaning, that will increase visitors’ knowledge and appreciation of significant natural and cultural resources at the Park and to expand their understanding of ecological relationships. (Chrisman et al. 2004:223)

The broad interpretive themes that specifically apply to Stern Ranch are:
Primary theme #2: The Mayacamas Ridge has long exerted an influence on human activity in the region. (Chrisman et al. 2004:225)

This theme speaks to the human-environment relationship through time (see Chapter V. for a detailed discussion).

Primary theme #3: Protecting Park resources requires help on several levels (Chrisman et al. 2004:225)

This theme can be addressed through a description of landscape change through time. Each feature on the landscape is an integral piece of the history of that place. Stern Ranch is an inherited landscape, meaning that each generation inherits it, keeping some of the original elements, but also shaping it to suit contemporary needs. Visitors to the Park should be made aware of their impact to natural and cultural landscapes through an understanding of landscape change through time. Change is inevitable and often necessary, but change needs to be managed conscientiously. The SRSP general plan (Chrisman et al. 2004:225) encourages interpreters to make visitors aware of the choices they make when visiting public lands. A good mantra to promote through pamphlets and brochures is ‘take only photos, leave only footsteps’ (National Park Service 2015). This is a small but effective reminder to respect public lands.

**Bringing Stern Ranch into the SRSP Interpretive Program**

Interpretation of Stern Ranch could focus on the natural and cultural history of the site and how it relates to the early development of Kenwood, California over time. Stern Ranch has three important overlapping historic periods that are represented by specific landscape features. The Native American period began in prehistory and continues today. This period is represented throughout the Park by archaeological sites, cultural sensitive
plants, and isolated artifacts. Since many prehistoric archaeological sites are vulnerable to looting and vandalism, interpretation of this period can be done through a cultural landscape approach. The landscape management approach does several things for park interpreters. It moves beyond site-specific interpretation and considers how features on the landscape fit into broader systems both spatially and temporally. It also establishes a link between several historic periods, where one place can tell a story about different people and events through time. In this way, the native vegetation used by speakers of the Wappo and Southern Pomo languages can be the focus of interpretation that can be used anywhere in the Park away from specific archaeological sites.

The second important historic period for SRSP is the agricultural period, which is represented by historic-period ranches, homesteads and sites within the Park. The interpretive focus for this period is the rural agricultural settlement and development in Kenwood, California and the surrounding area. In Stern Ranch, this period exhibits an extensive amount of features including barns, a storage cellar, a chicken house, two privies, a domestic tank house, several orchards, and dams.

The third historic period is the rural recreation period that began in the 19th century and continues today. This period exhibits features of unique architecture, including the Stern house, the pool and pool house built in the early 1970s. To reiterate, interpretive themes that could be used in Stern Ranch are as follows:

- Primary Theme- Stern Ranch is a cultural landscape that encompasses the story of three overlapping historic periods, the Native American period, the agricultural period and the rural recreation period.
• Supporting Theme 1- Stern Ranch has a rich native vegetation community, which has been used and managed for thousands of years.

• Supporting Theme 2- Stern Ranch, as a rural, historic-era ranch and farm, represents a critical time in the development and expansion of Kenwood, California.

• Supporting Theme 3- Stern Ranch represents the long history of rural recreation in Kenwood, California that continues today.

The landscape in Stern Ranch contains features and artifacts that are integral to the understanding of land use through time. These artifacts can be targets for looters and should be protected against theft and vandalism. When taking visitors through this area it is important to stress the importance of preservation in place. It is also important to understand what the audience’s interests are so that interpretation can be tailored to specific groups. For example, a class of fourth grade children will have vastly different interests than folks from the Glen Ellen Historical Society. Understanding these interests is vitally important to developing stewardship for the Park and its resources. One way of doing this is through the development of an IMP (discussed above), which encourages engagement with visitors of the Park in order to gain an understanding of visitor interests. Tools for interpretation that can be used in Stern Ranch include guided and self-guided walks, brochures, interpretive signs and eventually, computer-aided tours.

Future Directions

In this information age, the way that people receive and use knowledge is much different than it was even ten years ago. Staying relevant to the public will mean bringing
interpretation of cultural resources into the 21st century. The Angel Island State Park Interpretation Master Plan (Brees, 2012:79) addressed this issue and discussed a need to develop a variety of interpretive tools that aid visitors in guided and self-guided exploration of the park. These tools include multimedia applications on wayside panels and orientation hubs, exhibits in visitor centers, web-based media and downloadable content for personal devices. (Brees 2012:79)

With limited and sometimes shrinking budgets, mobile technologies may be the best option. Smartphones and tablets can be used by State Parks to create a customized tour of Parks with text, photos, audio and visual information. Interpretive programs currently operating at SRSP include the use of brochures and interpretive signs, guided and self-guided nature and cultural walks, campfire and junior ranger programs, and nighttime viewing sessions at the observatory. Team Sugarloaf has also been looking into mobile technology applications such as Canogle, which provides a web based interpretive program that can be accessed on smartphones (Roney 2014). Bringing mobile technologies into the interpretation programs at SRSP could increase the interpretive potential of the Park.
Chapter IX. Cultural Resources Management Plan

Properly done compliance should result in good management, and good management should put an agency in compliance with the law. (King 2008:11)

Introduction

In this chapter, I lay out a cultural resources management plan based on the background and data provided in this thesis and the guidelines and management directives of SRSP. The Sugarloaf EIR identified an increased demand for improved interpretation, specifically of the prehistoric and historic past, and outdoor recreation use (Chrisman et al. 2004:50, 165, 179). Several suggestions were made to meet these demands, including the creation of additional interpretation areas and trail expansion (Chrisman et al. 2004:165, 208). With the acquisition of Stern Ranch, an opportunity arose to meet these demands. In addition to wide areas of open space and historic trails and roads for hiking, the ranch includes several dwellings that would benefit from having tenants. Set in close proximity to the Hurd family homestead, this agricultural landscape adds to the historic character of the Park and is an excellence place for an interpretive program. The following plan addresses the management concerns and necessary actions for the acquisition of the property, the development or rehabilitation of trails, and the adaptive re-use of the buildings on the ranch by considering future impacts and making recommendations for management of cultural resources in Stern Ranch.
Anticipated Future Impacts to Cultural Resources in Stern Ranch

The Sugarloaf EIR identified several resource protection and management issues for cultural resources. The key issues are natural occurrences and impacts due to visitor use. Impacts to cultural resources have mainly come from erosion along Sonoma Creek and other waterways. “Other factors, such as wild pig rooting, foot and equestrian traffic, looting, and construction or maintenance of Park facilities have caused cumulative damage to some sites” (Chrisman et al. 2004:182). This has led the District to implement an archaeological evaluation program to monitor the damage to sites mainly along the Sonoma Creek drainage. In Stern Ranch, management issues revolve around the acquisition and incorporation of the property into the Park, the development or rehabilitation of trails, and the adaptive re-use of the buildings on the ranch. Other impacts are also considered including natural occurrences and illegal marijuana gardens.

Acquisition and Incorporation of the Ranch into the Park

The addition of Stern Ranch into SRSP has the potential to impact cultural resources within the property due to neglect. Before this, caretakers lived on the property maintaining the various buildings, structures, springs, etc. With the acquisition of Stern Ranch into SRSP, Park management must implement Parks’ policies to ensure the protection and preservation of cultural resources (see Recommendation 5).

Development and Rehabilitation of Trails through the Ranch

There are several historic trails and roads within Stern Ranch that could be used by the public. However, the rehabilitation of these trails has the potential to degrade their
historic character if done improperly. Additionally, the creation of new trails within the property has the potential to impact cultural resources just below the ground surface (see Recommendation 4).

The trails also bring visitors into the property where significant cultural resources exist. These resources have the potential to be vandalized or looted as a result. Looters tend to collect whole artifacts, such as bottles and projectile points. The large artifact concentrations found within Stern Ranch could be a prime target for looters.

**Adaptive Re-use of Buildings**

The dwellings in Stern Ranch are historical resources that may be impacted by their re-use if they are managed improperly. Maintenance of these dwellings may also require ground-disturbing activities including replacement of underground pipes and foundations. These activities may expose buried cultural resources (see Recommendation 5).

**Natural Occurrences**

SRSP is sometimes struck with severe storms in the winter, which speeds the erosion of the banks of the Park’s many waterways. Cultural resources could be damaged or destroyed as a result of this disturbance. Evidence of wild turkey rooting was also quite prominent throughout the property. Buried archaeological sites could be unearthed due to rooting, leaving a greater potential for artifact looting. Natural fires also pose a risk for cultural resources, especially the buildings and structures on Stern Ranch (see Recommendation 6).
Illegal Marijuana Gardens

Illegal marijuana gardens have been a concern within SRSP since 2007 when they were first discovered in the Park. These gardens not only disturb cultural and natural resources within Stern Ranch, but also visitor safety and experience. Garden areas are cleared and sometimes terraced, potentially exposing and destroying cultural resources. Marijuana growers dam creeks and springs to irrigate their plants, using black plastic pipes that are left strewn in the waterways after the season is over. They use toxic fertilizers, which seep into the ground and get into the nearby waterways. Animals and insects exposed to these toxins often die, creating an imbalance in the sensitive ecosystems within the Park. Marijuana growers also leave behind camps, that are costly and time consuming to clean up for the Park. The cleanup efforts themselves could result in the disturbance or displacement of cultural resources. Additionally, while there have been no problems with violence in SRSP, marijuana growers in other public lands have been known to carry weapons to defend their crops. This poses a major safety concern for visitors to the property (see Recommendation 4).

Recommendations

The purpose of these recommendations is to aid SRSP management in accomplishing its goals for cultural resources while complying with the various laws and regulations regarding these resources. The Sugarloaf EIR states the following goal for cultural resources: To “Identify, protect, preserve, and interpret significant cultural resources identified within the Park” (Chrisman et al. 2004:207). The Sugarloaf EIR also stipulates a set of guidelines to help accomplish this goal. The following
recommendations stem from these guidelines as well as other agencies management practices with regard to cultural resource/landscape management.

**Recommendation #1: Enact a Landscape Management Approach**

The landscape management approach is useful to Park managers for several reasons. It moves beyond site-specific management and considers how features on the landscape fit into broader systems both spatially and temporally. It establishes a link between several historic periods, where one place can tell a story about different people and events through time. It also considers the spaces between ‘sites’ or the environment in which these sites are located. Therefore, the integration of ecological and archaeological principles is integral to this management approach. When CEQA projects or federal undertakings are planned, archaeological resources should be considered. An archaeologist should be a part of the team implementing management projects/undertakings in order to provide input regarding impacts to cultural resources.

**Recommendation #2: Initiate Legal Compliance Procedures**

Laws and regulations that govern cultural resources may be applicable to California State Parks (See Chapter I for in-depth discussion). Furthermore, legal compliance is addressed in the Sugarloaf EIR guidelines:

CULT-6: As part of the planning and design process for area-specific projects, and prior to commencement of any ground disturbance, grading, or construction related to new facilities, enhancements, or demolition, develop the appropriate project-level CEQA documentation providing the environmental evaluation and mitigation measures necessary to avoid, reduce, or minimize potentially significant impacts to cultural resources. These measures may include:
A qualified cultural resource professional will conduct appropriate record reviews and any necessary fieldwork to determine the presence of cultural resources or culturally sensitive areas as may be required.

If the cultural resource investigations indicate the presence of cultural resources or culturally sensitive areas within or adjacent to areas that will be affected by the proposed activities, such activities will be planned and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to the identified resources.

In the event that some disturbance to cultural resources is unavoidable, appropriate measures will be identified and implemented in consultation with a qualified cultural resource professional. Such measures shall be consistent with all applicable rules and regulations relating to the protection of cultural resources. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208-209)

A procedural outline should be developed to make legal compliance easier to follow. CEQA and PRC 5024 and 5024.5 are laws that State Parks may have to comply with. CEQA (PRC § 21000 et seq.), enacted in 1970, as amended, requires that prior to carrying out projects on non-federal land, the lead agency must identify significant effects on the environment that may be caused by the project. PRC § 21083.2 and 21084.1 recognize that adverse effects to both historical and archaeological resources constitute adverse effects to the environment. If substantial adverse effects are identified, the lead agency takes action, where feasible, to avoid or mitigate those significant effects.

State and local public agencies follow State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR § 15000 et seq.) when going through the review process required by CEQA. PRC 5024 requires State agencies to evaluate State-owned resources for eligibility to the National Register and the California Historical Landmark (CHL) listing. It also stipulates that State agencies create and maintain a list of historical resources. The steps through the CEQA and PRC 5024 and 5024.5 processes are described in Chapter I. The following flow chart (Figure 17) details the CEQA process, in an accessible format.
Figure 17. CEQA Process Flow Chart (Association of Environmental Professionals 2012:246)
Recommendation #3: Continue to Identify and Record Sites and Landscape Features

The fieldwork conducted for this thesis did not cover all of the Stern Ranch property. Areas that were excluded from survey include those areas that were excessively steep, covered in thick vegetation, or surrounded by barbed wire fencing. In the future, if these areas become more accessible they should be surveyed for cultural resources. This recommendation is addressed in the Sugarloaf EIR guidelines as follows:

CULT-1: Identify and map cultural resources in the portions of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park that have not been previously surveyed, including newly acquired properties, into the park’s GIS database. Facilitate information sharing with Sonoma State University and the Northwestern Information Center. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208)

Any resources found in these areas should be formally recorded on DPR 523 forms, added to the SRSP cultural resources inventory and submitted to the Northwest Information Center. Additionally, any newly acquired properties should be surveyed for cultural resources and incorporated into the inventory of the Park.

Recommendation #4: Rehabilitate existing Historic Trails and/or Create new Trails through Stern Ranch

The protection of cultural resources within SRSP should be of prime importance when considering any type of action/project/undertaking. Action should also be taken to protect cultural resources that are in danger of being impacted by vandalism or looting. This is reinforced in the Sugarloaf EIR guidelines:

CULT-2: Continue programs protecting the significant cultural resources of the park and extend programs to other areas of the park where damage to archaeological sites is likely. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208)

The most effective way to prevent vandalism and looting is to limit public access to sensitive sites. It is important to keep a buffer zone between sensitive areas and public
access routes when opening trails to the public. Action should be taken to obscure the visibility of surface archaeological deposits when a buffer zone is not feasible. This can be accomplished by planting native vegetation along trails to screen artifacts from view and to prevent trespassing. Site locations should be kept confidential, disclosing information only to those Park employees who need to know. Additionally, opening the Stern Ranch landscape to visitors may prevent criminals from planting illegal marijuana gardens in the area because of the exposure to the public.

One historic trail, documented on the 1916 Santa Rosa USGS Topographic Quadrangle, runs north through the southern boundary of the property, through the main residential complex, north further paralleling Pony Gulch, and then heading east toward Bald Mountain Trail (USGS 1916). Portions of this trail are still intact and could be rehabilitated for use. There are two possible loop trails through the property that would effectively incorporate Stern Ranch into the SRSP trail system. The first is a short loop trail that uses the existing, paved Stern Trail into the property, then turns west past the Stern pool, across Pony Gulch, and south through the southern boundary meeting the Pony Gate Trail. The historic trail portion of this trail is well developed and will need little work to rehabilitate it for use. There is one archaeologically sensitive area along this trail that will have to be obscured from view if this trail is developed. Additionally, the earthen bridge that once crossed Pony Gulch has washed out and will need to be rehabilitated (see Figure 18).
Figure 18. Trail Map 01- Short Loop Trail

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University

Rohnert Park, California.
The second proposed trail is a long loop that also uses the existing, paved Stern Trail for access into the property. From there the proposed trail veers off east of the paved road through an open meadow to avoid the main residential complex and archaeologically sensitive areas. The proposed trail then meets with a historic trail north of the residential complex that runs parallel to Pony Gulch, then heads east, exiting the property boundary and meeting with Bald Mountain Trail. The historic trail portion of this route is not well developed and will require a moderate amount of work to rehabilitate. There are also archaeologically sensitive areas near the trail that should be obscured from view. Additionally, the proposed portion of the trail from the paved Stern Trail to the historic portion would be entirely new and will need to be created (see Figure 19).
Figure 19. Trail Map 02- Long Loop Trail

This figure has been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.

Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University Rohnert Park, California.
**Recommendation #5: Evaluate and Re-Use or Adaptively Re-Use Buildings and Structures**

The Stern Ranch Complex contains several historic-era buildings including four dwellings, two barns and five outbuildings that could be used by Park staff. The Sugarloaf EIR guidelines address this as follows: “CULT-4: consider adaptive reuse of historic structures, as appropriate” (Chrisman et al 2004:208). Park staff and their families presently occupy three of the dwellings: the ranch house, the caretaker house, and the domestic tank house. Plans to find a tenant for the Stern house are currently underway. Some of the other buildings in the complex have also been adaptively re-used as storage facilities. The continued use of the buildings in the Stern Ranch Complex ensures that they will not become neglected. If a future proposed project has the potential to affect these historic buildings, a qualified architectural historian should evaluate them individually for inclusion in either the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places depending on the regulatory context. Furthermore, if any of the buildings are to be altered in any way guideline Cult-7 should be followed (Chrisman et al. 2004:209):

**CULT-7**: Alteration or removal of any historic or archaeological features will be subject to Public Resources Code Section 5024.5 review requirements. All construction, maintenance, or improvements of historic structures will be in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings and the California Historical Building Code.

**Recommendation #6: Develop a Park Vegetation Management Plan**

Natural fires are a major threat to cultural and ecological resources. Measures should be taken to decrease the risk of fire through vegetation management. The Hood
Mountain Regional Park Vegetation Management Plan (McBride and Barnhart n.d.) was developed, among other things, to minimize fire hazards. It was found that certain vegetation types are more of a fire hazard than others, and therefore should be managed to reduce this risk. “The plan recommends prescribed burns to reduce fuel loads and describes the expected impacts...on invasive and rare and endangered species” (Chrisman et al. 2004:41). At SRSP, prescribed burns have been initiated to control yellow-star thistle in the Park. Other measures to control this noxious weed have been herbicide application and insect release (Chrisman et al. 2004:90). These methods could be used to control vegetation types that create the highest risk of fire hazard. A vegetation management plan, that considers the risk of fire to cultural and ecological resources should be developed for SRSP.

In the event of wild fire within the Park, a qualified archaeologist should survey the area after the event to make sure buried archaeological materials were not exposed as a result of the fire. Archaeological sites that were in the area burned should be visited, and any damage sustained to the site should be recorded. New sites discovered as a result of a fire should be formally recorded on DPR 523 forms, added to the SRSP cultural resources inventory and submitted to the Northwest Information Center.

Recommendation #7: Implement a Regular Monitoring Program and Continue Archaeological Evaluation Program

The archaeological evaluation program at SRSP was developed, in part, to respond to ongoing damage to cultural resources in the Park. The main impacts sustained by cultural resources are erosion along Sonoma Creek and its tributaries, wild animal rooting, visitor foot and equestrian traffic, looting, and construction and maintenance
(Chrisman et al. 2004:106). The archaeological evaluation program “has involved intensive surveys, auger probes, unit excavations, and artifact collection” in an attempt to remedy this problem (Chrisman et al. 2004:106). This program should continue and extend to include the Stern Ranch Complex. This program should be a part of a long-term monitoring program for cultural resources and landscapes in the Park.

Previously recorded archaeological sites within SRSP should be monitored on a bi-annual basis by a qualified archaeologist. Monitoring is an effective tool for the management of natural and anthropogenic impacts to archaeological sites and cultural landscapes. Monitoring will inform management strategies to avoid or mitigate impacts to cultural resources on a site-by-site basis. A monitoring form should be developed that documents the general condition of the site, documentary photographs, evidence of natural or anthropogenic impacts, and recommendations for site-specific management.

**Recommendation #8: Involve Stakeholders and Community in Management Plans and Activities**

Community involvement is vital to site stewardship, protection, preservation and interpretation. When managing archaeological sites, buildings, structures etc. within a park it is important to remember that it is not only the resources that need to be managed, it is also cultural heritage. Cultural heritage “is a particular version or interpretation of the past that belongs to a person or group…shaping group or community identities and political ideologies” (Jameson 2008:57). Understanding the perspective and opinions of all stakeholders, community members, organizations, etc. ensures a collaborative approach to the management of cultural resources and heritage in SRSP.
SRSP has had a long history of involving volunteers in Park activities. Nonprofit and volunteer organizations have conducted guided ecological tours through the Park. “Acorn Soupe organizes an educational program and nature walk for 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} grade classes approximately 12 times per year” (Chrisman et al. 2004:117). Volunteers have also helped out in restoration work, including repairing trails, creek clean ups and illegal marijuana garden clean up (Chrisman et al 2004:118). These volunteers play a vital role in the operation of the Park and could potentially aid in the management, protection and preservation of cultural resources.

It should be noted that it is not always appropriate to involve all stakeholders in the management of all cultural resources. This is particularly true of prehistoric and historic archaeological sites that could be vulnerable to looting if locational information is given to the public. A professional archaeologist, in communication with local tribal governments, should assess the sensitivity of each prehistoric site before deciding whether or not to disclose locational information.

Involving stakeholders in Park management actions and decisions should be done proactively as part of a larger Interpretation Master Plan (IMP) (see Chapter VII for details on IMPs). Although IMPs focus on interpretation, community involvement is a large part of how the public benefits from the management of cultural resources in the Park. IMPs focus on public opinion and solicit local community input. The development of an IMP could be an opportunity to establish relationships with various stakeholders who could participate in cultural resource/heritage management moving forward through formal and informal interviews and questionnaires. The stakeholders of SRSP include Team Sugarloaf, local historical societies, including Glen Ellen and Sonoma County and
local Indian tribes including the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley, The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria, the Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians, and the Lytton Band of Pomo Indians. There are also thousands of visitors each year that regularly assign value and meaning to the Park.

**Recommendation #9: Consult with Tribal Governments Regarding Management Plans and Actions**

Involving local tribal governments is addressed in the Sugarloaf EIR guidelines as follows:

CULT-3: Establish and maintain relationships with interested local Native American groups to allow for Native American input on proposed projects. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208)

As in recommendation #8, this process can promote collaboration on CEQA projects and/or federal undertakings and illicit mutual understanding. Typically, this process has been initiated through ‘consultation’ with federally recognized tribes. Consultation is a term of art that is legally mandated under several federal and state laws. This term is defined as:

The meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties’ cultural values and, where feasible, seeking agreement. Consultation between government agencies and Native American tribes shall be conducted in a way that is mutually respectful of each party’s sovereignty. Consultation shall also recognize the tribes’ potential needs for confidentiality with respect to places that have traditional tribal cultural significance. (Cal. Government. Code § 65352.4)

Prior to Assembly Bill 52 being approved on September 25th 2014, consultation with California Native American tribes was not mandated under CEQA. This bill, which will
go into effect on July 1, 2015, has made, among other things, the following changes to the CEQA process:

SEC. 5. Section 21080.3.1 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:
21080.3.1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares that California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area may have expertise concerning their tribal cultural resources. (b) Prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, the lead agency shall begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project if: (1) the California Native American tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe, and (2) the California Native American tribe responds, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification, and requests the consultation.

California Native American tribes under Assembly Bill 52 are those tribes that are included on a contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (PRC Sec. 3 § 21073). Relationships with local tribal governments should be established and maintained through periodic meetings, to discuss objectives and goals for the management of cultural resources in the Park. Local tribal governments should be contacted during the planning of any CEQA projects or federal undertakings that may affect Native American cultural resources. Projects should be carried out under the appropriate legal context.

**Recommendation #10: Develop and Implement an Interpretive Program**

As stated in Chapter VIII, Public Resources Code § 5003 mandates interpretation at SRSP. PRC § 5003 states that, “the department shall administer, protect, develop and interpret the property under its jurisdiction for the use and enjoyment of the public”. While this is a compelling reason to continue to provide high quality interpretation to the
Parks many visitors, this is not the only reason for doing so. It is also one of the guidelines laid out in the Sugarloaf EIR as follows:

CULT-5: Provide interpretive and educational programs on cultural resources within the park and the history and pre-history of the area. (Chrisman et al. 2004:208)

Interpretive and education programs bridge the gap between archaeological research and the public, and encourages site stewardship. Site stewardship is an essential part of preserving, protecting and maintaining archaeological sites in the Park.

Schimandle (2012:iii) identified the State Park General Plan as the primary management document that describes a park’s purpose, management direction and future development. The Sugarloaf EIR provides a general framework for an interpretive program, which can be further developed through the development of an Interpretation Master Plan (IMP) and Interpretation Action Plan (IAP). An IMP is a planning document that identifies current programs, analyzes how they meet visitor needs and goals of the park, and provides a set of recommendations for improving these programs (Schimandle 2013:55) (see Chapter VIII for details on IMPs). An IMP and IAP should be developed for SRSP in order to provide a long-term plan for successful, inclusive, interpretation and education program within the Park.

In 1983, Unit Ranger Linda Gresham conducted an oral history with the Hurd family children that lived on the Hurd homestead in the early 20th century. This oral history provided a glimpse into what it was like to live in the Park during this time, the types of activities that were conducted and the history of early rural development in Kenwood, California (see Appendix E for full oral history document). An effort should
be made to collect additional oral histories with people that have been involved in the early history of the Park, including former rangers, caretakers, and private owners.

Stern Ranch should be incorporated into the existing public interpretation and education programs currently employed in SRSP. As stated in Chapter VIII, Stern Ranch has three important overlapping historic periods that are represented by certain landscape features. They are the Native American period, the historic-era ranching period, and the rural recreation period. The landscape features associated with these period represent the following themes:

- **Primary Theme**- Stern Ranch is a cultural landscape that encompasses the story of three historic periods, the Native American period, the agricultural period and the rural recreation period.

- **Supporting Theme 1**- Stern Ranch is full of native vegetation, which has been used and managed for thousands of years.

- **Supporting Theme 2**- Stern Ranch, as a rural, historic-era ranch and farm, represents a critical time in the development and expansion of Kenwood, California.

- **Supporting Theme 3**- Stern Ranch represents the long history of rural recreation in Kenwood, California that continues today.

**Recommendation #11: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains and Cultural Resources**

Human remains may exist and could be inadvertently discovered within SRSP. If human remains are discovered in the Park, California State Health and Safety Code
(CSHSC) § 7050.5 must be initiated. The Sugarloaf EIR addresses this in its guidelines for cultural resources as follows:

CULT-8: If in the event that human remains are encountered:

- The Sonoma County coroner will be contacted and appropriate measures implemented. These actions would be consistent with the State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

- If the county coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work. (Chrisman et al. 2004:209)

In the event that unrecorded cultural resources are found within the Park, a professional archaeologist should be contacted to record, evaluate and treat the resources.

The California Code of Regulations § 15126.4 addresses preservation measures, stating that:

(A) Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation may also avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the site.

This option may not always be feasible and treatment options should be developed by a professional archaeologist within the proper regulatory context and in consultation with stakeholders.
Native American Recommendations

This section presents Native American recommendations that were gathered through informal interviews. The recommendations are paraphrased based on these conversations.

Nick Tipon, Sacred Sites Protection Committee, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR)

Nick Tipon provided the following table (Table 10) of culturally sensitive plants. The Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo people have used these plants in the past and present for different reasons. When monitoring for cultural resources, these plants should be identified and their locations documented. These plants should be protected from destruction, and populations of these plants should be encouraged in all areas of the Park. The Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo groups should have access to these plants for continued use (Personal communication 12 January 2015).

Table 10. FIGR Native Plants List, Provided by Nick Tipon (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Coast Miwok Word</th>
<th>Southern Pomo Word</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Angelica californica</td>
<td>Hutuu</td>
<td>ba cowa</td>
<td>Medicinal / Ceremonial / Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Laurel</td>
<td>Umbellularia californica</td>
<td>sowl'-las (Tree)</td>
<td>bahsa (tree) beh e (nut)</td>
<td>Food / Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td>Quercus californica</td>
<td>kotis</td>
<td>yohsiy</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry</td>
<td>Rubus ursinus</td>
<td>wate</td>
<td>ti bahqay</td>
<td>Food / Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluedick</td>
<td>Dichelostemma capitatum</td>
<td>waila (Tamales)</td>
<td>hi bu la</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye</td>
<td>Aesculus californica</td>
<td>yawi (tree) 'ulem (mush)</td>
<td>bah sa</td>
<td>Food / Tool / Ceremonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulrush</td>
<td>Schoenoplectus californicus</td>
<td>looko (big) sappa (small)</td>
<td>siw's</td>
<td>Food / Baskets / Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttercup</td>
<td>Ranunculus californicus</td>
<td>sitila</td>
<td>qa baja</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Poppy</td>
<td>Eschscholzia californica</td>
<td>munkai</td>
<td>si dohcho</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>saata</td>
<td>sa can</td>
<td>Food / Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeberry</td>
<td>Rhamnus californica</td>
<td>po'-tah (Tamales)</td>
<td>si bas bak le</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote Brush</td>
<td>Baccharis pilularis</td>
<td>tcu'u</td>
<td>Medicinal / Shelter</td>
<td>Coyote Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Coast Miwok Word</td>
<td>Southern Pomo Word</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudweed</td>
<td>Gnaphalium canescens</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
<td>Cudweed</td>
<td>Gnaphalium canescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currant</td>
<td>Ribes victoris Greene</td>
<td>kawisu</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Currant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogbane</td>
<td>Apocynum cannabinum</td>
<td>tsopogo</td>
<td>Cordage / Medicinal</td>
<td>Dogbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogwood</td>
<td>Cornus sericia L. ssp.</td>
<td>mahsa</td>
<td>Baskets</td>
<td>Dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougis Iris</td>
<td>Iris douglasiana</td>
<td>lawik</td>
<td>si wi ta</td>
<td>Cordage / Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderberry</td>
<td>Sambucus caerulea</td>
<td>bat ink le</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Elderberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Willow</td>
<td>Salix lasiandra</td>
<td>luma</td>
<td>k a lan</td>
<td>Food / Baskets /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumlant</td>
<td>Grindelia hirsutula</td>
<td>q aqa we</td>
<td>Tool / Medicinal</td>
<td>Gumlant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry</td>
<td>Vaccinium hirsutula</td>
<td>po' te</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Huckleberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithuriel's spear</td>
<td>Triteleia laxa Benth.</td>
<td>putcu</td>
<td>bim'u</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimson Weed</td>
<td>Datura stramonium L.</td>
<td>monoy</td>
<td>qa lqasia</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine</td>
<td>Lupinus chamissonis</td>
<td>soppoko</td>
<td>galgas'a</td>
<td>Baskets / Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugwort (sage)</td>
<td>Artemisia douglasiana</td>
<td>kicin (Tomales)</td>
<td>qa p ula</td>
<td>Ceremonial /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>po'-to-po'-to</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bodega)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbud</td>
<td>Cercis orbiculata</td>
<td>ta pa' tapu</td>
<td>'ah ay ta</td>
<td>Crafts / Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>lume</td>
<td>kas'in</td>
<td>Shelter / Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>Juncus textilis Buch.</td>
<td>katece</td>
<td>ci ba</td>
<td>Baskets / Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonberry</td>
<td>Rubus spectabilis Pursh</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Salmonberry</td>
<td>Rubus spectabilis Pursh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaweed</td>
<td>Porphyra abbottae</td>
<td>hastuka</td>
<td>'o t ono</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedge</td>
<td>Carex barbarae</td>
<td>kissi</td>
<td>co sink le</td>
<td>Tools / Baskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showy Indian Clover</td>
<td>Trifolium amoenum</td>
<td>kaali</td>
<td>kaali</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverweed</td>
<td>Potentilla anserina</td>
<td>citila</td>
<td>Medicinal / Food</td>
<td>Silverweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soaproot</td>
<td>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</td>
<td>hakka</td>
<td>ha 'an</td>
<td>Food / Tool /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry</td>
<td>Fragaria chiloensis pacifica</td>
<td>i'yum</td>
<td>muhway mi</td>
<td>Food / Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>Helianthus annuus</td>
<td>hii pakas</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>Nicotiana bigelovii</td>
<td>kayaw</td>
<td>ka'wak le</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td>Heteromeles arbutiolia</td>
<td>puylak (berries)</td>
<td>bu'du</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Oak</td>
<td>Quercus lobata</td>
<td>hakya</td>
<td>sunk le</td>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax Myrtle</td>
<td>Morella californica</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Wax Myrtle</td>
<td>Morella californica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>Achillea millefolium L. var.</td>
<td>kickin</td>
<td>sunam ketey</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerba Buena</td>
<td>Satureja douglasii</td>
<td>yerba beenu</td>
<td>yerba beena</td>
<td>Medicinal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Otis Parish, Cultural and Historic Preservation Officer, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point Rancheria

There is a possibility that subsurface cultural deposits may exist within the project area. Given this, if any ground disturbing activity will occur within the Park, the Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians should be contacted for further recommendations. Recommendations may include a contractual agreement for tribal monitors to be present while ground disturbing activities occur (Personal communication 16 September 2014).

Brenda Tomaras, Tribal Representative, Lytton Band of Pomo Indians

The Lytton Band of Pomo Indians recommends that during any ground disturbing activity, including grading and excavation, an archaeologist and a Native American tribal monitor be present to periodically check for any cultural resources. If cultural resources are found during periodic checks, further monitoring should be executed (Personal communication 16 September 2014).

Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Research

This thesis identified, mapped and evaluated cultural resources in the newly acquired Stern Ranch property. It addressed the legal obligations associated with the development of recreational trails and adaptive re-use of buildings on the ranch. It also contextualized the ranch as a cultural landscape and showed how it fits into the broader socio-historical landscape of the surrounding area through a detailed description of its environment and history. This research has provided a basis for an interpretation program that proposes to unite the prehistoric, early Euro-American settlement and recreational
history into a cohesive narrative. Suggestions are provided to continue the management of cultural resources within Stern Ranch and SRSP as a whole. With that said, there are opportunities for future research that fell outside of the scope of this thesis, some of which were discussed in the recommendations and one that I will discuss below.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) have had a huge impact on the way that cultural resources management is practiced in recent years. There are a number of ways to apply this method including: spatial analysis, and settlement and land use pattern modeling (Jones 2006), cognitive landscape modeling (Whitley 2002) and viewshed and visual analysis (Llobera 2007). One of the most striking things about walking through Stern Ranch are the expansive views overlooking the surrounding hills and valleys. This is coupled with the evidence that dramatic landscape changes have occurred throughout the centuries. These two aspects of this landscape had an impact on how people perceived, experienced and used this space. While it would be presumptuous to assume that past human perception and experience could be gleaned from GIS modeling alone, there are compelling reasons for looking further into this research focus.

The first is that the overarching structure of the visual space in SRSP is mostly unchanged. This allows people today to experience, to a certain degree, what people in the past experienced. As Llobera (2007:53) points out,

> It is through ‘guided rediscovery’ that culture (and shared perception) is transmitted from one generation to the next…We end up sharing common world views by sharing the context in which we generate information about the world.

Another reason is that SRSP is in a unique upland environment, and has an extensive history of land use. Because of this, SRSP could provide an arena for research into sacred landscapes, prehistoric upland settlement patterns, and resource utilization. Using a GIS
modeling approach to these research themes could provide an avenue through which to study past human perception of the environment and behaviors.
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Appendix A- Hand Drawn Map of Stern Ranch (Sher-Mar-Lin Ranch)

* This document was produced by the Stern Ranch landowners (presumably the Clowers) in the 1960s. It was given to the author by Sugarloaf Ridge State Park management.
Appendix B- Gilcrest family and Howard Carpenter’s Photos and Letters

*Copies of these documents were given to the author by Susan David between 2 January 2015 and 4 February 2015*
William Murray Gilcrest and his Wife Ella Fishing at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro

John Gilcrest’s Children, Mary and Jack at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro
John Gilcrest

John Gilcrest and Family Fishing at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro
Howard Carpenter and William Murray Gilcrest at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro

Howard Carpenter Fishing at Rancho Escaleres Del Oro
LETTER OF FRANCELIA SHAW WESTON DEWITT

Rancho Escalares Del Oro
Kenwood, Sonoma Co. Cal.
Aug. 3, 1894

My Very Dear Sister,  (Written to Marilla Weston Shulze )

I have got so anxious to hear from you that I can't wait any longer for an answer to the last one I wrote you, but write again hoping that this may bring the long desired letter. I know you have many cares, much to do and a very great many letters to write, but I do so want one that I think if you could realize it, you would try and get it in. I had a good long letter about six weeks ago from Mrs. Erickson, which told me a little about you but only made me the more hungry for more, as do all the little items I get from the papers. Mrs. E. wrote about Wills illness and I am very anxious to hear how he is getting along. I do feel so sorry for John and Frona ¹ they have had so much trouble in the past year, but I know they bear it bravely as they always have, whatever comes to them and you too have had your share lately. But I hope to hear that you are all better in every way and that business has improved and sickness is passing away. My own way has been very smooth and peaceful for the last few years, but still my head turns longingly to Elon in his self-banishment, and I so wish I might hear from him again, but I have about given up any expectation of it.

We have been here camping on John's ranch since the ninth of June and have had a very lovely quiet time, we came a little too early as we had a couple of weeks of rather cold weather with two days rain. Of course, we had the house to stay in days and to cook and eat in, but the tents were cold and damp to sleep in. But we none of us got sick, though Cora and the girl got head colds getting the provisions sheltered but since then it has been very warm and pleasant. The only drawback, the fact that little Mary strained one of the ligaments in one of her feet just before we came up, and Cora had to take her to the City to have it treated. She could not walk for several weeks, but is getting over it now, though we have been very anxious about it. Otherwise she is in excellent health and we feel that both of the children will be greatly benefited by their outdoor life. Jack is as well and hearty as he can be and so full of business as Mr. Carpenter, who is John's partner in the Ranch and who runs its. He is a bachelor, but has a family to keep house. He is devoted to Jack and lets him trot after him all day long. It has made it lovely for Jack and a good deal easier for the rest of us.

I must tell you a little about the ranch. It is in the mountains about 1300 feet above the valley, which we reach by a distance of about four miles, so you see part of it is a steep climb. We follow the creek up part way then strike a grade that is very steep for the rest. The ranch has 320 acres mostly stock ranges with, here and there, a piece of tillable land mostly in vines and orchards. It has never paid anything to speak of yet but they hope in a few years it will. Now the orchards are beginning to bear, have had some apricots and will have a good many prunes and apples and they begin to think that the apples will be the best paying crop as the land is so high and cool that they are very fine

¹ Saphronia Weston Mitchell, Francelia's sister-in-law
flavored. The scenery is very lovely and the walks pleasant though it is what you might call up hill work to take them. But I have not only surprised every one else but myself as well, at the amount of walking I can do when it is not too hot, but when the thermometer gets up to 96° I am ready to stay in the shade.

We have two tents carpeted and with comfortable beds. A place under the trees with carpets spread where the hammocks are hung and our rocking chairs. That is our parlor, then a little distance away another old tent for shelter for the dining table, a good stove and every thing convenient for housekeeping. They were all John's mothers and are to go into a cottage up here when John gets ready to build it. In the meantime they are stored up here when we are not using them.

I saw by the papers that Katy has moved into the old house and that you are back in your own and also the Harriet is visiting you. It must be nice to be in your own house again, and a perfect delight to have your only daughter with you again. I only wish I could be there too for I know you would give me a corner, but I am afraid I shall never get there again. I have been in very good health but I get tired very easy and once in a while have a little touch of rheumatism to remind me I suppose that I can no longer call myself young, but I don't feel old. But when I think of the children's ages, and today especially for it is Lizzie's 41st birthday, I begin to realize that the years are fast creeping on and those to come, be they ever so many are very few. Lizzie has been in very poor health since the middle of April. She had got very much run down, worse than we any of us knew and one evening after helping to move Jack's crib and she had an attack of heart failure. But could not realize that she was (not) all right and went to the office the next day and the second one she had another one worse than the (first). She was alone in the office, but knew where there was some brandy. And after a little was able she thought, to go down and take a street car home, but by the time she had got to the foot of the stairs, found she could not, so managed to get into a store and send for a carriage. When she got home I helped her upstairs and went for the Dr. He said she had no pulse even then and he hasn't got over wondering yet how she ever got home. She was not down stairs for two weeks and couldn't go back to work till the first of June, and was not able to then, but will carried her through. But she writes now that she is feeling very well, but I doubt if she is ever as well as before and we shall always fear sudden excitement or exertion. I should not have left her, only a friend stayed with her.

John has been in Oregon and Nevada since last May but returned home Thursday and will be up here either tonight or tomorrow. And I suppose then our stay will be short here, for he has to be in the City most of the time and wants his family at home.

I got a letter from Will2 this morning. He is very well, but has been greatly discouraged at his inability to procure a better position, for while he has not been idle his position has not been pleasant and has only just paid expenses for the past year. Just now he is feeling more hopeful as he and a friend have gone into the retail fish business and while it may not sound very fascinating, they have every encouragement to think it will be profitable and that seems to be the main thing. I should so love another letter from Frona, but with all the cares she has, I do not expect it. But I do hope to hear from you, for while you too have many cares, you are younger and can more easily write. We had a letter from Aunt Rilla Pool just before I left home. She was well and wrote such a nice letter that one could hardly realize that she will soon be 87 years old.

2 Wilmar Weston Dewitt, Francelia's son and Cora's brother
Cora sends love to all. She intended writing to Agnes before going home, but has not had the chance. Give my love to each and everyone but, especially to John and Frona. They grow nearer and dearer to me every year.

As ever your loving sister,

Francy
Ezeakins Delphi
Sept. 20th 1886

Mrs. Ella Wilber\nat
Dear friend,
With heat the air is shimmering
On this sultry Sabbath day
And the autumn leaves are drifting
By the repiles blown away.

The bees and wasps are humming
On this lazy, lazy afternoon
While the quail for his "tobacco"
Is piping like a loon.

The flicker and the jaybird
Are squawking in the trees
While a saucy little squirrel
Is chattering to the breeze.
On this line and dusty hillside
On this rocky sloping hillside
Where the Poison Oak is growing
Where the Chapparrel is waving
And the live Oak tree's his branches
Beside the Varnished, brown MacBook.
If I wish to have a vineyard
Have a rich and juicy vineyard
From which to make the streak Burgundy
Make the Port, Sauvignon and Sherry
Pine, Dee, and Widow Clieon.
Stored in cellars aromatic
Deep into the hillside tunnelled
I will have to do some grubbing
Wield the pickaxe and the mattock.
At the first roots primeval,
Swing the great unwieldy mattock
While the dews of labor trickle
Down from off my classic forehead
That is what I now am doing
From the dewy morn till even.
But I find that manual labor
finds that blood-libian labor
Whatever may be said by poets
To praises sung by ancient writers
I'm sure Virgil says 'it censurers'
Still I find it not conclusive
To writing Rhyme vs. Blankverse.
But I hope to be in Oakland
In October very early.
While that month is young and tender
By the 5th or maybe sooner
Than I'll tell you all about it.

I hope that you and Mrs. are happy.
And the youthful heir is healthy

You can show this to Mrs.
I know he'll concur
When I say then to Burn it.
Burn it! Burn it!!!

Yours Truly
Carl
JUMBO
THE STORY OF A SHETLAND PONY
by
Evelyn Gilcrest

The haying crew found him in the barn one day after their noon hour. He had come in from the Pine Forest Range, and had found the grain bin in the barn, and had eaten until he had almost foundered. He was a Shetland pony in his summer coat of mouse gray with a dark brown streak running from his nose all the way through his gray mane down his back and through his long tail.

It was at the Big Creek Ranch, one of the Miller and Lux ranches in the Pine Forest Range in northwestern Nevada, where he first appeared. The haying crew decided from the condition he was in, and backtracking his route, that he must have traveled from Lovelock, Nevada, and wandered over the Seven Troughs Range to Jackson Mountain by way of Sulphur Pass, then drifted across the northern end of Black Rock Desert and followed the south side of the Pine Forest Range to the Big Creek Ranch. It was approximately 125 miles, and he had had little if any food. Years later it was learned the haying crew's idea of where he had come from was accurate, but that is getting ahead of the story.

Needless to say, he was a great curiosity at the ranch. The men soon found he had a mind of his own. He refused to be ridden bare-back, and since no regular saddle would fit him, it became their evening and Sunday sport to see how long each could stay on him before being bucked off. Since he was so little, they only fell a few feet, and only their pride was bruised.

My father, John Gilcrest, was general manager of all the Nevada and Oregon cattle ranches of the firm of Miller and Lux, and made regular
inspection trips to all the ranches. When he made his next trip to the
Big Creek Ranch after the pony appeared, he was amused and interested to
hear about him and see him in action. Since he had been unclaimed for
several months, he decided to have him "gentled" for his children's use.
This was done, and "Jumbo," as the men called him, learned to respond to
bridle and reins and to tolerate a saddle. About a year or so after he
appeared at the ranch, he was driven with a bunch of saddle horses to
Winnesuca, Nevada, and put aboard the blocked-off end of a freight car
which was part of a train taking cattle from the Miller and Lux ranches to
San Francisco.

Our home was in Oakland on Linda Vista Terrace at that time. Dad
wrote Mother when the pony would arrive, and my brother Jack went to the
stockyards and brought him across the bay on the creek route ferry up the
Oakland-Alameda Estuary to the foot of Broadway, then to a livery stable in
Oakland. This was in 1899, and on Christmas morning of that year, Dad led
him up the steps of our house and into the living room where the candle-
lighted Christmas tree stood. He was my sister Mary's present, and under
the tree was a brand new bicycle for Jack.

Never was there a more thrilled and happy little girl! Dad had a
handsome replica of a western style saddle made and bought a bridle with a
scissors bit. This special bit was necessary because the pony had what was
called a hard mouth, and would try to clamp down on the bit with his jaws,
and go his own sweet way. The scissors bit pinched his tongue enough to
make him amenable to direction.

Mary's first ride on him was taken with Dad accompanying her astride
Mother's driving horse Tom, who while astonished to be ridden, was delighted
to have Jumbo's company in the stable. Jumbo behaved well and gave every
indication of being a docile child's pet. Every day that Mother drove Tom downtown to the Oakland Free Market or Coakley's Butcher Shop, Mary followed behind on Jumbo, and there were many expeditions into the Piedmont hills. For the next couple of years, he was the neighborhood darling. A ride on him could be traded for almost anything a small girl could want, bicycle or coaster rides, the use of roller skates, or the loan of some other child's new doll.

Then came the incident which proved that the pony did take the long trek to the Big Creek Ranch. In the spring of 1901, Jack had ridden Jumbo downtown in Oakland. There was a traveling pony show or circus in town, and on the outskirts a man called to Jack and asked him where he got the pony, and claimed he belonged to him and had gotten away from the show in Lovelock, Nevada, several years before. Jack gave him Dad's name and address and the man later wrote to Dad and asked that the pony be returned. Dad replied that if he could prove ownership and would pay the pony's feed bill for the intervening years, he could have him. Nothing more was ever heard from him again.

Later that year, Dad moved all of us except Jack to the Leonard Creek Ranch in Nevada, Jack went into a boarding school at Alta, California, and the house was leased. Dad and a friend, Mr. Carpenter, owned a little ranch called Escalares, in the hills of Sonoma Valley, where the family used to spend their summer vacations. So Tom and Jumbo were put on the Estuary Creek boat to San Francisco, then on a stern wheeler boat to Petaluma. The next day they went over Sonoma Mountain and arrived at Escalares that evening. Here on the sunny pastures and later, when the ranch was sold, at John McCormick's ranch adjoining, Jumbo and old Tom and a little white Indian pony named Blanco, that Dad had used in his surveying work, lived the good life with nothing whatever to do.
After our stay at Leonard Creek, we moved to the Alvord Ranch in eastern Oregon. Jack went to the Mount Tamalpais Military Academy, joining us later in Oregon. The house remained leased and it was not until 1906 that we all moved back to Oakland. The home on Linda Vista Terrace was sold and in 1907, Dad bought a home and vineyard in the Livermore Valley planning for his early retirement from Miller and Lux. We moved there that year.

I was ready for the fourth grade in the Livermore schools, and since the vineyard was five miles from town, I needed transportation. There were no school buses in those days! Jack went to the McCormick ranch and rode Jumbo down the mountain, staying overnight at a cousin's home near St. Helena. Next day they continued to Napa where Jack watered the pony, put him aboard the stern wheeler, bought some hay for him, and a meal for himself. The boat left Napa at six in the evening, and arrived in San Francisco at 5 A.M. There they boarded the Creek Route Ferry again, and rode to Oakland, where Jumbo stayed in a livery stable for a day or two. Then the two of them started the trip to Livermore of some 50 or 60 miles, with an overnight stop at Dublin. Jumbo was a seasoned traveler by the time he reached his new home at Escondido Vineyard.

That fall, Jumbo and I started to the new school together. Since Shetland ponies were seldom seen in the valley, Jumbo was a great attraction. Both the grammar school and the high school had barns where our horses stayed during the long school days. Each morning I tied a small bag of hay behind my saddle. There were always plenty of town boys who wanted the privilege of feeding Jumbo, leading him to the watering trough at noon, and saddling him up at night. Although no one was supposed to ride the horses during the school day, it was inevitable that some boy would try to
Evelyn Gilcrest with Jumbo
Livermore, California
My Dear John,

Your very interesting letter of May 17th received and read and enjoyed and read over again-It seems that they have altered the plans some in that Calaveras dam to what they were when old T.R. Scowden planned it in 1874. Among other things it is to be 40 feet higher-and, as I remember, that line of the contour of the then proposed surface of the water that we ran around the side of the valley, the day Thomson of the "Swedish movement" failed with the transit and G.F. Allardt put me in charge. I should, I think, that a 40 foot raise would about run it over that gap in the hills on the Milpitas side-but 421/2 years is quite a spell, and maybe I don't remember just how high that gap was above our contour line-Gosh, I would like to see that country again and see just about how much I do remember. I am glad to know that Fink pulled through his operation all right and hope he is as good as new now. Is he doing any engineering work now- Please remember me to him when you see him. Well it is pretty tough to have to turn a fine vineyard into a hog ranch-but with bacon at 35 cents a pound and wool 60 cents- hogs are Princes of royal blood and sheep are Kings. We used to call the old "Escalares" "Upper hog thief" Will you have to change "Escondido" into "Abajo las Coches de la Ladrones"?

Well yes, we sure have had a bad war on our hands-and the slogan that reflected Wilson does not apply any more now. -War is a horrible thing, but now we are in it, I hope we will do ourselves honor-and all will get behind the government to the best of their ability. - I regret that age and infirmity will keep me from doing my bit in the field. - Our little precinct has responded to the call very well in the purchase of Liberty Bonds- and has taken over $20,000 worth- Our circumstances have changed some since I wrote you last- About the first of May we succeeded in making a sale of the farm for $10,000. About $4,000 down and $6,000 left on the place on first mortgage for three years. We sold the stock and some of the furniture to the man who bought the place and moved into a rented house in the village of Meridian. We still retain our interest in the First National Bank here- I got somewhat run down and am trying to rest up and recuperate this summer, that is if we have any. The season is still very cold and backward. Gardens have been killed down by late frosts -but fruit has not thus far been injured and there is prospect of a large crop of all kinds- we have not as yet made up our minds what we will do. All Nellie's own family live in Boise. While this war is on we may feel that it is best to sit tight where we are-

I send you a picture of our boy, John, taken about the first of April, last-

We were most certainly born for hard work but had we been more successful in our investments and been permitted to make money in our speculations we would in all probably have died off with the gout or liver complaint or some other ill, attendant on good living and lack of the strenuous exercise that we have been compelled to take, to chase the wolf from the door.
From an Obituary in the Burns Times Herald, Burns, Oregon (Harney County) dated Friday, February 14, 1930 we learn a little more about John Gilcrest:

The death of John Gilcrest on January 31 at his home in Berkeley, California, marked the passing of one of the salwari characters that had much to do with the early history of this county. He was for thirty years in full charge of the vast Miller and Lux cattle interests in Eastern Oregon and Nevada, where he built up comprehensive and strategic land holdings that gave his company advantages in carrying on the extensive and successful business in which the firm was engaged. Mr. Gilcrest was a civil engineer. Upon assuming the superintendency of the company his first step was to secure advantageous watering places that controlled the range: also natural meadow lands where irrigation water was available. These land holdings extended from Grant county on south through Harney and into Nevada, making it possible for stock drives to market to reach a company holding each night from the extreme northern section of its activities to practically the San Francisco market, as the Miller and Lux corporation had vast land holdings in California as well.

During those thirty years John Gilcrest made his personality felt in this region. He was a man of forceful character, a clear, active mind; he had judgement and foresight, working his plans out as he progressed in his systematic way and when he once made a decision he was sure he was right.

His dealings with men were straightforward and fair. He made warm friends among his acquaintances because of his stableness; his consistent analytical mind brought quick decisions upon subjects and thus it was always said that John Gilcrest's word was final when once expressed and could be depended upon.

A broken hip from an accident in Silvies valley in 1914 was the immediate cause of his resigning his position with the Miller and Lux corporation and started his decline of health. For months he was confined to his bed at the Holland home in Burns, where he constantly worried because of his infirmities, which coupled with his inability to follow his former active life, effected his further decline.

In 1889 he was married to Miss Cora Dewitt-Weston, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Elon Dewitt-Weston, of Oakland. After retiring from the employ of Miller and Lux in 1915 Mr. Gilcrest resided in Livermore Valley from then until 1922 when he moved to Berkeley, since which he had been in failing health."
Further notes by Mary Ann Gilcrest:

The Oakland City Directory lists his residence from 1865 to 1889 as 304 Second Street (same as 2nd and Harrison), then 504 15th St. and in 1892 his residence is listed at 726 11th St. which is the same residence as Francelia Shaw Dewitt-Weston. At that time it is believed that Francelia Dewitt-Weston was separated from her husband, Elon, and was running a boarding house at the 11th St. location. In 1897 his residence became 748 Oakland Ave. (The Linda Vista home in Piedmont). From 1870 to 1892 he was a surveyor throughout the State of California and in 1892 he became associated with Henry Miller and the Miller & Lux holdings. In the mid 1890's he owned land in Sonoma County in the hills above Windsor jointly with H.B. Carpenter. They probably intended to develop it as a vineyard. The family spent their summers camping on the property. He probably became acquainted with Henry Miller while surveying in the Central Valley of California. From 1902 to 1906 he moved the family to the Alvord ranch in Harney County, Oregon. In 1905 they acquired the vineyard in Livermore valley "Escondido" where he intended to retire. In 1907 he returned to the Alvord ranch after relocating the family in Livermore. The Filbert St. address was probably a residence purchased upon the families return from Alvord, prior to obtaining the Livermore property.

Further notes:
1. "Alvord Ranch Interlude" by Evelyn Gilcrest Oregon Historical Quarterly December, 1962
2. Letters of John Gilcrest to his family 1907 to 1910
3. Letters of H.B. Carpenter and Francelia Dewitt-Weston
Appendix C- Correspondence
To: Native American Heritage Commission  Date: 25 September 2013
Fax No.: 916.373.5471  Total Number of Pages: 2
Phone No.: 916.373.3710 (including cover page)

From: Lacey Klopp  Re: Cultural Resources Management
Plan for the Stern Ranch Property within Sugarloaf Ridge State Park
Fax No.: (707) 664-4155
Phone No.: (707) 509-9145
E-mail: kalberl@sonoma.edu

COMMENTS

Please review the sacred lands files for any Native American cultural resources that may
be within or adjacent to the project area depicted on the accompanying map. The project
area, in Sonoma County, lies within Sugarloaf Ridge State Park at Township 7 North,
Range 6 West, sections 15 and 16, as depicted on the Kenwood, Calif. 7.5’ topographic
map. The study is being prepared as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts in Cultural Resources Management at Sonoma State University. I
would also like to request a list of Native American individuals/organizations who may
have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Please call if you have any
questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

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

Please call as soon as possible if there are any transmission problems: (707)664-2381
October 10, 2013

Lacey Klopp
ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES CENTER
1801 Cotati Ave., Bldg. 29
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

By Fax: 707-664-4155

Number of Pages: 3

Re: Stern Ranch project, Sonoma County

Dear Ms. Klopp;

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

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

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3713.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Debbie Pilas-Treadway
Environmental Specialist III
Native American Contacts
Sonoma County
October 10, 2013

Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians
Patricia Hermosillo, Chairperson
55 South Cloverdale Blvd., Suite A
Cloverdale, CA 95425
(707) 894-5775
(707) 894-5727

Stewarts Point Rancheria
Emilio Valencia, Chairperson
1420 Guerneville Road, Ste 1
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Emilio@stewartspoint.com
(707) 591-0580 - voice
(707) 591-0583 - Fax

Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians
Mario Hermosillo Jr., Tribal Environmental Planner
55 South Cloverdale Blvd., Suite A
Cloverdale, CA 95425
mhermosillo@cloverdalerrancheria.com
(707) 894-5775
(707) 894-5727

Stewarts Point Rancheria
Nina Hapner, Environmental Planning Department
1420 Guerneville Road, Ste 1
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
nina@stewartspoint.org
(707) 591-0580 ext107
(707) 591-0583 FAX

Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians
Harvey Hopkins, Chairperson
P.O. Box 607
Seyserville, CA 95441
(707) 522-4290

Stewarts Point Rancheria THPO
Otis Parish, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
1420 Guerneville Road, Ste 1
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Otis@stewartspoint.org
(707) 591-0580 EXT 105
(707) 591-0583 FAX

Ytton Rancheria of California
Marjorie Mejia, Chairperson
37 Aviation Blvd
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
nargiemejia@aol.com
(707) 575-5917
(707) 575-6974 - Fax

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Gene Buvelot
6400 Redwood Drive, Ste 300
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
coastmiwok@aol.com
415 279-4844 - Cell
707-566-2288 ext 103

Ytton Rancheria of California
Lisa Miller, Tribal Administrator
37 Aviation Blvd
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
yttonband@aol.com
(707) 575-5917
(707) 575-6974 FAX

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Greg Sarris, Chairperson
6400 Redwood Drive, Ste 300
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
coastmiwok@aol.com
707-566-2288
707-566-2291 - fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5057.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5057.99 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed term Ranch project, Sonoma County.
Native American Contacts
Sonoma County
October 10, 2013

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Rank Ross
O Box 854
Jovato, CA 94948
niwokone@yahoo.com
415) 269-6075

‘a-Ka-Ama
465 Steve Olson Lane
Forestville, CA 95436
belleau@yakaama.org,
707) 887-1541

Coast Miwok
Southern Pomo

Pomo
Coast Miwok
Wappo

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Graton Ranch project, Sonoma County.
Sample of the initial correspondence to those people listed in the NAHC response letter

Hello,

My name is Lacey Klopp and I am a cultural resources management student at Sonoma State University. I wanted to get in touch with you because for my thesis I will be doing a cultural resources management plan for a portion of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. Senior State Archaeologist E. Breck Parkman mentioned that you may be interested in being involved with the project. The property is a newly acquired 500-acre ranch that has never been surveyed within the middle of the park. More specifically it is on the 1954 USGS Kenwood 7.5-minute quadrangle, T7N/R6W sections 15 and 16. A part of my thesis will include a survey of portions of the property and recommendations for the management of cultural resources. I want to know if you would like to be involved in any part of the project? I do not have definite dates for fieldwork yet but I will let you know as soon as I do. I would really appreciate your involvement. Please let me know if you are interested in being involved.

Thank you,

Lacey Klopp
Appendix D- DPR Forms
Appendix D- DPR Forms

These forms have been omitted due to sensitive archaeological information.
Available from the Anthropological Studies Center or the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University
Rohnert Park, California.
Appendix E- Oral History Document (Gresham 1983)

*This document was given to the author by Sugarloaf Ridge State Park management*
This is Linda Gresham, Unit Ranger of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. With me today to assist in this interview is Larry Moats, DPR Maintenance Worker and student of history. The date today is August 27, 1983. I am sitting at Bear Creek with members of the Hurd family. Their parents homesteaded this property between 1914 and 1930. This interview is structured as an open-ended conversation about what the Hurd's remember from when they lived here. I would like to begin by asking Hazel Harding to introduce herself and the rest of the family members present. Then I would like her to give us a brief background about both her father and mother and how they came to settle here at Bear Creek.

"I'm Hazel Hurd Harding, and my folks' names were Ray Hurd and Bertha Hurd. We lived in St. Helena and heard of this land that was up for homesteading. We went to San Francisco and filed on it and came here as near as I can remember, in 1914. We lived here until I went away to school and high school which was - and then we were back again on this homestead until about 1928 and still we sold it - the folks sold it in about 1930, as near as I can remember."

Linda: Do you remember who they sold it to?

Hazel: They sold it to Joe Vasconi1 of St. Helena. He used it as a hunting club. When he sold it, I don't know.

Linda: O.K. Now, introduce your brothers.

Hazel: My brother, Francis Hurd, is here and my brother Alvin and Francis' son, Ken and his two boys, Moe and Kyle, and Alvin's wife, Nora.

My folks lived in St. Helena and we came up through John McCormick's property and drove up as far as the camp which they called the Buck Camp. From there we left the horse and the wagon and the horse carried, and we each carried - there was 7 of us children, to - our load over here and my dad carried shakers to build our first cabin which was 12' x 12.' Just these regular shakes - bundles of them and he put some on the horse. Everything we had came in by packing it or dragging it behind the horse on a drag.

Linda: You didn't have a wagon?

Hazel: Not after we left McCormick's. We did not have a wagon - no road. There was just a trail in here. There was no anything in here. Everything came in that way. Either was packed in or on the horse or on our own backs in here. Everything came in that way, either it was packed in, on the horse or on our own backs and us children went to school in St. Helena. We would stay up here over the weekend with Mama and then go down Monday morning and stay with Dad - he painted in St. Helena and came back on Friday. We did that for 2 years and then my father built a little schoolhouse, hired a school teacher. She lived with us as one of the family and we went to that little schoolhouse every day 9:00 to 3:00 - the same as you would anywheres else. Until we were old enough for high school.

Linda: Now this school is the one you were talking about that is built right right up here along...right up Bear Creek?
Hazel: Yes, and that's where we went to school.

Linda: And how many of you were there then, how many kids?

Francis: Seven, 'cause I'm number 8.

Hazel: Well, I mean that's how many children were in the school. We had our family, which was Fern, myself and Jim and Grace. Pearl did not go to school until later; wasn't old enough. And we had a neighbor girl, Edith Cookson and 2 of my cousins went to this little school, Margaret and Morris. But the last year we were here to this little school, there was only about 4 of us went to that school.

Francis: That's the picture I have here.

Hazel: The folks moved off the homestead when I went to high school when I was 14. They went - and they didn't come back until, how many years - how old was you when they came back?

Francis: Oh, between 4 and 5.

Larry: Where did they move to then, Hazel?

Hazel: We moved to St. Helena - we moved back to St. Helena.

Linda: And they left this barren...?

Hazel: My brother stayed here. My brother was in an accident working at Mare Island during the war. In 1917 he lost his leg and lived here a good part of that time.

Linda: In about what year was that?

Hazel: 1917 until about 1920 - Oh, they lived here, he kept the homestead - we kept the homestead, we didn't sell it until they moved down, after Francis was 7.

Linda: Then actually your folks only lived up here for about 3 years, between 1914 and 1917.

Hazel: No, they came back and lived here, and he (Francis) was born here.

Francis: During that time, something that Hazel hasn't told you - Hazel and a couple of my little sisters went on to school - my older brothers never went to high school. And then Hazel was being - during the last time when we lived up here - Hazel was being courted by Al Harding who operated the Reynolds Ranch right above where your Sugarloaf Park is, over -

Linda: That's when Reynolds owned that property?

Francis: I don't know whether Reynolds owned it or not, but Al was working it for somebody, but it was the Reynolds ranch.
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Hazel: Well, we rented it.

Francis: I can remember him coming over here and he...one day he was letting me play dentist with him...I remember that - and I got a hold of his whole tooth with the pliers and scratched it.

Hazel: When you were down on the Pierce Ranch, wasn't it?

Francis: No, that was sitting on a bench right up there.

Larry: When you came around that trail that comes into that other homestead?

Francis: Right.

Linda: So, when you came up here you built the barn or your folks?

Hazel: Well, they didn't have the barn right away, I mean this cabin was built first and they built that second cabin that you saw the pictures of.

Larry: Now was that on this side, Hazel - the first and the second cabin was that right here?

Hazel: The first cabin was built over further that way and the second one was right up here and the house was right up here.

Linda: Now the cement and all the structures -

Hazel: That was put in later so they could drive in here.

Linda: So the person who came in after you probably just added on to it. Put in plumbing and that kind of thing.

Hazel: Made quite a clubhouse out of it, I think.

Linda: And you got water from a well?

Hazel: From that spring around the hill there, piped around here, that runs down now into Bear Creek. You go down the road here away and the spring goes down to the creek, well that spring is up on the hill. It was piped around to here.

Francis: There's a cistern still left up there on the hill.

Linda: Yeah, we've seen that.

Francis: My mother was one of 7 sisters and one of her sisters, Myrtle Cookson had their homestead over the mountain and down in the canyon towards White Silver Spring over here. Another of my mother's sisters lived on what is the Verotsa Ranch now, and if you went from here to there, you would go up this trail through here and up this canyon and around this north side of Bald Mountain and over to Silver Oaks. They sold that to the Verotsa's, her name was Harrison and it was the Cookson
FRANCIS: that was related to my mother who lived over here, the ranch where we were just at over here was his brother. They actually weren't related to us. If you got everybody together that was in this little community up here and then there would be quite a few people, maybe 35 if you counted everybody that was involved.

LINDA: And how many acres did you own?

Hazel: 160.

LINDA: And it was on this side of Bear Creek? All of it?

Hazel: Well it run to that fence. 4

LINDA: The fence is there now.

Hazel: That was the line over there. While we were here my mother and us children were here alone since Dad had to go away to work. My sister Grace, whom she was about 7, got appendicitis and my mother took her horseback, walked from here to St. Helena, which was 7 miles to the doctor with her. And it was quite a trip. She led the horse and took her all the way to town and her appendix didn't rupture, but then she got pneumonia and had a bad time. But if anything happened, my brother when he lost his leg here, didn't lose it here - he lost it coming home from Mare Island to Napa, my mother was here and that's the way she went - walked all the way to St. Helena and took a street car to get to Napa to him.

LINDA: You never had much dealings with Kenwood?

Hazel: We finally got a road into Kenwood, yes, and when that second house was built, the last house we had here, they hauled lumber up this way from Kenwood on a wagon.

FRANCIS: We had a bridge across - I remember the bridge, it went across the creek (Bear Creek) right down here, by foot about a quarter of a mile. We were close to it a while ago. And you just take this old road here and follow clear around and it takes you right down to Bear Creek and you cross Bear Creek on that bridge. Then the Hurd Road, my father agreed with a fellow by the name of Fitzsimmons, he was a neighbor on that side, to clear twice as much opening as he used for a road going through an opening over there and that's how he gained a right of way to go into Kenwood that way. And the road comes into the creek a little ways below your park entrance there. Something that Larry didn't know, there was probably one of the first ones in California, but surely the first one around in this country - nudist camp - took over the Fitzsimmons Ranch. And when I was a little boy, it was all talk and let me tell you, people's morals in those days are a lot different than they are now - people running around without clothes - my goodness. We were looking for Sodom and Gomorrah to come down any minute. But anyhow, that was over here - and there was an old cabin over there. Hazel may correct me, I think I remember from the stories. We had some neighbors by the name of Johnson's and there was, I know, 2 kids in that family
Francis: and I think they lived on the Fitzsimmons Ranch. But anyhow, Mr. Johnson decided he had enough of this life and he took a stick of dynamite and went out either on one of them rock outcroppings or stump and lit the fuse and sat down on it. And anyhow, Harry is about the age of my brother that had the puppies under his arm (picture). From that time on, he lived with the Hurd family off and on, clear around until World War II. He lived with my brothers and cut wood in this cabin that's over on the other side of the hill. It isn't there anymore. Didn't Herb and what was his sister's name, Annie - didn't they - my father's... 

Hazel: Margie went back to Honolulu.

Francis: Come up here?

Hazel: Well, she may have visited up here and she did twice, she came back once when...

Francis: Herb never lived up here and went to school:

Hazel: Herb did, he lived with his father over on McGarrett's place and came over. Yeah, he went to school a little bit here with us. Him and his father lived with us off and on at different times.

Francis: Did the Cookson's ever come over here to school? Sam and Leonard?

Hazel: No, they went the other way.

Linda: Can you remember about what year these 'houses were built? What year that one was built, and what year that one was built, and when the barn came in?

Hazel: I wouldn't - I really don't know what years they were built.

Francis: You could figure out - the first one was built over here in 1914, because you had so much time, you had to prove up and live on this land for 3 years before it became yours, you see. So that one had to be built and proved up on so that one was... and incidentally, there are a picture or two around of that. Lumber was so scarce packing it in here, that some of the corner posts were oak trees cut off at the right height, the sprouts growing up around the roof of the first old cabin and it had a dirt floor. But I wouldn't know about the one Hazel has a picture of, because that was in between. But the last one was built a little while before you left to go down the hill.

Larry: So what did you do, did your dad pay a filing fee for the homestead and then make improvements within 3 years, or how did that work?

Hazel: It was a conventional thing, but I can't tell you that because I never had the opportunity to homestead, I would really like to pioneer a place and build a log house and all that. I had dreams of doing that for a long time, and maybe the Lord willing and the creek don't dry, I'll do it one of these days.
Linda: Now the barn was built...

Hazel: Oh, the barn was built probably around the time that the first house over here where we are standing in front of it.

Francis: It was before this other house and that much I know because Dad told me that.

Linda: It was probably anywhere between 1916 and 1920.

Francis: O.K. it looks pretty new to me in this picture and I was born in 1921.

Linda: You were born in 1921, so it was probably around 1920 that that barn was built.

Francis: That's what I think.

Hazel: Yeah, you was a baby standing with the turkeys...

Linda: And so by that time you were able to bring the lumber for the barn up through Kenwood. Did you do more business with Kenwood rather than St. Helena?

Francis: What was the name of the store, Hazel, right across the road and down about a block that we used to - Cunningham's was over in Sebastopol, folks dealt with them, I know.

Linda: And you say your father went away to work, what did he do?

Hazel: He was a house painter.

Linda: So he travelled a lot?

Hazel: Well, he worked in St. Helena, and I have an uncle that lived in Lodi that was a painter and he used to go to Lodi and paint with his brother.

Linda: All the way to Lodi!

Hazel: Yes, he would be gone for weeks.

Francis: The shakes and that sort of thing on the barn then looked fairly new.

I got a couple of tintypes, one of my father when he was about 3 or 4 years old and one of my mother and the next oldest sister. Tin pictures. The one of my father I know is about 103 years old, according to Dad. Dad was born in '78. Looks like he was about 3 years old, somewhere's about 3 years old. And we have the reunions and sometimes our family gets as many as 200 to these reunions. They're direct descendants of my mother and her sisters. The last time that we had - well 2 years ago, when we had a big turnout, this year was bad weather. But somebody took the time to figure out the living and it was 682 from those 7 women.
Linda: That's amazing.

Francis: And so we have a big family. We have lots of fun. We have one of those things every year. We have tug of wars, the loggers against the truck drivers and pulling on a big rope and have a baseball game going, play three or four every day. He has the biggest time of his whole life, when he is over there, nothing but fun for three or four days. Redwood Creek has a nice big creek, it is a neat place to go.

Hazel: Ned Wilson had a store in Kenwood, a grocery store. Well, he had brought all kinds of things in those stores at that time, you know, in a little town like this. In fact, it was the only store you could buy groceries. But he was one that if you didn't have the money, you got your groceries anyway, and when you got the money you paid your bill, you know that kind of thing. And that's where we traded when we went to Kenwood.

Linda: What did you raise up here? As far as crops and livestock?

Hazel: We had some stock, but not a lot of stock. This place wouldn't carry that much and we always had a horse or 2 or 3 and momma raised turkeys and we always had chickens and the cows you know, for milk and butter.

Linda: Just enough for your family?

Hazel: We never had much to sell off this place.

Francis: Sold the turkeys. I could remember loading up great big wood boxfuls of those turkeys.

Linda: Where did you sell the turkeys?

Francis: We'd take them down to Kenwood, I don't know who Dad sold them to, but we dressed them there in the barn.

Hazel: That's how I met my husband when we got married. My brother haxed him if he would take the turkeys to the City and he sold them in San Francisco that year and on the way back he stopped at my sister's where I was staying and working at Napa at the General Hospital and that was Thanksgiving and we were married on Christmas.

Linda: You were together ever since?

Hazel: Yes, over 55 years.

Linda: That's great.

Francis: About the same length of time as Dad and Mom, huh? Had you thought about that?

Hazel: No, not really.
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Linda: Did you have big gardens?

Hazel: Yes, all the vegetables and those kind of things. Momma always had a big vegetable garden.

Larry: You never had much of an orchard up here?

Hazel: No. They had those little trees, but they never produced very good. One apricot tree is still up there.

Francis: Some humor - if you want a little humor, at my expense! You know how kids are. I was probably the world's worst about leaving stuff laying around. When you see these pictures of the old man stepping in his nightgown, his feet going out from under him, that would have fit into my situation. Anyhow, I had a wagon and there's a wagon and there's a picture of me and the dog with it here. And the trail and the yard path and the house went right down through here and out a gate right there, and my mother never liked to see the kids my age. She didn't think they should stand around and watch chickens get their heads chopped off and things of that sort. We were expecting company over the weekend and so Dad was going to kill a red rooster down at the barn. She said, "Now you can go down there and help Dad pick the rooster and I'll let you know when." It was just getting dark and so she told me I could go. I went out the back or front door of the house, whichever one you want to call; front door come out this way and out the side door and down here, just as fast as I could go, and I had left that wagon right across the path. I went right over it, and I still have the habit - that if I am really concentrating on something, so does her son - it must run in the family. Well, I evidently had my tongue between my teeth and running just as fast as I could run, went over that, fell on my chin and I had my teeth in, and the only thing I had left holding my tongue was the two outside edges. Just bit right through it. And i love chicken and dumplings, and I was worried sick I wasn't going to get any of those chicken and dumplings that day, or two days later, whenever it was, I remember that. Anyhow, any blood that flowed freely, my mother had one cure for that to to stop it, and it was sugar balls! Just load it up with sugar and it coagulates the blood. And so she took a look and saw what my tongue was doing and she says, "don't talk, don't laugh, don't move your tongue. Just let it lay between your teeth and open up your mouth!" And she took the old sugar spoon and ladled it full of sugar and it stopped bleeding pretty quick, and believe it or not, I at least got dumplings and gravy!

Linda: You didn't do down and get it stitched then, did you? You just left it like that?

Francis: No, like Hazel was saying, it was 7 miles to town and no wheels, maybe once in a while a horse to ride. Same things Alvin stepped on a great big bottle one time, jagged bottom of a bottle about that big when he was a kid - shoved right into the front of his heel and every time his heart beat, it was "shh-shh," just like that. This was after we moved away from here and down next to the Veteran's Home, and
HURD FAMILY ORAL HISTORY

Francis: here he come, you know we always had some of my nieces and nephews around, here comes a stream of kids with Alvin in the front, knew he was going to die, heading for the house and every step he took, he left a shot of that blood. And my mother saw him coming, and she didn't even wait, she headed for the sugar bowl and she met him about ways up them long front stairs on that two-story house in Yountville, and said, "pick his foot up in the air," and just like shoeing a horse, "put your foot up in the air," and she poured full of sugar. Couple of minutes it stopped. It will stop bleeding - sugar, I can attest to that, it will stop it bleeding. But it was things like that. She was talking about Grace. A rattlesnake bit Grace on the leg right down over here, my mother doctored that, and that was it.

Linda: So what kind of social events did you go to, if any?

Hazel: There wasn't any place to go. Well, our cousins and the families used to get together like that. Thanksgiving and Easters we always had big picnics. They would haul the ice up from Kenwood for ice cream, I can remember that.

Linda: But basically the town...there wasn't anything like that?

Hazel: As far as going to church, there was no church, of course here. At the schoolhouse, we would meet up there with the neighbors around - the ones that were here - and have a little church service. Had an organ that you pumped, you know, with your feet. My mother played the organ, she sang well and my aunt did, too - my Aunt Millie. We used to have Sunday School and church up at the schoolhouse. Do you remember that?

Francis: That wasn't that many here when I was here.

Linda: When you moved from here now, you moved down where the Reynolds place was?

Hazel: No, the folks moved to St. Helena, back to St. Helena. I worked in Lodi and I wasn't home too much after that.

Francis: See these girls, the older sisters by then were grown up and the valley boys came up and found the Hurd sisters and carried them off!

This is whe I was giving you that little rundown on the 2-family business to start with. You're talking about 2 different episodes on this mountain. Hazel and the folks moved off and when they moved back when I was a little boy like you see here. These are the kids that were here then. When I was here I had my sister and myself and Alvin was born here. And my oldest sister had one little girl. She's not in this one (picture) but they came up here and stayed one winter. Her and her husband, and their name is Williams. So that other little girl about the same size an these was here, but I run the woods wild. I mean, like I told you, when they started talking about moving to town and going to school, forget that. And I made up my mind I wasn't going, and I didn't. Those first two years the teacher
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Francis: told my mother that I was retarded. And then Miss Terrell come by, mother brought her down for an evaluation. "What's the matter with this kid, he can't learn anything, you know, he was half grown by then." Well, I was 14, I was as tall as I am now. I wasn't going to leave here. I left with Dad.

Linda: And you married the gentleman that lived down on - Reynolds Ranch.

Hazel: He wasn't on the Reynolds Ranch at that time, he had run the Garrett place for years. He came from New Jersey when he was 17, and he worked in New York for a year to earn the money to come West. That's all he heard is, "Young Man, Go West," you know. And so he had lost his mother when he was just a little thing, so he came west and he landed in San Francisco. He looked in the paper for a job and he was alone, that far from home, and he found an ad that Doc Johnson was running the Garrett place at the time.

Linda: Where was the Garrett place?

Hazel: It's the one between, over here where that tank house is. It joins the park there.

He went on the ranch and he just loved it and that's where he stayed until he was 25 not always on the ranch.

Yeah, and then after we were married then we went over on the Reynolds Ranch. We weren't up there long.

Francis: And then from there you went to that place up by Healdsburg. We drove the cattle to Healdsburg from here, up the back road, you know. Took 'em two days for the cattle to walk that far.

Linda: Reynolds was here at that time? Mr. Reynolds. The white house?

Hazel: Mr. Gaines lived in that. No, he lived over the mountain up where we were. We walked up there this morning, but ther's just some apple trees up ther and I could see where the cabin was that we lived in and where we cut the hay in that picture.

Elderberries.

Linda: But there is no foundation left.

Hazel: No, there is nothing there. Those old housed or cabins that were built that lone ago only was built on anything you could find handy. You know, I mean, my dad cut posts just out of oak trees and split them out - poles and stuff like that, right from whatever he could find and used.

Linda: So this was prior tp the time that Reynolds sold the property to the State.
Hazel: No. The State already owned that property. He owned further - the other side of where the park is. Up over the hill where Mr. Reynolds lived at that time.

Francis: Another name that I remember from up here but from over that way is Langtry. Langtry's were pretty close up to the McCormick Ranch coming on the other side. Spring Mountain Road.

Linda: So what were the winters like. How did you survive through the winters?

Hazel: Well, there was always plenty of wood to keep us warm. Momma had a big wood range she cooked on and warmed the house.

Francis: When I was little, what was grown here was - my mother had a small turnip and beet and radish kind of garden. Right beyond the concrete there, towards that little swale. And what we do is - it was easy to get the pressure out of the tank to water the garden there. Then right up along that area there, right up along there, she raised her corn and she raised a lot of corn and popcorn and you was talking about what we could do for recreation. Well, we popped corn and we used to like to do is, you got a big pot of butter on your plate and you would take a case knife and you would slather that butter and stick 'em on the knife, and you stick that in the corn and about a half dozen of kernels stick to the butter and that way you would get a little butter in every bite, see. We did things like that, bet Alvin remembers that, doing that.

And I remember hoeing corn there, back and forth there and Dad on weekends, when he would come home, he would help Mother get that thing, but she raised a lot of stuff. At Redwood Creek. When she died in 1956, July, she was 73 when she died, there's still, and we just leave it there, she had a fruit cellar that Dad had dug. They pioneered the place up there and Dad had dug it back into the side of a hill, so it was cool and of course he had a lot easier stuff to work with, like redwood trees around there, for shades and things of that sort. And built a little fruit cellar in the side of this hill. Some of my mother's stuff is there, but she canned lots of stuff. 400 quarts of stuff, no big thing. Mom uses to put cheese cloth...

The wife I have now, she cans a couple hundred quarts of stuff every year.

Linda: That's basically what you did here.

Francis: Oh, yeah.

Hazel: Yes, dried sweet corn and then she would dry apples. She canned a lot of things.

Francis: You build a - you build a - he has his right in his garage - and you pack it full of sawdust - you got a wall about this thick and he's got drawers in there, and it don't make any difference; winter,
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Francis: summer or spring, and if you want a carrot or rutabaga or anything - they keep. You just go in there and pull a drawer out and there they are. They put 'em away, see - vegetables and things like that. Well my mother came from Minnesota, back there they had ice houses for summer, you went out on a lake and sawed ice, put them in there and you had ice place for all summer. So she knew how to keep the food that she raised, she kept. We raised potatoes.

Hazel: The corn drying on the house, she put cheese cloth, to keep the flies and stuff off. She used to dry apples.

Francis: The thing that has happened to Americans now is that the store is a half a block down the street and you got - it takes $1.50 to buy a loaf of bread. Back then you worked for a week for $1.50 and it bought enough food to last you for a week. Everything is flip flop. And so when you talk about what you did in a place like this to live, well you make do. The lady of the house worked like a slave, ten hours a day, did the washing with a wash board and I was the first kid that my mother had a washing machine and that was after she moved out of here. The first one, all the rest was done on the wash board. But she worked ten hours a day and all that. Now Kenny's mother is a career woman and she gets up early in the morning at 7:00 which is not quite as early as my mother, but she get up early in the morning. She does some of her work at home and she's fast, she flies into things like mad, goes to work for the State, for 9 hours a day, she's gone 9 hours a day, comes home at night, does her washing, mops the house, keeps a clean house and everything like that there, when it's all said and done, everybody still works 10 hours a day and gets about the same amount done.

Well, I doubt that many women would agree to that today, but I mean basically that's what happened.

Linda: So the winter's weren't that bad?

Francis: They were better up here. I can remember probably 100 days out of the year you can look off into Sonoma Valley and it looks like a big white ocean of fog. Day after day you could get out and walk up here and look down in there and that's what it looked like. Big white tops.

Linda: So it is pretty much open range back then. But I mean like the deer and the rabbits...you were allowed to shoot or were there seasons then?

Francis: The first day of deer season we always saw from 10 to 20 hunters here and my mother love every minute of it. She told me one time after we were gone from here, she said, "one time a deer hunter left a tip under the plate!"

Larry: Did she used to feed them?
Francis: Oh, yeah, she'd feed them...loved it. We had a big table across that end of the kitchen dining room part of our house. It went from wall to wall and it was a row of windows with four or six panels and on to that wall was built a bench. And the kids that were big enough to hack it on their own - that's where you sat - back there, back of that table. I'm not sure, I don't know if the table was fastened to the wall too or not, but it might have been with that many kids. Did it move, Hazel?

Hazel: The table moved, yeah.

Francis: On the other side was Mother and Dad, so they could watch you and one kid. Now this is the kind of way it was when I came over and I think my mother said it was that way. Most all the kids sat on Dad's knee until the next one come along and bumped you. He had his plate over to the left side and then - of him - and he ate and let you sit right there, he always turned his leg out to the side for a high chair for you and that's where you sat. I can remember sitting there. Did you sit on Dad's knee, Hazel?

Hazel: Oh yeah, we all did 'til the next one, but I wasn't very old 'til the next one came along.

Francis: The one that moved off the hardest was Pearl, that's the one just older than me. She had that spot until she was 7.

Linda: Did you remember finding a lot of Natiye American artifacts?

Francis: There used to be lots of arrowheads, yeah. In case you ever decide you want to look for some, I', sure youy can still find, they could'nt all been found. We found a lot of them, I'll tell you where to go to look for them. You go right above where this cabining was built, let me see if I can tell you how to find that spot. Get on this road, I go on up over the hill and it goes down to a steep shoot on the other side of where you can see here, and you get down in the bottom, it winds around some bare hills like this and like this, and it's about before inside turn around you should see, what you look for is a road turning up the hill. Now was mostly turned off of - headed this way, so it should kind of turn up the hill. If you follow that up a couple of blocks you come to where this cabin set and there's a spring, the door come in the other end, there's a spring right over in here and this is Indian ground, there was Indian camp there, there's a lot of shale there. My sister-in-law that lived here probably had half a coffee can full of perfect arrowheads when they moved off there. There was lots of them and that shale runs from there clear up the back side of this ridge over here that has the fir timber on it, up through there.

Francis: Do you remember the woodcutting cabin?

Alvin: Yeah, but I only went up there a couple times, only once that I re-member that we went up there.
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Francis: That's where we went deer hunting after the lodge come in here and they didn't allow you to come over here and hunt, but we did anyhow.

McCormick Ranch run pretty much straight off like that, clear down into the valley on that side they called that the lower end of Mac's. They had a lot of cattle and a lot of sheep on that thing. Three, four, five men to run it, to round up, keep up the fences and stuff.

Larry: Not you had sheep here too, right?

Francis: Yeah, Raymond raised sheep here and he raised some big Durham cattle here. This is the years that the folks were gone, but my older brother lost that leg and we has awful self-conscious of that.

Larry: So he just stayed here?

Francis: He hibernated up here and when he had some sheep and then he got into the cattle business. He raised some big Durham steers up here that weighed 1500 lbs. when he sold them. Big! I was telling Alvin and Morrie, the last trip I remember making up that hill, I hung onto the tail of the biggest horse here, Raymond was riding on this big one in the middle, Dick held onto his tail from the creek up, I guess I was 6, 7 years old. And I got with my older brother and some other cowboys; they finally got all Raymond's cows. There were like deer, you know, you couldn't get close to them. 'The fact is the very last one they shot and butchered up in the brush, they couldn't catch it. Anyhow, they had taken them down and all that bunch of cowboys they just come back up the hill. I had been down there visiting somebody down in the valley, one of my brothers, I think, that wasn't in that thing and they brough me over and got me with Raymond to come back up the hill. They had a cowboy lunch at the creek and tins of corned beef and crackers and cheese, and a drink of water, and made cowboy coffee up the creek there, just after you cross. And we all came up the hill and that was the last trip I made up the hill.

Linda: Well, I think I have covered about all the areas I wanted to cover. Is there anything anybody would like to add. Did you have any more questions?
Appendix F- Stern Ranch Architectural Documents and Photos
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The collection, which spans the years 1930-1978 (bulk 1954-1968), consists of records, drawings, photographs, and papers relating to the architectural career of Germano Milono. Working mostly in California and Nevada, Germano Milono and Associates took on educational, civic, commercial, medical, religious, planning and single-family residential projects. The firm collaborated with structural engineer, T.Y. Lin and landscape architect, Thomas D. Church.

Major educational projects include renovations to several buildings on the University of California, Berkeley campus, including California Hall, Moses Hall, and Stephens Halls. The collection also includes his work for the new UC Santa Cruz campus Social Sciences Building and Sonoma State College Library. Milono also worked extensively on the Santa Catalina School for Girls in Monterey, California.

Notable religious projects include the Church of the Good Shepherd in Corral de Tierra, California, Holy Name Parish Hall in San Francisco, and St. John the Baptist Church in Napa, California. Milono also participated in several civic projects. Notable residential projects include the Gauer House, Sonoma County, California, the Kelly House, Santa Rosa, California, the Honig House in Inverness, California, and the Foster House in Pebble Beach, California.

Project Index
The following is a list of architectural projects from the Milono Collection. For more complete information about collection contents for each project, as well as shelf location and microfilming status, download the complete Project Index in an Excel spreadsheet format by going to http://www.ced.berkeley.edu/cedarchives/pindex/milono.xls . For instructions on interpreting the Project Index, see The Guide to the Project Index at http://www.ced.berkeley.edu/cedarchives/pindex/guide.htm .

The project list below, derived from the Project Index, is arranged alphabetically by Project/Client Name and contains information, where available, about the location, date, project type, collaborators, photographers, and formats for each project in the collection.

Project/Client Name (location, date, project type) Collaborator (role), Photographer [Format - Ms=Manuscripts, Dr=Drawings, Ph=Photographs]

- * 88 - 1st Street ( San Francisco , CA ; 1961-1965 ; residential-multi ) [Ms, Dr]
- * 88 - 1st Street ( San Francisco , CA ; 1964 ; residential-multi ) [Ms, Dr]
- * Allied Arts Guild Sales Building ( Menlo Park , CA ; n.d. ; commercial ) Photographer: Partridge, R. [Ph]
- * Archambeau, Judith Karen ( Sonoma County , CA ; 1975-1976 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
- * Bel-Aire Commercial Development ( Sonoma County , CA ; n.d. ; planning ) [Dr]
- * Belgran Memorial ( Colma , CA ; 1959 ; memorial ) [Dr, Ph]
- * Belgran, Frank L. ( San Francisco , CA ; 1954-1955 ; residential ) [Dr]
- * Belvedere Model ( n.d. ) Photographer: Parker, M. [Ph]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Designers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bender (Albert M.) Library</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>1959; educational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Irving</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1956-1958; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissinger, Paul</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1966-1968; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen, Mary Ann</td>
<td>Kent Woodlands, CA</td>
<td>1950-1951; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Office Tower</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>n.d.; commercial</td>
<td>[Ms, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain's House</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>n.d.; residential</td>
<td>[Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardanini, Tom and Lynda</td>
<td>Burlingame, CA</td>
<td>1977-1978; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carletonini Properties Corporation Medical Office Building</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1959-1962; medical</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Good Shepherd</td>
<td>Corral de Tierra, CA</td>
<td>1957-1959; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Good Shepherd</td>
<td>Corral de Tierra, CA</td>
<td>1964; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cielo Vista Subdivision</td>
<td>Gonzales, CA</td>
<td>1958-1959; planning</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M.</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Danville, CA</td>
<td>1965-1970; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, George</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>1962-1964; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Paul L. Jr.</td>
<td>Piedmont, CA</td>
<td>1957; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBell, Grace and Daryl</td>
<td>San Mateo, CA</td>
<td>1955-1957; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: Dwelling 1959A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: S. KPA Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n.d.;)</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolhinow, J.L., additions &amp; alterations</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1965-1966; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drautz, Gus and Fay</td>
<td>Vallejo, CA</td>
<td>n.d.; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreifus, Charles Jr.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1956; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M.</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreifus, Charles Jr.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1959; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury, Clark</td>
<td>Carmel, CA</td>
<td>1960-1961; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducato, Alfred, pool lanai</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>n.d.; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Sturtevant, R., House &amp; Garden</td>
<td>[Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estero Municipal Improvement District: Central Park Community Center</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>1970-1973; civic</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estero Municipal Improvement District: Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>1973-1974; governmental</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahrney, D.L.</td>
<td>Kent Woodlands, CA</td>
<td>1949; residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Church, T. (landscape architect)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Security Administration: Defense and Migrant Worker Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>(residential-multi)</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermi, Enrico, memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n.d.)</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>1966-1970; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>1966; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City Display/Sales Pavilion</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>n.d.; civic</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M.</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Jack Jr.</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA</td>
<td>1960-1961; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Raymond</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>1963; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, T. Jack</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA</td>
<td>1956-1958; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M.</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis, Donald</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>1971; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauer, Edward H.</td>
<td>Sonoma County, CA</td>
<td>1968; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Eckert, M.</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Park Senior Citizens Center</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1974; civic</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Estates</td>
<td>Solano County, CA</td>
<td>1961; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin, Conway &amp; Jones, office building</td>
<td>Modesto, CA</td>
<td>1958-1960; commercial</td>
<td>Photographer: Baird Photo Service</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin, J.E.</td>
<td>Modesto, CA</td>
<td>1956; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M.</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunst, Morgan A.</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA</td>
<td>1960; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, A.E.</td>
<td>San Mateo County, CA</td>
<td>1954-1955; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding, John M.</td>
<td>Carson City, NV</td>
<td>1977; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks, Frank &amp; Kavin</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1956-1957; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• * Hermann, Grover ( Pebble Beach , CA ; 1950-1951 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Hermann, Grover, alterations ( Pebble Beach , CA ; 1963-1965 ; residential ) [Dr, Ph]
• * Hermann, Grover, pool and fountain ( Pebble Beach , CA ; 1967 ; residential ) [Dr, Ph]
• * Hill , Lewis ( Petaluma , CA ; 1960-1962 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Hobbs, roof deck ( n.d. ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Holy Name Church ( San Francisco , CA ; 1960 ; religious ) Photographer: Jones, P. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Holy Name Church ( San Francisco , CA ; 1961 ; religious ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Holy Name Parish Hall Alteration ( San Francisco , CA ; 1964 ; religious ) [Dr]
• * Holy Name School/Convent Chapel ( San Francisco , CA ; 1966 ; religious ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Honig, Victor ( San Francisco , CA ; 1960-1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Honig, Victor ( San Francisco , CA ; 1963 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Honig, Victor ( San Francisco , CA ; 1976-1978 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Honig, Victor, alteration ( Inverness , CA ; 1968-1969 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Honig, Victor, alteration ( Inverness , CA ; 1968-1969 ; residential ) Photographer: Riek, K. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Honig, Victor, alteration ( San Francisco , CA ; 1976-1977 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Imperial Savings ( Sebastopol , CA ; ca. 1972 ; commerical ) [Ph]
• * Imperial Savings ( Hayward , CA ; ca. 1973 ; commerical ) [Ph]
• * Imperial Savings ( San Francisco , CA ; n.d. ; commerical ) [Ph]
• * Innes, William ( Foster City , CA ; 1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Jennings, Percy ( Lafayette , CA ; 1951 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Jennings, Percy, addition ( Lafayette , CA ; 1955 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Jennings, Percy, addition and alteration ( Lafayette , CA ; 1956 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Jennings, Percy, first phase ( Lafayette , CA ; 1950 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Jennings, Percy, living room wing addition ( Lafayette , CA ; 1957 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kaiser, Leland ( Menlo Towers ) ( Menlo Park , CA ; 1972 ; residential ) Collaborator: Fluckiger, A. (architect) [Dr]
• * Kalman ( Unger Apartments ) ( San Francisco , CA ; 1958-1960 ; residential-multi ) [Dr]
• * Kaplan, Henry ( Stanford University , CA ; 1957-1959 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Kaufman, William ( San Francisco , CA ; 1958 ; residential ) Photographer: Baer, M. [Dr, Ph]
• * Kaufman, William ( San Francisco , CA ; 1960 ; residential ) Photographer: Baer, M. [Dr, Ph]
• * Kelly, Jack ( Foster City , CA ; 1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kelly, Jim ( Sonoma County , CA ; 1978 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kelly, Mrs. Paul ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1955-1956 ; residential ) Collaborator: Church, T. (landscape architect) ; Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Kelly, Mrs. Paul, cottage and deck ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1971 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kelly, Mrs. Paul, cottage and deck ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1971 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kelly, Mrs. Paul, deck cabinet ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1962 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Kelly, Mrs. Paul, gazebo and deck ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1959 ; residential ) Collaborator: Church, T. (landscape architect) ; Photographer: Baer, M. [Dr, Ph]
• * Kelly, Paul B., Memorial Pulmonary Institute ( Santa Rosa , CA ; 1959-1961 ; medical ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Kraus, Laurence ( Belvedere , CA ; 1961 ; residential ) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Krug Ranch ( Winery ) ( St. Helena , CA ; 1966 ; commercial ) [Ms, Dr]
• * Krug Winery, toilet building ( St. Helena , CA ; 1962 ; commercial ) [Dr]
• * Krug Winery, warehouse and bottling building ( St. Helena , CA ; 1956-1959 ; commercial ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * L-20-55 ( Foster City , CA ; 1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * L-50-63 ( Foster City , CA ; 1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * L-60-55 ( Foster City , CA ; 1964 ; residential ) [Dr]
• * Lenway, Fred H. ( Berkeley , CA ; 1955-1956 ; residential ) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Lenway, Fred H. (Berkeley, CA; 1959; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• MacDonald, Graeme, garden house (Hillsborough, CA; residential) Photographer: Parker, M. [Ph]
• Maddux, Joseph (Sonoma County, CA; 1959-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Markel, Jesse (San Francisco, CA; 1959-1960; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Marvin, Robert (San Francisco, CA; 1962-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McCrea, Frederick H. (St. Helena, CA; 1955; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McCrea, Frederick H. (St. Helena, CA; 1958; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Med. Arts Pharmacy (San Francisco, CA; 1947; medical) Photographer: Sommer, P. [Ph]
• Medical office building (Oakland, CA; 1959; medical) [Ms, Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins (Chesham, NH; 1956; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins (Pebble Beach, CA; 1977; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, addition and alteration (Pebble Beach, CA; 1960; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, fireplace addition (Chesham, NH; 1959; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, garden shed (Pebble Beach, CA; 1957; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, lake shelter (Silver Lake, NH; 1960; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, studio (Pebble Beach, CA; 1957; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, studio alteration (Pebble Beach, CA; 1952; residential) [Dr]
• Milbank, Robbins, studio (Pebble Beach, CA; 1951; residential) Photographer: Whitney, B. [Dr]
• Milano, studio (San Francisco, CA; n.d.; commercial) [Dr]
• Mira Glen Subdivision [Rolor Construction Co.] (San Francisco, CA; 1965-1967; residential-multi) [Ms, Dr]
• Mirviss, Harold (Hanford, CA; 1959-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Mohun International Travel Building (San Carlos, CA; 1954-1955; commercial) Photographer: Partridge, R., Elwing Studios [Dr, Ph]
• Mosaic Law Congregation New Synagogue Center (Sacramento, CA; 1965; religious) [Dr]
• Orrick, William H. (San Francisco, CA; 1965-1966; residential) Collaborator: Church, T. [Dr]
• Orrick, William H. (Stinson Beach, CA; 1967-1970; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Panting, Norman (Santa Rosa, CA; 1963-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Panting, Norman, pool & pool deck (Santa Rosa, CA; 1968; residential) [Dr]
• Parichan, Harold (Pebble Beach, CA; 1977; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Peterson, Lowell J. (Reno, NV; 1956-1958; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Peterson, Lowell J. (Reno, NV; 1965; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ralston Street Medical Office (Reno, NV; 1965; medical) [Dr]
• Rancho Village Subdivision [see Crown Development Co.] (Novato, CA; 1958; residential-multi) [Dr]
• Riverside Apartments (Riverview Tower) (Reno, NV; 1963-1964; residential-multi) [Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: 2nd floor dormitory building (Monterey, CA; 1961-1962; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: 4 room dormitory building (Monterey, CA; 1964; educational) [Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: addition to existing dormitory (Monterey, CA; 1965; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: alterations (Monterey, CA; 1971; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: alterations to existing library classroom (Monterey, CA; 1961; educational) [Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: chapel (Monterey, CA; 1952; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: classroom building (Monterey, CA; 1962-1963; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: dining room (Monterey, CA; 1955; educational) [Dr]
• Santa Catalina School: dormitory building (Monterey, CA; 1961; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: entrance gate and sign (Monterey, CA; 1971; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: entrance gate and sign (Monterey, CA; 1971; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: library (Monterey, CA; 1963-1966; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: lower school classroom building (Monterey, CA; 1964-1965; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Santa Catalina School: Master Plan (Monterey, CA; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• * Santa Catalina School: pool dressing (Monterey, CA; 1968-1970; educational) [Dr]
• * Santa Catalina School: Fortress Office (Monterey, CA; 1960; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• * Santa Catalina School: science building (Monterey, CA; 1963-1968; educational) [Dr]
• * Santa Catalina School: Science Classroom Building (Monterey, CA; 1968; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• * Santa Catalina School: storage vault for existing senior classroom building (Monterey, CA; 1970; educational) [Dr]
• * Santa Catalina School: study hall and lay faculty building (Monterey, CA; 1959-1960; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Santa Catalina School: tennis court (Monterey, CA; 1966; educational) [Dr]
• * Santa Catalina School: theater (Monterey, CA; 1972; educational) [Dr]
• Saunders, John (Yuba City, CA; 1959-1960; residential) [Dr]
• Saunders, Robert J. (Yuba City, CA; 1956; residential) Photographer: Baer, M. [Dr, Ph]
• Seely, Paul (Modesto, CA; 1955; residential) [Dr]
• Seller, Robert, addition & alteration (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Dr]
• Senior Center Billing
• * Shapivo, P. (San Francisco, CA; 1955, 1967; residential) [Dr]
• * Shepard, Andrew (Santa Rosa, CA; 1963-1964; residential) Photographer: Milono, K. [Dr, Ph]
• * Shoemake, A.C. (Patterson, CA; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R. [Dr, Ph]
• * Simmons Co. Showroom remodeling (San Francisco, CA; 1973-1974; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• * Sinton, Robert apartment (San Francisco, CA; 1970-1971; residential) [Dr]
• * SMC Fountain
• * Smernoff, Noah (Reno, NV; 1963-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• * Sonoma Mortgage Building (Santa Rosa, CA; 1955-1957; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Sonoma Mortgage Building - addition (Santa Rosa, CA; 1956; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Sonoma Mortgage Corp. Alterations and fountain (Santa Rosa, CA; 1963; commercial) Photographer: Partridge, R. [Dr, Ph]
• * Sonoma Property Loan Co. (Santa Rosa, CA; 1954; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• * Sonoma State Library - Phase I (Sonoma, CA; 1965; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• * Sonoma State Library - Phase II (Sonoma, CA; 1975; educational) Collaborator: T.Y. Lin International (structural engineer) [Dr, Ph]
• * Sproul, Curtis C. (Weimer, CA; 1976; residential) [Dr]
• * St. John the Baptist Church (Napa, CA; 1962; religious) Photographer: Jones, P. [Dr, Ph]
• * St. John the Baptist Church (Napa, CA; 1964-1966; religious) Photographer: Jones, P. [Dr, Ph]
• * State Office Building (Eureka, CA; 1957; governmental) Photographer: K.D. Commercial Photography [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Stern, Carl (San Francisco, CA; 1955; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• * Stern, Carl (San Francisco, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• * Stern, Carl - alterations (San Francisco, CA; 1965; residential) [Dr]
• * Stern, Carl - fallout shelter (San Francisco, CA; 1960; residential) [Dr]
• * Stern, Carl - iron gate (San Francisco, CA; 1966; residential) [Dr]
• * Stern, Carl and Marjorie Ranch (Kenwood, CA; 1972; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• * Stern, Marjorie - condominium (San Francisco, CA; 1976; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• * Stern, Marjorie - pool trellis (1977; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• * Summit Savings (commercial) Photographer: Riek, K.H. [Dr, Ph]
• * Susselman, S.E. (San Francisco, CA; 1952; residential) Photographer: Jones, P. [Dr, Ph]
• * Susselman, S.E. (San Francisco, CA; 1958; residential) Photographer: Jones, P. [Dr, Ph]
• * Trione, Henry (Santa Rosa, CA; 1976-1978; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• * Trione, Henry Office Building (Santa Rosa, CA; 1956; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• * Trione, Henry Office Building (Santa Rosa, CA; 1956; commercial) [Dr]
• *Trombetta, Alex (Santa Rosa, CA; n.d.; residential) [Dr]
• *Tule Goose Club (n.d.) [Ph]
• *Tuteur, John (Napa, CA; 1952-1954; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R. [Dr, Ph]
• *Tuteur, John Jr. (Napa, CA; 1965-1966; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R. [Dr, Ph]
• *Tuteur, John Jr. (Napa, CA; 1970; residential) Photographer: [Dr, Ph]
• *UC: California Hall - handicap lift (Berkeley, CA; 1976; educational) Photographer: Riek, K.H. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *UC: California Hall, Chancellor's Reception Area (Berkeley, CA; n.d.; educational) [Ph]
• *UC: falling hazards, Chancellor's Reception Area (Berkeley, CA; 1975-1976; educational) Collaborator: Howard, J.G. (architect); Photographer: Riek, K.H. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *UC: Northside Center (Berkeley, CA; 1966-1970; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *UC: Social Science Building (Santa Cruz, CA; 1966; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *UC: Stephens Union (Berkeley, CA; 1960; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• *UC: Stephens Union, step one (Berkeley, CA; 1962; educational) [Dr]
• *Unidentified: projects [Ph]
• *University of California (UC): Bernard Moses Hall Alterations (Berkeley, CA; 1963-1965; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• *Untermeyer, Henry (San Francisco, CA; 1966-1968; residential) [Dr]
• *Untermeyer, Henry (San Francisco, CA; 1968; residential) [Dr]
• *Untermeyer, Henry, additions and alterations (Sausalito, CA; 1976; residential) [Ms]
• *Untermeyer, sauna (Sausalito, CA; 1976; residential) [Dr]
• *Villa Los Alamos (Santa Rosa, CA; 1973-1974; planning) Collaborator: Vallette, J.R. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Vollmer, A. (Mt. Shasta, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Vollmer, A., retaining wall (San Francisco, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• *Vollmer, cabin (Mt. Shasta, CA; 1955-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Waters Sales Building (San Francisco, CA; 1956; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Waters, Robert A. Jr. (Hillsborough, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Waters, Robert A. Jr. (Hillsborough, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• *Waters, Robert A. Sr. (Hillsborough, CA; 1955-1956; residential) Photographer: Parker, M. [Ms, Dr]
• *Wear, Charles (Sonoma, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• *Wilson Ranch (Placer County, CA; 1977; residential) [Dr]
• *Zimmerman, Kent (Berkeley, CA; 1961-1963; residential) Photographer: Watt, D.M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Thomas D. Church Collection (ARCH 1997-1) Environmental Design Archives

I. PERSONAL PAPERS, 1930-1963

Physical Description: Boxes 1 and 9, Tubes 1-8
Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged chronologically within series.
Series includes large examples of student work, personal photographs and portraits.

A. Student work

B. Photographs

C. Art collection
II. PROFESSIONAL PAPERS, 1918-1970

A. Writings

II. PROFESSIONAL PAPERS, 1918-1970

Physical Description: Boxes 1-2, 9
Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged chronologically within series.
Series includes documents related to Milono's activities within the profession, but outside his office. Includes documents related to professional organizations such as the AIA and NCARB as well as several newspaper and magazine clippings referenced to colleagues such as Thomas Church.

B. Associations and Committees

C. Awards and Licenses

D. Reference materials

E. Office photographs

III. OFFICE RECORDS, 1947-1978

Physical Description: Boxes 2-15
Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Series A, C, and D arranged chronologically. Series B arranged by project number and then alphabetically by job name.
Series includes documents produced by the office for marketing purposes. Mostly contains photographs of finished projects. Series consists of small and large photographs, presentation drawings and models for the Kelly Gazebo and the Foster City Sales Pavilion.

A. Public relations

B. Photographs

C. Clippings

D. Design awards
IV. PROJECT RECORDS, 1947-1978

A. Files

B. Specifications

C. Drawings

SERIES I. PERSONAL PAPERS, 1930-1963

A. Student work

Box/Folder 1 : 1  High School Newspaper Clipping ca. 1930
Box/Folder 9 : 2  School Certificates 1930-1937
Box/Folder 1 : 3  Beaux-Arts Institute of Design 1932-1937
Box/Folder 9 : 4  Beaux-Arts Institute of Design/Carnegie Tech Drawings 1932-1937, 1959
Tube 1-8  Student Work n.d.

B. Photographs

Box/Folder 1 : 5  Portraits n.d., 1958
Box/Folder 1 : 6  Pinnicals Park, Stinson Beach 1961
Box/Folder 1 : 7  Kelly Swimming Pool, Milono and Zells 1961
Box/Folder 1 : 8  Story Hill Ranch, Pool 1963, n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 9  Marco and Carlo at Camp 1963
Box/Folder 1 : 10 Mother n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 11  R. Hills n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 12  Sandpiper Palm Desert n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 13  San Francisco n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 14, 9 : 15  Unidentified Photographs n.d.

C. Art collection

Box/Folder 1 : 16  Italian Prints n.d.

SERIES II. PROFESSIONAL PAPERS, 1918-1970

A. Writings

Box/Folder 1 : 1  "An Educational Park on Alcatraz Island" Interiors, November 1967 1967

B. Associations and Committees
B. Associations and Committees

Box/Folder 9 : 2 California State Board of Architectural Examiners 1964-1969
Box/Folder 9 : 3 American Institute of Architects 1950-1969
Box/Folder 9 : 4 NCARB 1962, 1970

C. Awards and Licenses

Box/Folder 9 : 5 Professional Licenses 1947, 1962

D. Reference materials

Box/Folder 1 : 6 Foster City Homes n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 7 Gazbos (sic) n.d.
Box/Folder 1 : 8 Architect and Engineer, April 1918 1918
Box/Folder 1 : 9 Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons, Architects projects n.d., 1948
Box/Folder 1 : 10 Thomas D. Church magazine clippings 1953, 1954, 1955
Box/Folder 2 : 12 Magazines - House Beautiful 1956, 1960

E. Office photographs

Box/Folder 2 : 13 Office photographs n.d.

SERIES III. OFFICE RECORDS, 1947-1978

A. Public relations

Box/Folder 2 : 1 "Organization, Experience and Work Summary" n.d.
Box/Folder 2 : 2 "Form 251 - US Government Architect-Engineer Questionnaire" 1966
Box/Folder 2 : 3 Germano Milono and Associates Brochure n.d.
Box/Folder 2 : 4-8 Brochure Data n.d.
Box/Folder 2 : 9 Marketing Portfolio n.d.
Box/Folder 2 : 10 Office Portraits n.d.

B. Photographs (may include drawings used for marketing purposes)

** See Project Index

C. Clippings

Box/Folder 8 : 142 MacDonald Residence, House Beautiful 1951
Box/Folder 8 : 143 Waters House, House Beautiful 1951
Box/Folder 8 : 144-145 Kelly Residence, House and Home, House Beautiful, Sunset Magazine, Western Architect and Engineer, Life 1960-1964
Box/Folder 8 : 146 Kaufman Residence, House Beautiful 1962
Box/Folder 8 : 147 Honig House, House Beautiful 1974

D. Design awards

Box/Folder 8 : 148; FF 6 Honors/Awards for specific projects 1957-1968

SERIES IV. PROJECT RECORDS, 1947-1978

A. Files
A. Files

** See Project Index

B. Specifications

** See Project Index

C. Drawings

** See Project Index
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Descriptive Summary
Collection Title: Thomas D. Church Collection,
Date (inclusive): 1933-1977
Collection Number: 1997-1
Creator: Church, Thomas Dolliver, 1902-1978
Extent: 114 boxes, 9 flat boxes, 29 tubes, 8 flat file drawers
Language: English.

Access
Collection is open for research.

Publication Rights
All requests for permission to publish, reproduce, or quote from materials in the collection should be discussed with the Curator.

Preferred Citation
[Identification of item], Thomas D. Church Collection, (1997-1), Environmental Design Archives. College of Environmental Design. University of California, Berkeley. Berkeley, California

Access Points
Garden structures.
Landscape architects--California.

Thomas D. Church Collection,
1933-1977
1997-1
Landscape architecture--California.
Campus planning--California--Berkeley.
Campus planning--California--Santa Cruz.
Gardens.
University of California, Berkeley--Planning.
University of California, Santa Cruz--Planning.
Wurster, William Wilson, 1895-1973
Caddes, Carolyn, 1935-
Partridge, Rondal.
Parker, Maynard L.

Biography

Thomas "Tommy" Dolliver Church was born in Boston but lived in Ojai until he was a teenager and then moved to Berkeley. He is credited with being the creator of the "modern garden." He was educated at the University of California, Berkeley and Harvard. Following graduation in 1922, he traveled extensively in Europe on a Sheldon Travelling Fellowship. Upon his return to the United States, he began teaching landscape architecture at the University of California, Berkeley. He returned to practice in 1929 and three years later opened his own office in San Francisco at 402 Jackson Street where he practiced until his retirement in 1977. During the 1930s, Church’s wife Betsy worked for “Cargoes” a gift shop that sold furniture. She talked the manager into allowing Tommy to show his drawings there and when the Aaltos—who were good friends of the Churches—wanted to sell their furniture in the US, Betsy was also allowed to show it in the space.

Church’s design approach combined with the local natural environment and economic climate of the 1930s through the 1970s to lead to the development of what became known as the California style. Church designed gardens primarily for the expanding middle class, both in cities and in the rapidly developing suburbs of the Bay Area. In addition to the residential gardens that make up the majority of his work, Church designed larger scale open space for housing, industrial plants and hospitals, and was consultant to Stanford and the University of California at Berkeley and Santa Cruz. Church’s designs were much publicized by a number of popular home and garden journals, primarily Sunset magazine. His philosophy and principles of design were spelled out in two books, Gardens Are For People (1955, reprinted in 1983) and Your Private World (1969).

Among Church’s most important works were the Dewey Donnell garden, El Novillero, in Sonoma, California (1948), done with Lawrence Halprin, who was then working in his office; the beach garden of Mr. and Mrs. O. Martin, Aptos, California (1948); the General Motors Technical Center in Warren, Michigan (1956); portions of the campuses of Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley and Santa Cruz; and Longwood Gardens in Pennsylvania.

During the course of his practice, Church collaborated with numerous architects including William Wurster and Gardner Dailey. He also influenced many young landscape architects. Garrett Eckbo, Robert Royston and Lawrence Halprin all worked in Church’s office during the early stages of their careers. His awards include the Gold Medal of the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Fine Arts Medal of the American Institute of Architects.

Sources:

Scope and Content

The Thomas D. Church collection documents over two hundred of Church’s projects through textual records, drawings and photographs. The collection is arranged in four series: Office Records, Project Records, Display Boards, and Additional Donations. The office records include correspondence relating to prospective (uncompleted) projects, subject files that contain photographs and clippings of landscape details and structures, public relations files and exhibit boards. The public relations files include correspondence regarding the publication of Church’s work and photographs of Church projects. The exhibit boards also feature photographs, as well as drawings. Additional photographs are located with the project files.

The bulk of the collection is comprised of project records. Arranged alphabetically, they consist of correspondence, plant lists, reports, clippings, photographs and drawings. Many project files include pre-construction site photographs. Records of Church’s major projects form a large part of the series, including the General Motors Technical Center (Warren, Michigan, 1956), numerous sites for the Caterpillar Company (Illinois, 1958-62), Longwood Gardens (Kennett Square, Pennsylvania, 1971-75), Stanford University (Palo Alto, 1949-76), and University of California, Santa Cruz (1962-75). The Dewey Donnell
garden, his most acclaimed project, is also documented. The third series consists of multimedia display boards from the retail store Cargoes, illustrating projects Church collaborated on with William Wurster and Gardner Dailey. The bulk of the collection was transferred from Church’s office in 1998, and their original order has been maintained. Blueprints and photographs donated separately are included in the final series.

A project list is available in the Archives.

Title: Theodore C. Bernardi Collection,
Identifier/Call Number: 1991-1,
Contributing Institution: Environmental Design Archives
Title: Photographs Related to Thomas Dolliver Church,
Identifier/Call Number: BANC PIC 1979.121,
Contributing Institution: The Bancroft Library
Title: Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect (1978),
Contributing Institution: The Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office
Title: Thomas Church, landscape architect and related material,
Identifier/Call Number: BANC MSS 77/97,
Contributing Institution: The Bancroft Library
Title: Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons Collection,
Identifier/Call Number: 1976-2,
Contributing Institution: Environmental Design Archives

Project Index

The following is a list of architectural projects from the Thomas D. Church Collection. For more complete information about collection contents for each project, as well as shelf location and microfilming status, download the complete Project Index in an Excel spreadsheet format by going to http://www.ced.berkeley.edu/cedarchives/pindex/church.xls. For instructions on interpreting the Project Index, see The Guide to the Project Index at http://www.ced.berkeley.edu/cedarchives/pindex/guide.htm.

The Project Index list is arranged alphabetically by Project/Client Name and contains information, where available, about the location, date, project type, architect, collaborators, photographers, and formats for each project in the collection.

Project/Client Name (location, date, project type) Collaborator (role), Photographer [Format - Ms=Manuscripts, Dr=Drawings, Ph=Photographs]

- Academy of Sciences: Cowell Hall (San Francisco, CA; 1967-1974; cultural) Collaborator: Pflueger, MT (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Adams, Lane (New Canaan & Wilton, CT; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Albert, Alexander (San Francisco, CA; 1950, 1974; residential) Photographer: Harlow, B [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Aldrich, Winthrop (Providence, RI; 1972; funerary) [Ms]
- Alexander, Foster (Atherton, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Alioto, JM (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Allen, Elain S (Hillsborough, CA; 1977; residential) [Ms, Ph]
- Allen, Mrs Francis J (Greenwich, CT; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Allen, Mrs Hubert B (Saratoga, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Allende, MF (San Francisco, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Almaden Winery [see also Benoist, L] (Paicines, CA; 1958-1967; commercial) [Ms, Ph]
- Alperin, Ralph (Fremont, CA; 1954, 1961-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Ames, Aymas (Syosset, NY; 1961; residential) [Dr]
- Ames, Aymas: 7 Gates Farm (Martha's Vineyard, MA; 1957-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Ames, Elbert N (San Francisco, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Anawalt, Richard (Los Angeles, CA; 1968-1969; residential) Collaborator: Anawalt, D (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Anderson, H James (Santa Rosa, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Anderson, James [see Miscellaneous] (Orinda, CA; 1969; residential)
• Anderson, Richard (Fargo, ND; 1961-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Andrews Jr, Adolphus (San Francisco, CA; 1959; residential) [Dr]
• Anthony, Thomas J (Atherton, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Arnold, Don [see Huff, R; "The Bel Air"]
• Atkinson, George (San Mateo, CA; 1941; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Austin, Paul (San Francisco, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms]
• Austin, Perry (Santa Barbara, CA; 1954-57; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Avenali, Peter (Oakville, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Aversa, AA (San Francisco, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Avery, Burt (Atherton, CA; 1967-68; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Azhderian, Edward (Los Banos, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Backus Jr, Standish (Montecito, CA; 1967-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Bacon, John (Santa Barbara, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Baer, Louis (Burlingame, CA; 1961-63; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bain, Frank C [see Spencer, S]
• Balance Street (San Francisco, CA; 1960, 1968-1969; recreational) Collaborator: Bianchi, A & Yeon, J (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Baldwin, John (Woodside, CA; 1939, 1957; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bale, Mrs AJ (Piedmont, CA; 1937; residential) [Ph]
• Balsam, Richard A (Bedford, NY; 1957-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Baltimore Museum of Art: Sculpture Garden (Baltimore, MD; 1974-75; cultural) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barkan, Thomas (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Barmann Jr, HW (Chico, CA; 1952, 1965-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barmann Sr, HW (Chico, CA; 1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barmann, Mrs H Wilfried (Colusa, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barnes, Paul (Walnut Grove, CA; 1953-54; residential) [Dr]
• Barnett, James (Long Island, NY; 1953; residential) [Dr]
• Barnett, James (Bel Air, CA; 1956-1967; residential) Collaborator: Fickett, EH (architect); Photographer: Ezra Stoller Associates [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barnett, James (Sun Valley, ID; 1971-1976; residential) Collaborator: Morrison Wright, N (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Barnette, Dean (Foster City, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Barton, Hugh (Modesto, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bates, John B I Gilroy, CA; 1968, 1972-1973; residential) [Ms]
• Baxter, William A (Woodside Hills, CA; 1945-1946; residential) Photographer: Parker, M; Partridge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bean, Theron (Atherton, CA; 1955-1958, 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bearden, Clarke W (Pebble Beach, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Beaulieu Vinyards [see de la Tour, Mrs. G]
• Bechtel Jr, Stephen D (Piedmont, CA; 1958-1968; residential) Photographer: Harlow, B; Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bechtel, Elizabeth Hay: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Bechtel, Kenneth K (Kentfield, CA; 1966-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bechtel: Casita Cypress (Pebble Beach, CA; 1974; residential) [Dr]
• Beise, S. Clark (Hillsborough, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Belgrano Jr, Frank N (San Francisco, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Bell Jr, Alfred D (Hillsborough, CA; 1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bellis, Gordon (San Francisco, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Belvere Tiburon Shopping Center (Belvedere, CA; 1955; commercial) [Dr]
• Benner, Frederic (Berkeley, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Bennett, DG (Atherton, CA; 1948-1949; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bennett, Mrs John [see also Booth, WH and Birnam Wood Golf Club: Bennett] (Montecito, CA; 1972; residential) [Dr]
• Benning, Arthur (Pebble Beach, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Benning, Arthur (Ogden, UT; 1959-1964; residential) Photographer: Eccles, JD [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Benoist, Louis [see also Almaden Winery] (Paicenes, CA; 1957-1958, 1965; mixed-use) [Dr]
• Berrigan (San Francisco, CA; n.d.; residential) Photographer: Harlow, B./Channing, Phillip [Ph]
• Berry, Benjamin S (Hillsborough, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Best, Dan G (Woodland, CA; 1958-1959, 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Beyer, Robert [see also Morris, RS] (Colorado Springs, CO; 1971-1972; residential) Collaborator: Kurtz, R (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Beyer, Stanley (Los Angeles, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Bianchi, Arci (Kent Woodlands, CA; 1955; residential) [Dr]
• Binswanger, Millard (Richmond, VA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Bacon, Norman (Lot 20) (Montecito, CA; 1969; residential) Collaborator: O’Connell Jr, HM (architect) [Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Bechtel, Elizabeth Hay [see Bechtel, EH]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Bennett, Mrs. John [see also Bennett, Mrs. J] (Montecito, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Bowling Green (Montecito, CA; 1968; commercial) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Braun [see BWGC: Spec Houses] (Montecito, CA; 1973; residential)
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Cass, Thomas F [see Cass, TF and BWGC: General]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Chandler, Dan (Montecito, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Club House Area (Montecito, CA; 1966-1967; commercial) [Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Converse, Converse M (Montecito, CA; 1969-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Croquet Courts (Montecito, CA; 1973; commercial) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Doolan, Jerome K (Montecito, CA; 1976; residential) Collaborator: Gulbrand, T (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: General, East Valley Ranch (Montecito, CA; 1964-1977; commercial) [Ms, Ph]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Golf & Tennis Professional Building (Montecito, CA; 1973; commercial) Collaborator: Warner & Gray (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Guest & Hotel Cottages (Montecito, CA; 1971-1972; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Hascall, Mrs RG [see Hascall, Mrs RG]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Hellman, Richard [see Hellman, R]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Howard, Nelson [see Howard, N]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Jennison, Charles D [see Jennison, CD]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Kirkpatrick, Mrs LH [see Kirkpatrick, Mrs LH]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Kohler, Robert [see Kohler, R]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Lienau, Paul (1) (Montecito, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Lienau, Paul (2) (Montecito, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Lot 13 (Montecito, CA; n.d.; commercial) [Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Lot 26 (Montecito, CA; 1971; commercial) Collaborator: Andrew-O’Connell (architects) [Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Lots 12, 13, 14 [see BWGC: Project “X”]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Maxwell, Mrs Harriet [see Maxwell, Mrs H]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Meek, Thomas B (Montecito, CA; 1970-1971; residential) Collaborator: Haller, I (landscape architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Moller, Joseph E (Lot 25) [see also BWGC: Spec Houses] (Montecito, CA; 1969; residential) Collaborator: Kruger, Benson, Ziemer (architects) [Dr]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Montgomery, G Donald (Montecito, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Moor, Robert (Montecito, CA; 1976; residential) Collaborator: Pederson, DE (architect) [Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Paschall, Nathaniel (Montecito, CA; 1969; residential) Collaborator: Haller, I (landscape architect) [Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Perelle, Charles W [see Perelle, CW]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Project "X" (Montecito, CA; 1972-1974; commercial) [Ms, Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Schwartz, AL (Montecito, CA; 1969-1970; residential) Collaborator: Warner, Morris, & Wilson Inc (architects) [Ms, Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Sears, William W (Lot 7) (Montecito, CA; 1956, 1959, 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Spec Houses (Montecito, CA; 1968-1973; residential) [Ms, Ph]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Van Hagen, Karl (Lot 24) (Montecito, CA; 1970; residential) Collaborator: Andrew-O'Connell (architects) [Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Vought, Russell (Montecito, CA; 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Ph]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Ward, Harold (Montecito, CA; 1969; residential) Collaborator: Russell, GV (architect) [Dr]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Warden Jr, Mrs. Herbert W [Dot] (Montecito, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Ph]

• Birnam Wood Golf Club: Wilson, Page (Montecito, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]

• Blair, Lawrence D (San Francisco, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

• Bloedel, Prentice: Agate Point Farm (Bainbridge Island, WA; 1953-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

• Blumenfeld, Charles (Sacramento, CA; 1952; residential) [Ms, Dr]

• Bona, Charles (Hillsborough, CA; 1971-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

• Bond, George L (Atherton, CA; 1953-1954; residential) [Ms, Dr]

• Bond, George R (Atherton, CA; 1964, 1968-1969; residential) Photographer: Parker, M; Partridge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]

• Bradford, Ian H (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]

• Bowles, Henry M (Los Banos, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

• Boyd, William S (Hillsborough, CA; 1961-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]

• Bradford, Ian H (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]

• Brawner Jr, Harry (Atherton, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Breinig, Peter (Los Altos, CA; n.d.; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Brennan, Thomas A (Ross, CA; 1950-1952; residential) Collaborator: Hamnarberg, P (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Breuner, Richard (Orinda, CA; 1938, 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Brewer, Walter H (Newport Beach, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms]
• Bristow, Robert (Richmond, VA; 1972; residential) [Ms]
• Broadhead, DK (San Marino, CA; 1968-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Brodie, R.N. (Berkeley, CA; 1935; residential) Collaborator: SEE VAUGHAN COLLECTION
• Bromberg, Jerrold L (1) (Hillsborough, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Bromberg, Jerrold L (2) (Hillsborough, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Brooke, IL (Los Altos, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Brown, Stephen (Hillsborough, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Brusstar, Gordon (Napa, CA; 1958-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Buckingham, James (Linden, CA; 1969-1971; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, WW (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Budge, William W [see also Teller, O] (Hillsborough, CA; 1967-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Bull, David C (Palo Alto, CA; 1968; residential) Collaborator: Lynd, J (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Bunch, Thornton (Berkeley, CA; 1975; unknown) [Ms]
• Bundy, William (Washington, DC, DC; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Burrell Jr, Frank L (San Francisco, CA; 1966-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Butcher, Preston (Menlo Park, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Butler, Lewis (San Francisco, CA; 1961, 67; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Butler, Lucy (Santa Cruz, CA; 1940; residential) [Ph]
• Caddes, Donald E and Carolyn (Palo Alto, CA; 1973-1978; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Callender, Mrs John (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Callaway Gardens (Pine Mountain, GA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Camp, Mrs Jean (San Francisco, CA; 1971; cultural) [Ms, Dr]
• Callender, Mrs John (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Cannery, The: Parking Structure (San Francisco, CA; 1973-1974; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Carnation Farms (Carnation, WA; 1974; commercial) [Ms]
• Carpenter, Russell (Hillsborough, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Carpenter, Thomas (Palo Alto, CA; 1946; residential) Collaborator: Fein, P [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Carr, Jesse (San Rafael, CA; 1945-1951, 1961; residential) Collaborator: Hill, H (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Carr, Lawrence (Ross, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Carrigan, H. [additional donation] (San Francisco, CA; )
• Cartan III, Henry (Atherton, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cartan, Henry (Atherton, CA; [1948]; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ph]
• Carver, GW Douglas (Woodside, CA; 1958-1960, 1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Cass, Thomas F: Birnam Wood Golf Club [see also Birnam Wood: General, East Valley Ranch] (Montecito, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Casserly, Charles: Hope Ranch (Santa Barbara, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Casserly, Mrs John (San Mateo, CA; 1957-1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Caterpillar (Aurora, IL; 1958-1960; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Caterpillar (Decatur, IL; 1959-1960; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Caterpillar (Joliet, IL; 1951-1954; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Caterpillar (Mossville, IL; 1957-1960; commercial) [Ms]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Collaborators</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar (Peoria, IL)</td>
<td>1964; commercial</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar (York, PA)</td>
<td>1953-1955; commercial</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar of Australia</td>
<td>Melbourne, AUS; 1959;</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar: Industrial</td>
<td>Mossville, IL; 1957-1964; commercial</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Stanford, CA; 1953-1955, 1966-1967; educational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Jr, Selah</td>
<td>Woodside, CA; 1955-1957, 1974-1975; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain, Selah</td>
<td>Woodside, CA; 1948-1949; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaney, Alger</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA; 1967-1968; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaney, Alger</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA; 1962-1963; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaney, Alger</td>
<td>New Place Road (Hillsborough, CA); 1971-1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapin Jr, Roy D</td>
<td>Healdsburg, CA; 1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, Gilbert W</td>
<td>Redding, CT; 1958-1959; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase, Stephen</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA; 1968; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Baer, M</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham, Hugh H</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA; 1971-1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham, Thomas</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC; 1961-1968; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheek, HC (Berkeley, CA)</td>
<td>n.d.; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Mrs Kenneth C</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA; 1965; residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Roy</td>
<td>San Marino, CA; 1968-1970; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Roy</td>
<td>Sundance, UT; 1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle Building, San Francisco Newspaper Printing Co</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA; 1973; commercial</td>
<td>Collaborator: Yuill-Thornton, Warner, &amp; Levikow (architects)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church, Thomas D</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA; 1962; residential</td>
<td>Photographer: Caddes, C</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Nativity</td>
<td>Menlo Park, CA; 1970-1973; religious</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ojai: Libbey-Smith-Hobson Park</td>
<td>Ojai, CA; 1972-1973; planning / recreational</td>
<td>Collaborator: Royston, R (landscape architect)</td>
<td>[Ms]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Don</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA; 1964; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, GD</td>
<td>Atherton, CA; 1952, 1955; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Hervey P</td>
<td>Woodside, CA; 1936-1937; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Mrs Sherman H</td>
<td>Atherton, CA; 1973; residential</td>
<td>[Ms]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Russell J</td>
<td>Cloverdale, CA; 1967-1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Russell J, alterations</td>
<td>Cloverdale, CA; 1973-1974; residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Scheife, Keck, &amp; Ass. (architects)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, William Boucher</td>
<td>Fallbrook, CA; 1970, 1975; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausen, AW (Hillsborough, CA)</td>
<td>1974-1975; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, William</td>
<td>San Marino, CA; 1950-1952, 1959, 1967-1968; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clever, Fred E</td>
<td>Haddonfield, NJ; 1971; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates, Cullen</td>
<td>Atherton, CA; 1971-1972; residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Sharps, LJ; Brown, IF (architects)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coats, Robert T</td>
<td>Live Oak, CA; 1962-1963, 1967; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coberly Jr, William B</td>
<td>Oceanside, CA; 1975-1976; residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Pearson &amp; Wuesthoff (architects)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codiga, William J</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA; 1975-1976; residential</td>
<td>[Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coghlan Jr, Philip</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA; 1973-1974; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby, Gilbert</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA; 1946; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman Estate</td>
<td>unknown, n.d.; residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, George</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA; 1946-1947, 1952; residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Coleman, James (unknown, CA; n.d.; residential) [Ph]
• Coleman, James (Modesto, CA; 1971-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Collins, George (Kentfield, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Collins, George (San Francisco, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Collman, FA (Saratoga, CA; 1947-1949; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Colonial Williamsburg [see Williamsburg Inn]
• Cone, Fairfax M (Carmel, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Congdon, Guilford GH (Atherton, CA; 1953-1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Conley, Scott (San Francisco, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Converse, Converse M. [see Birnam Wood: Converse, CM]
• Cook Jr, Jack (St Helena, CA; 1972-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cook, Philip S (Washington, DC; 1971-1978; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cook, Ransom S (Woodside, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Cooley, Crawford (Atherton, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Cooper, O.E. (San Francisco, CA; 1954; residential) [Dr]
• Cooper, Sheldon G (Hillsborough, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Coppola, Francis Ford (San Francisco, CA; 1972-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cornwall (Santa Barbara, CA; n.d.; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Ph]
• Cox, Ralph (Sacramento, CA; 1973-1974; residential) Collaborator: Morrison & Ass. (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Crane, Bert (Merced, CA; 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cravens, Malcolm (San Francisco, CA; 1970-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Crimmins, ML (Atherton, CA; 1955-1956, 1959, 1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Crocket, Mrs Weston (Fresno, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Crosby, LO (Woodside, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Crowell, William (Woodside, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Crowley, Thomas (Piedmont, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Cummings, Jon C (Portola Valley, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Curtner, AD (San Jose, CA; 1947, 1952; residential) [Dr]
• Dahl Jr, Arthur L (Pebble Beach, CA; 1955-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Rh]
• Dahl, Ranier (Atherton, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dahling, Suzanne (Menlo Park, CA; 1967-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dailey, Gardner Memorial Garden (San Francisco, CA; 1971; cultural) [Ms, Dr]
• Dakin, John (Toussin Ave) [in same file with R. Dakin] (Kentfield, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Dakin, Richard (Rancheria Rd) [in same file with J. Dakin] (Kentfield, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Damon Jr, C Frank (Honolulu, HI; 1973-1974; residential) Collaborator: Hogan, Chapman, Cobean, & Ass. (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dana, Jacob (Hillsborough, CA; 1972-1974; residential) [Ms]
• Dant, JR (Atherton, CA; 1967; residential) Collaborator: Porter & Steinwedell (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Daulton III, H Clay (Madera, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Davies, Ralph K (Woodside, CA; 1937-1941, 1950; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Davis, TB (Memphis, TN; 1961-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dawson, Lawrence (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1960-1962, 1967; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Day, Justin (Sausalito, CA; 1954-1955; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Dr, Ph]
• De La Tour, Mrs George: Beaulieu Vinyards (Rutherford, CA; 1947, 1955; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G; Esherick, J (Architects) [Ms, Dr]
• DeBrettville, Charles (Woodside, CA; 1939, 1950-1954, 1972-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• DeBrettville, Charles (Pebble Beach, CA; 1972-1978; residential) Collaborator: Johnson, LeFF ingwell, & Ass (landscape architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• deGennaro, George (Los Angeles, CA; 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• deGuigne, Christian (Hillsborough, CA; 1959-1963; residential) Photographer: Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• DeHart, Dana (Burlingame, CA; [1952]; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Ph]
• del Bosque, Hugo (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Del Monte Hotel, Western International Hotels (Monterey, CA; 1974; commercial) Collaborator: Warnecke, JC & Ass. (architects) [Ms]
• Del Valle, Robert (San Francisco, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• deMartini, Walter (Piedmont, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• deRoos, Robert [see also Marshall, WR] (Hillsborough, CA; 1951-1953, 1956, 1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Design: A-Frame (unknown; 1965; residential) [Dr]
• Design: gazebo (unknown; n.d.; residential) [Dr]
• deTristan, Marc (Hillsborough, CA; 1974-1975; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dewey Jr, Charles S: East Hampton Museum (East Hampton, NY; 1969-1970; cultural) [Ms, Dr]
• DeZonia, Dudley (Pebble Beach, CA; 1968-1971, 1978; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dial, Morse G (Naples, FL; 1954-1955; residential) Photographer: Georges, A [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dillingham, Lowell (Honolulu, HI; 1961-1962; 1972; residential) Collaborator: Johnson, Leffingwell, & Ass (landscape architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dillingham, Lowell (Auburn, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dinkelspiel, Mrs Georgiana (San Francisco, CA; 1963-1964; residential) Collaborator: Walker, S (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Doan, Lee A (San Francisco, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Dobbins, Hugh T. [additional donations; also see Vaughan Collection] (Berkeley, CA; 1931; residential) Collaborator: Mitchell, James H (architect) [Dr]
• Doheny, Patrick A (Beverly Hills, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms]
• Doheny, William H (Los Angeles, CA; 1962-1963; residential) Eggers, H (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Dohrmann, Bruce (San Francisco, CA; 1963-1972; residential) Photographer: Harlow, B [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dohrmann, Bruce (San Francisco, CA; 1958; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Donahoe, Daniel (San Francisco, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Donald, Alexander (Woodside, CA; 1967; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Ph]
• Donlon, David (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Donnell, Dewey (Sonoma, CA; 1947-1954; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R; Baer, M. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Donnell, Dewey (Sonoma, CA; 1947-1954; residential)
• Doolittle Jr, Jeff erson (Ross, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Dorcy (unknown; n.d.; residential) Collaborator: SEE VAUGHAN COLLECTION
• Douglass, Earl ([San Francisco], CA; [1962]; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Downey, Russell H (Woodside, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Draney, Charles T. (Hillsborough, CA; 1957; residential) [Dr]
• Draper, Jerome C (St Helena, CA; 1971-1973; residential) Collaborator: Ryan, PA (Architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Draper, William [see also Lewis, P] (Atherton, CA; 1947, 1973-1976; residential) Collaborator: Stafford, JC (landscape architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ducato, Alfred (Atherton, CA; 1946, 1950; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect); Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ducato, Alfred (Menlo Park, CA; 1940; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Duff, Richard (Kent Woodlands, CA; 1945-1946, 1954, 1961-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Duff, Richard (Hillsborough, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
• DuPont Jr, A Felix (Wilmington, DE; 1967-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• DuPont, Nicholas R (Christiana Hundred, DE; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Dusterberry, Frank (Hillsborough, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Dwyer, Mrs Peter ( Colusa , CA ; 1974-1975 ; residential ) [Ms]
• Earl, Austin W [see also Sanders, J] ( Atherton , CA ; 1944-1949 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Earle, Anthony ( unknown ; ; n.d. ; residential ) [Ph]
• East Hampton Museum [see Dewey Jr, CS]
• East Valley Ranch Co. ( Santa Barbara , CA ; 1967 ; commercial ) [Dr]
• Edwards, Sterling ( Hillsborough , CA ; 1953-1954 ; residential ) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Edwards, William C ( Atherton , CA ; 1961-1962, 1966-1967, 1972-1973 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Edwards, William C ( Pebble Beach , CA ; n.d. ; residential ) [Dr]
• Eggers, Mrs. Florence McA ( Pasadena , CA ; 1975-1976 ; residential ) Collaborator: Eggers, HL (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ehrlich, Grant C (1) ( Santa Barbara , CA ; 1967-1969 ; residential ) Collaborator: Warner, J (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ehrlich, Grant C (2) ( Santa Barbara , CA ; 1974 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Eid ( unknown ; ; n.d. ; residential ) [Dr]
• Ellenberger, EG ( Palo Alto , CA ; 1971 ; residential ) [Ms, Ph]
• Ellkiorthy, Mark ( Aptos , CA ; 1948 ; residential ) [Dr]
• Englert, Joseph ( Atherton , CA ; 1957-1958 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• English, James T ( Kent Woodlands , CA ; 1956 ; residential )
• Epsen, Robert ( San Mateo County , CA ; 1974 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Epstein, Warren G ( San Francisco , CA ; 1962 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Erdman, Pardee ( [Santa Barbara] , CA ; [1960] ; residential ) Photographer: Parker, M [Dr, Ph]
• Erlich, John S. ( San Francisco , ; 1957 ; residential ) [Dr]
• Erskine, Morse [see Wolff , Mrs. G: Chestnut St.]
• Erving, [Alice] ( [Santa Barbara] , CA ; [1954-1955] ; residential ) Photographer: Parker, M [Dr, Ph]
• Esberg, Alfred M ( Montecito , CA ; 1969-1973 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Escher, Caspar H ( Oakville , CA ; 1962-1965, 1974 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Escher, Caspar H ( Napa Valley , CA ; 1964-1965 ; residential ) [Dr]
• Escher, Caspar H ( San Francisco , CA ; 1962 ; residential ) [Dr]
• Escher, Hugh ( Hillsborough , CA ; 1972-1973 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Essig, Robert W ( El Cerrito , CA ; 1959 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ets-Hokin, Louis ( Ross , CA ; 1946-1949 ; residential ) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Euphrat, Jack S: Dwight Lane/Atherton Ave. ( Atherton , CA ; 1952-1957, 1966 ; residential ) Photographer: Braun, E; Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Euphrat, Jack S: Tuscaloosa Ave. ( Atherton , CA ; 1973-1975 ; residential ) Collaborator: Garcia, M (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Evans, TM ( Greenwich , CT ; 1954 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fahrney, Paul L ( Kent Woodlands , CA ; 1949-1950 ; residential ) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Falk, Adrian ( Menlo Park , CA ; 1947 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Farfel, AJ ( Houston , TX ; 1955-1956 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fay Addition to Texas Medical Center, University of Texas ( Houston , TX ; 1969-1973 ; medical ) Collaborator: Mackie & Kamrath (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Fay, Ernest B ( Galveston , TX ; 1969-1970 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fay, Ernest B ( Houston , TX ; 1969-1970 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Feigenbaum, Joseph [see also Miscellaneous] ( San Francisco , CA ; 1968-1972 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Fennebresque, John D ( Oyster Bay , NY ; 1959-1961 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fickin, Walter C ( Madera , CA ; 1949 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Field, Charles D ( San Francisco , CA ; 1949, 1963 ; residential ) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Firestone, Leonard ( Pebble Beach , CA ; 1963-1966 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr]
• Fischer, Reginald C ( Los Altos , CA ; 1968-1969 ; residential ) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fisher, Mrs Donald (San Francisco, CA; 1974-1976; residential) Collaborator: Walker & Moody (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Fleishhacker Jr, Mortimer (San Francisco, CA; 1963, 1971; residential) [Ms]
• Fletcher, Harold (San Francisco, CA; 1938; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Fletcher, Harold (Ross, CA; 1939; residential) [Dr]
• Flood, James (Woodside, CA; 1940-1941, 1973-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Flood, James C (Napa, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Folger, Peter M (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Forbes [see Sterling, W]
• Foster, Richard H (Hillsborough, CA; 1973-1974; residential) [Ms]
• Foster, T Jack (Pebble Beach, CA; 1958; residential) Collaborator: Milono, G (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fouch, Jack (Hillsborough, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Frame, Howard (Atherton, CA; 1962-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Franck, Thomas G (Woodside, CA; 1955-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Franck, Thomas G [see also Homans, R - Hillsborough] (Hillsborough, CA; 1944-1945, 1962-1963; residential) [Dr]
• Franzheim II, Kenneth (Houston, TX; 1970-1971; residential) Collaborator: Ford & Heesch (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Franzheim II, Kenneth: Xalapa Farm (Paris, KY; 1969-1970; residential) Collaborator: Ford & Heesch (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Freer, William B (Burlingame, CA; 1944-1947, 1971; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Frendo-Randon, Mrs Rene (Silema, Malta; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Friend Jr, Hugo (Woodside, CA; 1971-1974; residential) Collaborator: Steinberg, GB (architect); Photographer: Caddes, C [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fritts, Donald (Hillsborough, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Fryer, CM (Atherton, CA; 1955; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Gahagan, William G (Atherton, CA; 1958, 1967; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Gallo, Robert (Modesto, CA; 1968-1970; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Gardiner, John (Kentfield, CA; 1962-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Gardner, Irvin B (Hillsborough, CA; 1956-1958; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Garrett, Mrs Leroy (Beverly Hills, CA; 1972; residential) Collaborator: Stepanian, SA (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Garrison, Lloyd (Goldens Bridge, NY; 1954-1960, 1969-1971; residential) Collaborator: Platt, W & G (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Gaston [see Miscellaneous] (Piedmont, CA; 1970; residential)
• Gauer, Edward (Sonoma County, CA; 1968-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• General Motors Technical Center (Detroit, MI; 1951; commercial) Collaborator: Saarinen, E & Ass (architects) [Ms, Ph]
• Gerow, Floyd (Palo Alto, CA; 1951, 1954; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Giffen, Russell (Fresno, CA; 1952-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Giffen, Russell (Fresno County, CA; 1965-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Gillbergh, Jack (Atherton, CA; 1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Gilmore, Mrs William (Atherton, CA; 1965, 1975-1977; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Gilpatrick, Frank (Marysville, CA; 1959-1967; residential) Collaborator: Oliver, RS (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ginzton, Edward L (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1971-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Given, Howard (Los Angeles, CA; 1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Glasgow, John L (San Francisco, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Golden Gate Park [see Strybing Arboretum]
• Goldman, Jack (Atherton, CA; 1955; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Goldman Jr, Richard N (Atherton, CA; 1961-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Goldsmith, LR (Palo Alto, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Golub, Orville (Los Angeles, CA; 1970-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Golub, Orville (Carmel, CA; 1972; residential) [Dr]
Goni, Ralph: Arcadian Ave. (Chico, CA; 1947-1948; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Goni, Ralph: Filbert Ave. (Chico, CA; 1973-1974; residential) Collaborator: Hooper, Olmsted, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Gonzales, Richard (Woodside, CA; 1957, 1962; residential) Collaborator: White, B (architect); Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Good, Stanley (Atherton, CA; 1954-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Goodman, Louis [see Gahagan, WG]
Goodwin, J Patrick (Hillsborough, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Govenor's Residence (Sacramento, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms]
Grant School Playground (San Francisco, CA; 1975; recreational) [Ms]
Grattan, Richard (San Francisco, CA; 1958-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Greenberg, Bernard (Beverly Hills, CA; 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Greene, James C (Pasadena, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Greenhood, Robert (San Francisco, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Greenwood (Piedmont, CA; ca. 1936; residential) [Ph]
Gregory Jr, Donald (San Francisco, CA; 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Griffin, Allan (Monterey, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Griffin, Everett (Stinson Beach, CA; 1964; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr]
Griffin, [Joan] (Santa Cruz, CA; 1947; residential) [Ph]
Griswold, Jack (Hot Springs, VA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
Grover, L Chace (San Francisco, CA; 1939; residential) [Dr]
Guittard, Horace (Hillsborough, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Gump, Richard [see also Bodman, ED] (San Francisco, CA; n.d.; residential) [Ph]
Gunst, Edward (Richmond, VA; 1970-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Gwerder, F Joseph (Walnut Grove, CA; 1963-1964, 1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Haake, Richard H (Atherton, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Haas Sr, Walter (Atherton, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Haas Jr, Walter [see also Boone, Mrs RE] (Atherton, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hahn, Gilbert (Washington, DC; 1961-1965, 1971-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hale Jr, Prentice Cobb (San Francisco, CA; 1959, 1971; residential) Collaborator: Potts, TR (architect) [Dr]
Halperin, Robert M (Atherton, CA; 1967-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Halstead, Emeinel [see Sanders, J and Earl, A] (Atherton, CA; 1944; residential)
Halstead, Mrs Robert (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
Ham, Lee (Hillsborough, CA; 1963-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Hames III, Durward (San Marino, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr]
Hamilton, Hugh: Mountain Shadows West (Scottsdale, AZ; 1974; residential) Collaborator: McGrath & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hamilton, Hugh: North Mojave Road (Scottsdale, AZ; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hamilton, John P (Poultney, VT; 1971; residential) [Ms, Ph]
Hancock, John (Atherton, CA; 1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Handwerker, Winston P (Fresno, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hanes, Ralph P (Winston-Salem, NC; 1959-1967, 1971-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
Hanisch (unknown, ; n.d.; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ph]
• Hanna, David (Atherton, CA; 1970-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hansen, J. James (Atherton, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc (Petaluma, CA; 1966-1969; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Harris, Jack (Fresno, CA; 1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Harris, Mrs John (Coalinga, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Harris, W. Gibson (Richmond, VA; 1955-1960, 1971, 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Harrison, Edward [see Murray II, D and Miscellaneous] (Napa, CA; 1969; residential)
• Harrison, Maurice (St. Helena, CA; n.d.; residential)
• Harrison, Maurice (additional donation) (St. Helena, CA; n.d.; residential) [Dr]
• Hart Jr, Dwight (Hillsborough, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hart, James (Berkeley, CA; ca. 1960; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Harvey Mudd College [see Mudd College]
• Hascall, Mrs RG: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1971, 1974; residential) Collaborator: Neff, W (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Hawkins (unknown; ca. 1960; residential) [Ph]
• Hawley Jr, Mrs Stuart (Atherton, CA; 1965-1969, 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Heil (San Francisco; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, Gardner (architect); Photographer: SEE DAILEY COLLECTION
• Hellman, Marco F (San Francisco, CA; 1963-1964; residential) [Ms]
• Hellmann, Richard: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Helmholtz, AC (Lafayette, CA; 1952-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Henderson, Wellington (Hillsborough, CA; 1933-1934, 1958-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Henderson, William D (Pebble Beach, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Henderson, William D (Sacramento, CA; 1973-1975; residential) Collaborator: Henderson, G (landscape architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Henry, JE [see Wade, H] (Westridge, CA; 1954; residential)
• Herrmann, Grover (Pebble Beach, CA; 1955; residential) [Dr]
• Hewitt, William A (Rutherford, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hiat, R.S. (Modesto, CA; 1939-1940; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hickingbotham, Diana (Hillsborough, CA; 1951, 1964; residential) Photographer: Fein, P [Dr, Ph]
• Hickingbotham, Diana (San Francisco, CA; 1970; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Hicks, Harold (Ganger, BC; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Hilgard, Henry (Santa Cruz, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hills Jr, R.E. (Atherton, CA; 1952-1953, 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hirschberg, Edward (San Mateo, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hobson, A.L. (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Hoefer (Bronxville, NY; ca. 1955; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ph]
• Holmes, J Gordon (Lafayette, CA; 1957-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Holt, Douglas (Hillsborough, CA; 1975; residential) Collaborator: Higley, T (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Holt, Harry (Stockton, CA; 1947; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Holt, Parker (Stockton, CA; 1950-1951, 1957, 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Homans, Robert [see also Franck, T] (Hillsborough, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Homans, Mrs Robert (Islesboro, ME; 1972-1975; residential) Collaborator: Campbell, Aldrich, & Nulty (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Homans, Mrs Robert: memorial, St Matthews Church (San Mateo, CA; 1973-1974; religious) [Ms, Dr]
• Hooper, John (Woodside, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hoover Jr, Herbert (Pasadena, CA; 1961-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hopkins, Mrs WL (Carmel, CA; n.d.; residential) [Dr]
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• Horowitz, Leonard M (Portola Valley, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Horton Jr, Allen W (Oakville, CA; 1961-1962, 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hotchkiss, Preston (San Marino, CA; 1958-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hotel Stanford Court [see Stanford Court Hotel]
• Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, Valencia Gardens [see Valencia Gardens]
• How, Jack (Hillsborough, CA; 1964-1966; residential) Photographer: Lyon, F [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Howard, Nelson: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Howell, Thornton (Montecito, CA; 1962-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Howland, John S (Montecito, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Hudson, Billy (unknown; n.d.; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ph]
• Huff, Robert: "The Bel Air" (Atherton, CA; 1964; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Huff, Robert: "The Deauville" (Atherton, CA; 1960-1961, 1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hume, William (Woodside, CA; 1952; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hume, William M (San Francisco, CA; 1956; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hunter, Derk [see Redfield, PS] (Atherton, CA; 1965; residential)
• Hunter, Derk K [see also Towne, B] (Woodside, CA; 1959, 1972-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hunter, Harry (Fresno, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
• Hunter Jr, Norman W (Atherton, CA; 1960-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Hunter, Robert (San Francisco, CA; 1972, 1977; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hunter, Robert (Sonoma, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hunter Jr, Robert E (Pasadena, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Huntington Botanical Gardens (San Marino, CA; 1971; cultural) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hutchinson Jr, William (Napa County, CA; 1965-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hutchinson Jr, William (San Francisco, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms]
• Hyde, Frank (Richmond, VA; 1957-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hyde Jr, Fritz (Greenwich, CT; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Hyde, Richard (Woodside, CA; 1946-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ichinose, Benjamin (Hillsborough, CA; 1969-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Insurance Company of North America (San Jose, CA; 1949; commercial) [Dr]
• Ireland III, RL (Thomasville, GA; 1971-1974; residential) Collaborator: Jinwright & Ryan; Kimball, RA (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Irmer, David [see Miscellaneous] (Belvedere, CA; 1969; residential)
• Isaacson Sr, Henry C (Orcas Island, WA; 1967; residential) Collaborator: Ayer & Lamping (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Isaacson Sr, Henry C: "The Highlands" (Seattle, WA; 1970; residential) Collaborator: Burr- Richards (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Ivy, Benjamin (Palo Alto, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jackson Square Assoc/City of SF [see Balance Street]
• Jackson, Daniel D (Atherton, CA; 1971-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Jackson, Palmer (Montecito, CA; 1968-1974; residential) Collaborator: Overpeck, WF (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jacobs, JJ (Carmel, CA; 1951-1952; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jacobs, S Nicholas (Ross, CA; 1949; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jacobsen, Allan S (Ross, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Janin, Covington (San Francisco, CA; 1970-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Janss, Mrs Elizabeth (Atherton, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jason, William E (Woodside, CA; 1947; residential) [Dr]
• Jenks, Edward (Montecito, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Jennison, Charles D: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1968-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jewett, Fritz (San Francisco, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jewett, Mrs George F (Spokane, WA; 1960; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Johnson, Deane (Bel Air, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Johnson, George (San Marino, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Johnson III, J Lee (Fort Worth, TX; 1956-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Johnston, George (Hillsborough, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jones, Bill (Modesto, CA; 1948; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Ph]
• Jones, Robert Letts (La Jolla, CA; 1972-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Jones, William R (Waterford, CA; 1972-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Junior League of Palo Alto, Inc (Menlo Park, CA; 1974; cultural) [Ms]
• Kahn, Mrs Samuel (Hillsborough, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kaiser, Leland (Atherton, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kauffman, SS (Atherton, CA; 1949; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Keady, William L (Portola Valley, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kean, Hamilton F (Katonah, NY; 1970-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kearney Jr, Rex T (Sacramento, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Keator (unknown; 1955; residential) Photographer: Fein, P [Dr, Ph]
• Kelham, Bruce (San Francisco, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kelham, Bruce (Oakville, CA; 1961; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Kelley, Thomas B (San Francisco, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kelly, A Dudley (San Francisco, CA; ca. 1955; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Ph]
• Kelly, Mrs Paul (Santa Rosa, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kennedy, Mrs Gerald (San Francisco, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kennedy, Reginald (Kentfield, CA; 1973-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kent, Roger (Kent Woodlands, CA; 1947; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kiely, John R (Kentfield, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kimball, George (Woodside, CA; 1964; residential) [Dr]
• Kimball, George: Robles Drive (Woodside, CA; 1973-1975; residential) Collaborator: Hooper, Olmsted, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Kingsley, LE (San Francisco, CA; 1966; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kingston, Mrs FC (Los Angeles, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Kircher Jr, J Charles (San Jose, CA; 1952-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kirkham, Francis (St. Helena, CA; 1956-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kirkham, Francis (San Francisco, CA; [1948]; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kirkland, AD (Pebble Beach, CA; 1963-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kirkpatrick, Mrs LH: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Kjellstrom, N David (Richmond, VA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Klein, Robert H (Westridge, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kline, David I (Visalia, CA; 1959-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knapp, Gordon [see also McDowell, WP] (Atherton, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knapp, William (Pebble Beach, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knapp, William (San Francisco, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knecht Jr, Gustav (Chalk Hill, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knecht Jr, Gustav (Gilroy, CA; 1959-1960; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Knecht Jr, Gustav (San Francisco, CA; 1950-1951, 1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Knight, Robert (Hillsborough, CA; 1951, 1954, 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Koerber, Harold (Hillsborough, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Kohler, Robert: Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Collaborators</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koshland Jr, Daniel</td>
<td>Lafayette, CA</td>
<td>1966-1967</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer, Charles B</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA</td>
<td>1963-1965</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Stephenson, WR (architect)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuechler III, Henry N</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1967-1974</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn, Charles</td>
<td>[see Meyer, EW]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtzon, Mrs Albert</td>
<td>Los Altos Hills, CA</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, William</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1968-1970</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachman, Mrs Gustav</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1959-1960</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, Howard</td>
<td>Woodside, CA</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamand, Pierre</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamberson, Charles A</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, Hunter</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1967-1968, 1974</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Publishing Co. (Sunset</td>
<td>[Menlo Park, CA]</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang, Otto</td>
<td>Pebble Beach, CA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon, Mrs FD</td>
<td>Menlo Park, CA</td>
<td>1965-1966</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapham, Tony</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Raley, RL (architect)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapkin, Mrs Ruth</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen, Carter</td>
<td>Healdsburg, CA</td>
<td>1958-1970</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughlin, William</td>
<td>Woodside, CA</td>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Jr, Mrs Stewart</td>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leff, Walter</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>1959-1960</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lek, Louie</td>
<td>[see Huff, R: &quot;The Deauville&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenahan, John A</td>
<td>San Mateo, CA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzen, Theodore L</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1961, 1965-1966</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Mrs Orman</td>
<td>[see DeRoos, Robert and Marshall, WR]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Peter</td>
<td>[see Draper, W]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libbey-Smith-Hobson Park</td>
<td>[see City of Ojai]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liese, G Burton</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Collaborator: Lloyd, H &amp; Morgan, WB (architects)</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little, Richard A</td>
<td>Atherton, CA</td>
<td>1972-1974</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan, William B</td>
<td>Hillsborough, CA</td>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, George</td>
<td>Woodside, CA</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, Mrs J Bradley</td>
<td>Woodside, CA</td>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Azalea House (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Collaborator: Fox, RP (architect)</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Conservatory Terrace (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Collaborator: Fox, RP (architect)</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Cowlot (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Flower Gardens (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1972-1975</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Fountain Garden (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Italian Watergardens/Water Garden Area (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1971-1974</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Master Plan &amp; General Layout (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1970-1975</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr, Ph]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Parking Lot (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1973-1975</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Peony Garden [see Flower Gardens]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Pierce House (Kennett Square, PA)</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>[Ms, Dr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Terrace Garden [see Flower Gardens]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Gardens, Inc:</td>
<td>Theater Garden [see Flower Gardens]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Longwood Gardens, Inc: Topiary Garden (Kennett Square, PA; 1973-1974; recreational) [Dr, Ph]
• Longwood Gardens, Inc: Varietal Demonstration Garden (Kennett Square, PA; 1973-1975; recreational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Longwood Gardens, Inc: Vegetable Garden (Kennett Square, PA; 1973; recreational) [Dr]
• Longwood Gardens, Inc: Wisteria Garden [see Flower Gardens]
• Longwood Gardens, Inc: Woodland & Wildflower Areas (Kennett Square, PA; n.d.; recreational) [Dr]
• Maxon, William (Berkeley, CA; 1952, 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Maxon, Harold F (Atherton, CA; n.d.; residential) [Ms]
• Maxwell, Mrs Harriet (Birnam Wood Golf Club, Montecito, CA; 1971; residential) Collaborator: Edwards-Pitman (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• May, Cliff (Los Angeles, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• May, Thomas H (Oakville, CA; 1966-1968; residential) Collaborator: Vedensky, D (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• McAllister, Decker (Burlingame, CA; 1936-1937; residential) [Dr]
• McAllister, Decker [see also MacLean, A] (Hillsborough, CA; 1945-1948; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• McAllister, Elliott (Woodside, CA; 1957; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McBean, Peter (Hillsborough, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McBean, Peter (Woodside, CA; 1952-1957; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McCarthy, E Avery (Montecito, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McClenahan, William (Hillsborough, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• McCollister, Paul (Belmont, CA; 1950; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McCollister, Paul (Atherton, CA; 1950-1952; residential) [Dr]
• McCormack, Douglas (Rio Vista, CA; 1969; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McCormack, Tom (Rio Vista, CA; 1972; residential) Collaborator: Taylor/Huston (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McCrory, Charles (Atherton, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms]
• McDonnell, T Murray (Bel Air, CA; 1968; residential) Collaborator: Benton, DW & Park, DG (architects) [Dr]
• McDowell, William P [see also Knapp, G] (Atherton, CA; 1950-1951; residential) [Dr]
• McEneany, Frank (Oakland, CA; 1939; residential) [Dr]
• McEneany, TE (Oakland, CA; 1938; residential) [Dr]
• McGanney, Daniel (Atherton, CA; 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McGinnis, Frank (Hillsborough, CA; 1972-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McGrew, George M (Kansas City, MO; 1967; residential) Collaborator: Clark Jr, ED (architect); Photographer: Warner Studio [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McGuire, John (San Francisco, CA; 1960; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Ph]
• McGuire, John C (Ross, CA; 1972-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McIntosh, Gordon (Hillsborough, CA; 1955-1957; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• McIntosh, JA [see McIntosh, G]
• McIntyre, Henry L (Atherton, CA; 1968-1970; residential) Collaborator: Vedensky, D (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• McKee, Albert (Woodside, CA; 1933-1935; residential) [Dr]
• McKeon, George R (Hillsborough, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• McNiff, Walter (Woodside, CA; 1958; residential) [Dr]
• Meier, AP (Atherton, CA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Mein Jr, William Wallace (Woodside, CA; 1953, 1978; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect); Rydel, R (landscape architect); Photographer: Parker, M; Braun, E; Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Menuhin, Yehudi (Alma, CA; 1941; residential) [Dr]
• Merrill Foundation [see Wagener, C - Seattle]
• Merryman, John H (Stanford, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Meub, Daniel (Atherton, CA; 1966-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Meyer, Ernest W and Kuhn, Charles (Aptos, CA; 1948; residential) Photographer: Partridge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Michael, Bruce (Woodside, CA; 1969-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Michaela, Alan J (Marysville, CA; 1958-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Milburn, Moritz (Seattle, WA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Milich, Robert (Baltimore, MD; 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Miller, Arjay (Woodside, CA; 1969-1974; residential) Collaborator: Rand, W (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Miller, Henry J (Atherton, CA; 1954-1955; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Miller, Mrs Robert Folger (Hillsborough, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Mills, William N (San Francisco, CA; 1956-1957, 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Milono & Associates (San Francisco, CA; 1976; commercial) [Ms]
• Mintzer, Mrs Lucio M (Menlo Park, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Miottel, John (Berkeley, CA; 1977; residential) Collaborator: Johnson, Leffingwell & Guthrie (landscape architects) [Dr]
• Miscellaneous (various, various) [Ms]
• Mix, Averill Q (Los Gatos, CA; 1971-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Moffitt, Herbert C (Napa Valley, CA; 1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Mondavi, Michael (Oakville, CA; 1973-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Mondavi Winery (Oakville, CA; 1966-1974; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Monteagle, Paige (Oakville, CA; 1952-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Montgomery, John C [see Miscellaneous] (Palo Alto, CA; 1970; residential)
• Moomjian, Richard A (Hillsborough, CA; 1972-1973; residential) Collaborator: Dodd, BC (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Moore, Douglas (San Francisco, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Moore, Joe (Hillsborough, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Moore Jr, William H (Old Lyme, CT; 1965-1969, 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Moore Jr, William H: Hobe Sound (Hobe Sound, Jupiter Island, FL; 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Moore III, William H (Greenwich, CT; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Morris, Mervin G (Atherton, CA; 1971-1974; residential) Collaborator: Stafford, J (landscape architect); Porter, C & Steinwedell, R (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Morris, Richard S [see also Beyer, R] (Colorado Springs, CO; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms]
• Mudd College (Claremont, CA; 1960-1972; educational) Collaborator: Mounce, HW; Stone, E.D. & Ass.; Heit, Schmidt & Thompson (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Mudd, Henry: Beach House ([Los Angeles], CA; 1964-1966; residential) Collaborator: Eggers, Wilkman & Whittle (architects) [Ms, Ph]
• Mudd, Henry T: "Saddle Rock Ranch" ([Los Angeles Co], CA; 1956-1957; residential) [Dr, Ph]
• Mudd, John [see also Fahrney, P - Kent Woodlands] (Kentfield, CA; 1977; residential) [Ms]
• Mudd, Thomas (Woodside, CA; 1970-1972; residential) Photographer: Caddes, C [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Murphy, Mrs Frederick (Atherton, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Murray III, G Donald (Napa, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Murray Jr, Mrs James G (Pebble Beach, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Neff (unknown, ; n.d.; residential) [Ph]
• Nell (n.d.) [Dr]
• Newkorn, Harold (Yuba City, CA; 1946-1950; residential) Collaborator: Wurster & Bernardi (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Noel, Richard C (Glenburn, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• North, Francis (Atherton, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Olney, Robert HP (Cold Spring Harbor, NY; 1964-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• O'Neill, George (Oyster Bay Cove, NY; 1955-1969, 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ophuls, Ernst (Kenwood, CA; 1970-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ophuls, Mrs Ernst (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential-multi) [Ms, Dr]
• Orr, Israel (Sacramento, CA; 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Orrick, Dorothy (San Francisco, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Orrick Jr, William H (Pebble Beach, CA; 1960; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Orrick Jr, William (San Francisco, CA; 1965-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Osgood, Edgar D (Woodside, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
- Oswald, John W (Penn State President's House) (Boalsburg, PA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Otterson, Lee (Colusa, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pabst, Rudolph (Hillsborough, CA; 1968-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Packard, Gordon (Atherton, CA; 1956, 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Papagni Wine Company (Madera, CA; 1974; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Park Merced (San Francisco, CA; 1942-1950; residential-multi) Collaborator: Schultz, L & Ass (architects); Photographer: SEE ALSO VAUGHN COLLECTION [Ph]
- Parker, James (Merced, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Parker, Joseph R (Atherton, CA; 1952-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Peck, Sumner (Fresno, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pederson, Carlton A (Stanford, CA; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Peery, Richard (Palo Alto, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pelott, Hugh [see Hamilton, Hugh]
- Perelle, Charles W (Birnam Wood Golf Club (Montecito, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pester, Russell J (Santa Barbara, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Ph]
- Peterson, Miss Frances (Palo Alto, CA; 1972-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Phelps, Louis J (Atherton, CA; 1951, 1957; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Philbin, Ewing (Woodside, CA; 1959-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Philbrick, Norman (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1956-1957; residential) Collaborator: Huston, PJ (architect) [Ms, Dr]
- Phillips, Clarence A (Belvedere, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Phleger, Herman (Woodside, CA; 1955-1956, 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pierce, Mrs Dickson [see also St. Matthews Church] (San Mateo, CA; 1972-1973; religious) [Ms]
- Poett, Mrs Henry (Hillsborough, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
- Pohlad, Carl R (Minneapolis, WI; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pohlman, HK (Atherton, CA; 1955-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pomroy, William Gallery (San Francisco, CA; 1960; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
- Pope & Talbot, Inc, Port Gamble Museum Entrance (Port Gamble, WA; 1973-1975; cultural) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Pope, George (unknown, n.d.; residential) [Ph]
- Popell, F Harvey (Woodside, CA; 1976; residential) Collaborator: Goodwin & Steinberg Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
- Popper, Mrs Hans (San Francisco, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms]
- Port Gamble [see Pope & Talbot, Inc]
- Potter, David (Lake Tahoe, CA; 1963; residential) [Dr, Ph]
- Potter, David (San Francisco, CA; 1967-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Potter, David (Watsonville, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
- Ponlatoff, Alexander M. (Atherton, CA; 1956; residential) [Dr]
- Power, Alexander (Santa Barbara, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Powell, Stanley (Sonoma County, CA; 1974; residential) [Dr]
- Preston, John (Hillsborough, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Prince, Irving (Harrison, NY; 1956; residential) [Dr]
- Purser, Carr (Brevard, NC; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Quillen, J James (Stanford University) (Palo Alto, CA; 1941, 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Raoul-Duval, Richard (Burlingame Hills, CA; 1938, 1951-1957, 1965-1973; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, WW (architect) [Ms, Dr]
- Ready Jr, Thomas J (Atherton, CA; 1957-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Ready Jr, Thomas J (Pebble Beach, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Redfield, Mrs Peter S [see also Hunter, D - Atherton] (Atherton, CA; 1965-1966, 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Reed III, William Thomas (Fishers Island, NY; 1970-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Reed III, William Thomas (Manakin-Sabot, VA; 1969-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Renning, James A (San Luis Obispo, CA; 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Rheem, RS (Orinda, CA; 1936-1939; residential) Collaborator: Tantau, C (architect) [Dr, Ph]
• Rhinelander, Philip H (Stanford, CA; 1957, 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Rice, J.B. (Belvedere, CA; 1958; residential) [Dr]
• Richmond Chase Company (San Jose, CA; 1947; commercial) [Dr]
• Richmond, Burnell E (San Jose, CA; n.d.; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Rickers, EM (unknown; [1946]; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Ritter Jr, Henry (Atherton, CA; 1957-1959, 1969-1973; residential) Collaborator: Centurion, FJ (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Robbins, Michael (St Helena, CA; 1964-1968, 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Roberts, William E: Albion Rd (Woodside, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Roberts, William E: Winding Way (Woodside, CA; 1961-1962; residential) Photographer: Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Robinson Jr, Hamilton (East Hampton, NY; 1968-1970; residential) Collaborator: Robinson, D (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Rodgers, John B (Hillsborough, CA; 1951-1954, 1961, 1974-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rogers, Emery H (Atherton, CA; 1960-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rolph, Henry R [see Grant School Playground]
• Roos, Robert A (Hillsborough, CA; 1955-1956, 1962-1963, 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rosekrans, John (Woodside, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rosenblum, Bert (Hillsborough, CA; 1952; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Ross, Mrs Lee (Kentfield, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Roth, William P (Woodside, CA; 1961; residential) [Dr]
• Rouse, James W (Baltimore, MD; 1957, 1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rousé, James (Columbia, MD; 1970-1972; residential-multi) [Ms]
• Roush, Carroll J (Westridge, CA; 1959-1960; residential) Photographer: Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Royal Stanford Hotel Company [see Stanford Court Hotel]
• Ruskin, Lewis (Scottsdale, AZ; 1957-1958; residential) Collaborator: Eggers & Wilkman (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Russell, Leon B (San Francisco, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Rutz, Emil (Hillsborough, CA; 1943-1953; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ruweler Sr, Howard (Atherton, CA; 1951-1952; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ruweler Jr, Howard R (Atherton, CA; 1951; residential) Collaborator: Nichols, L (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Sackman, Robert (Atherton, CA; 1960, 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Saint Matthews Episcopal Church [see also Pierce, D] (San Mateo, CA; 1972, 1978-1980; religious) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Saint Raymond’s Church (San Francisco, CA; 1970; religious) [Dr, Ph]
• Sales, Lindley [see Miscellaneous] (Berkeley, CA; 1969; unknown)
• Salinas Municipal Swimming Pool (Salinas, CA; 1944; recreational) Collaborator: Lloyd, FE; Dailey, G (architects) [Dr]
• Salzenstein, Charles A (Peoria, IL; 1958; residential) Collaborator: Verkler & Tinsman (architects); Photographer: Nicholson, ED [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sample, Joseph (Billings, MT; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• San Francisco Newspaper Printing Company [see Chronicle Building]
• San Francisco Redevelopment Agency [see Miscellaneous] (San Francisco, CA; 1969; unknown)
• San Francisco -Strybing Arboretum [see Strybing Arboretum]
• San Francisco War Memorial (San Francisco, CA; 1935; cultural) Collaborator: Brown Jr, A (architect); Vaughan, Leland (landscape architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Sanders, Jerry [see also Earl, A] (Atherton, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Saunders, Robert J (Yuba City, CA; 1956-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Savage Jr, Melvin D (Atherton, CA; 1955-1956; residential) [Ms, Dr]
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• Sayre, Paul (Gig Harbor, WA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Schafer, Jack (Nicasio, CA; 1973-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Schafer, Jack (San Francisco, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms]
• Schatz, John (Palo Alto, CA; 1972-1974; residential) Collaborator: Heid, WE & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Schermerhorn, Amos (Woodside, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Schermerhorn, Mrs Zanita (Palo Alto, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Schilling, AH (Atherton, CA; 1971-1972; residential) Collaborator: Law, JT & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Schindler, Robert A (Hillsborough, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Schmitz, Arthur J (Atherton, CA; 1948, 1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Schreck, Albert (Menlo Park, CA; 1963-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Schroll, Hannes (Woodside, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Schroll, Mrs M (San Francisco, CA; 1956-1957; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Schwarzenbach, JC (Pasadena, CA; 1968-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Scripps College (Claremont, CA; 1968-1975; educational) Collaborator: Mounce, HW & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sears, Pete (Santa Barbara, CA; 1956; residential) Photographer: Wood, CC; Boucher, H [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sears, Robert R (Alpine Hills, CA; 1963-1965; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, WW (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Selfridge, Mrs Bruce (Ross, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Setzer, G Cal (Roseville, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Shafer, Thomas Guy (Woodside, CA; 1956-1957; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Shapiro, Ralph (Los Angeles, CA; 1968-1969; residential) Collaborator: Muir, E (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Shea, Mrs JJ (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Shuey, Charles S (Claremont, CA; 1930; residential) [Dr]
• Shuman, John R (Piedmont, CA; 1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Simpson Jr, Kenneth R (Montecito, CA; 1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Singleton, Henry E (Los Angeles, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Skewes-Cox, Martin V (San Francisco, CA; 1957-1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sletten, Kenneth G (Woodside, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Sloss Jr, Louis (Portola Valley, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sloss Jr, Louis (Forestville, CA; 1974; residential) [Dr]
• Sloss Development (Forestville, CA; 1973-1974; residential-multi) Collaborator: Page, Clowdsley & Baleix (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Smith, G Kemper (San Mateo, CA; 1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Smith, Lawrence (San Francisco, CA; 1957-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Smith, Robert F (Atherton, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Smith, Robert F (San Francisco, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sox Jr, Harold C (Palo Alto, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Sox Jr, Harold C (Cntr for Adv Study in the Behavioral Sci Dir’s House) (Atherton, CA; 1973-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Spanish Bay Hotel, Western International Hotels (Monterey, CA; 1974; commercial) Collaborator: Warnecke, JC & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Spencer, Stephen L (Atherton, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Sperry, Leonard M (Los Angeles, CA; 1952-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sperry Jr, Leonard (Belvedere, CA; 1967; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford Court Hotel (San Francisco, CA; 1970-1973; commercial) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Stanford University: General (Stanford, CA; 1958; educational) [Ms, Ph]
• Stanford University: General Planting Plan (Stanford, CA; 1967; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Alumni Building (Stanford, CA; 1952-1955, 1965-1966; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Bookstore-Post Office Area (Stanford, CA; 1959-1960; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Bowman Alumni House Addition [see Stanford Univ: Alumni Bldg] [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Center for Biological Sciences (Stanford, CA; 1967; educational) Collaborator: Pflueger, MT (architect) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Chemical Engineering Area (Stanford, CA; 1961-1967; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Chemical Engineering Research Lab [see Stanford Univ: Chem Engineering Area] [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Clinical Sciences Research Building (Stanford, CA; 1963-1965; educational) Collaborator: Stone, ED & Pflueger, MT (architects) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Cowell Student Health Center (Stanford, CA; 1966; educational) Collaborator: Kump, EJ Ass (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Crothers Memorial/Hall [see also Toyon & Branner Halls] (Stanford, CA; 1949-1955; educational) Collaborator: Spencer, ET & Ambrose, WC (architects) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Electronics Research Lab (Stanford, CA; 1951, 1958-1959; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Faculty Club (Stanford, CA; 1963-1965; educational) Collaborator: Page, EB (architect) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Faculty Residence [see Stanford Univ: Stern Hall] (Stanford, CA; educational)
• Stanford University: Florence Moore Hall, Residence for Women (Stanford, CA; 1955-1956; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Frost Amphitheater (Stanford, CA; 1972; educational) [Ms]
• Stanford University: General Electric Microwave Laboratory (Stanford, CA; 1951-1955; educational) [Dr, Ph]
• Stanford University: Gilfillan Wing Addition [see Stanford Univ: Electronics Research Lab] [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Graduate School of Business (Stanford, CA; 1964; educational) Collaborator: Pflueger, MT (architect) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Hoover II (Lou Henry Hoover) (Stanford, CA; 1965; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Hoover Tower/Plaza (Stanford, CA; 1965-1966; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Lands Tree Planting/Professional Administration Area (Stanford, CA; 1957; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Law School (Stanford, CA; 1969; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Stanford University: Library Quad (Stanford, CA; 1967-1970; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Light Standards (Stanford, CA; n.d.; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Linear Acceleration Laboratory (Stanford, CA; 1949; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Lomita Mall (Stanford, CA; 1967-1968; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Stanford University: Main Library Development (Stanford, CA; 1968; educational) [Ms]
• Stanford University: Married Student Housing (Stanford, CA; 1958-1960; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Master Plans (Stanford, CA; 1964-1965; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Math Corner (Stanford, CA; 1962-1964; educational) Collaborator: Spencer & Lee (architects) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Medical Center [see Stanford Univ: School of Medicine] (Stanford, CA; educational)
• Stanford University: Memorial Church/Memorial Area [see Stanford Univ: Lomita Mall] (Stanford, CA; educational)
• Stanford University: Memorial Court Area (Stanford, CA; 1973-1975; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Stanford University: Moore House [see Stanford Univ: Florence Moore Hall] (CA; educational)
• Stanford University: Music Building (Stanford, CA; 1957, 1968; educational) [Ms, Dr]
• Stanford University: Nathan Cummings Art Building (Stanford, CA; 1967; educational) Collaborator: Warnecke, JC & Ass (architects) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Organic Chemistry Research Building [see Stanford Univ: Chem Engineering Area] (CA; educational) [Dr]
• Stanford University: Oval (Stanford, CA; 1964; educational) [Dr, Ph]
Stanford University: Palo Alto - Stanford University Hospital (see Stanford Univ: School of Medicine) (CA; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Physics Hall (see Stanford Univ: Science Complex) (CA; educational)

Stanford University: Quad Revisions (Stanford, CA; 1947; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: School of Medicine (Stanford, CA; 1956-1970; educational) Collaborator: Stone, ED & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stanford University: Science Complex (Stanford, CA; 1957; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Seminar Court (see Stanford Univ: Chem Engineering Area) (CA; educational)

Stanford University: Site Plans (Stanford, CA; n.d.; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Space Engineering Building (Stanford, CA; 1966-1968; educational) Collaborator: Spencer, Lee & Busse (architects) [Dr]

Stanford University: Stauffer I, II, III (see Stanford Univ: Chem Engineering Area) (Stanford, CA; educational)

Stanford University: Steam Plant (Stanford, CA; 1958-1959; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Stern Hall (Stanford, CA; 1949-1958; educational) Collaborator: Spencer & Lee (architects) [Dr]

Stanford University: Storke Student Publications Building (Stanford, CA; 1962-1965; educational) [Ms, Dr]

Stanford University: Student Activities Center (Stanford, CA; 1957-1963; educational) [Ms, Dr]

Stanford University: Tanner Pool (see Stanford Univ: Memorial Court Area) (Stanford, CA; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Telephone Exchange Building (Stanford, CA; 1957-1958; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Terman Engineering Center (Stanford, CA; 1973-1974; educational) [Ms]

Stanford University: Toyon - Branner Halls (see also Crothers Hall) (Stanford, CA; 1955-1956; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Tressider Memorial Union (Stanford, CA; 1961-1963; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Undergraduate Library (Stanford, CA; 1964-1966; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University: Undergraduate Men's Housing/Fraternity Group III (Stanford, CA; 1968; educational) Collaborator: Kump, Ej Ass (architect) [Dr]

Stanford University: White Memorial Plaza (Stanford, CA; 1962-1963; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stanford University: William W Keith Jr Memorial Terrace (Stanford, CA; 1967-1968; educational) [Dr]

Stanford University Hospital (see Stanford Univ: School of Medicine) (educational)

Stanton, Robert (Atherton, CA; 1957; residential) [Ms, Dr]

Steenland, Nelson C (Houston, TX; 1957; residential) Collaborator: Lloyd & Morgan (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Steinaecker, Mrs JEA (San Mateo, CA; 1975-1976; residential) [Ms]

Steinberg, Goodwin B (Los Altos Hills, CA; 1971-1973; residential) Collaborator: Steinberg, GB & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stent, Ernie (unknown; [1936]; residential) [Ph]

Stent, Ferdinand R: Occidental (San Mateo, CA; 1953; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stent, Ferdinand R: Seabury Ave (San Mateo, CA; 1956; residential) [Dr]

Sterling, JE Wallace (Atherton, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Sterling, Wallace (Stanford President's House) (Stanford, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]

Stern, Carl (Atherton, CA; 1950-1951; residential) [Ms, Dr]

Stern, Carl W (Kenwood, CA; 1970-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stewart, Robert (Hillsborough, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stone, Norman (Woodside, CA; 1969-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Stovroff, Jeanne (San Francisco, CA; [1974]; residential) [Ms, Dr]

Straus, Robert D (Morelia, Mexico; 1967-1969; residential) Collaborator: Ramirez Bernal, A & R (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Straus, Robert K: Hope Ranch (Santa Barbara, CA; 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Strybing Arboretum, San Francisco, Sunset Magazine Home Demonstration Gardens (San Francisco, CA; 1962-1963; recreational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]

Sullivan, Jerd (San Francisco, CA; 1935; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sullivan, Jerd (Saratoga, CA; 1944; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, WW (architect); Photographer: Baer, M; Partidge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sullivan, Louis (San Jose, CA; 1966-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sullivan, Thomas (Hillsborough, CA; 1959; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sultan, EH (Woodsie, CA; 1956-1958; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sunset Community Center Elementary, Junior & Senior High Schools (San Francisco, CA; 1951; educational) [Dr]
• Sunset Magazine, Home Demonstration Gardens [see Strybing Arboretum]
• Lane Publishing: Sunset Magazine Offices (Menlo Park, CA; 1951; commercial) [Dr, Ph]
• Suppes, Patrick (Stanford, CA; 1956-1957; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Swayne Jr, Lloyd (Lafayette, CA; 1950-1962; residential) Collaborator: Langhorst (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sweet, Donald H (Atherton, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sydnor Jr, Eugene B: Dancing Point (Richmond, VA; 1972-1974; residential) Collaborator: Stewart, RW (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Sydnor Jr, Eugene B: St Andrews Lane (Richmond, VA; 1959, 1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Tarleton, George W (Hillsborough, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
• Taubman, Robert (Atherton, CA; 1965; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Taylor, Robert (Ross, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Teller, Otto [see also Budge, WW] (Hillsborough, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Telles, Frank (Firebaugh, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Texas Medical Center [see Fay Addition to Texas Medical Center]
• Thieriot, Charles DeYoung (Hillsborough, CA; 1958-1959, 1968-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Thierot (San Mateo, CA; ca. 1953; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Dr, Ph]
• Thomas, Gerald (Ross, CA; 1964; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Thompson, Mrs Clint (Modesto, CA; 1974; residential) Collaborator: Esherick, J (architect) [Ms]
• Thorne, Edwin (Greenwich, CT; 1968-1973; residential) Collaborator: Kimball, R (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Thornton (unknown, ; n.d.; residential) [Ph]
• Threlkeld, Jack (Los Banos, CA; 1966; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Titchell, Haskell K (Belvedere, CA; 1971-1974; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Tobin, Cyril R (Hillsborough, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Topham, Edward (Atherton, CA; 1949-1958; residential) Photographer: Parker, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Tower, R Lockwood (Montecito, CA; 1967-1971; residential) Collaborator: Edwards-Pitman (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Towne, Bancroft (Anne) [see also Hunter, D - Woodside] (Woodside, CA; 1959; residential) [Dr]
• Towne, William S (Piedmont, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Tripiano, Thomas (Hillsborough, CA; 1952-1954; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Troyer, JV (Pasatiempo, Santa Cruz, CA; 1944; residential) [Dr]
• Truce, Walter (Atherton, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Tucker, Shepard S (Westridge, San Mateo County, CA; 1954-1955; residential) Collaborator: Thompson, V (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Turner, Everett (Modesto, CA; 1941; residential) Collaborator: Wurster, WW (architect); Photographer: Fein, P [Dr, Ph]
• Tyler, Ralph (Cnt for Adv Study in the Behavioral Sci Dir's House) [see also Sox, HC - Atherton] (Atherton, CA; 1958-1959; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Tyson, WO [see also Ziegler, RB] (Redwood City, CA; 1936; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect) [Dr]
• Unidentified residences (residential) [Dr, Ph]
• University of California: Barrows Hall (Berkeley, CA; 1964; educational) [Dr]
• University of California: Class of 1914 Gift (Berkeley, CA; 1966; educational) [Dr]
• University of California: Cowell Area [see UC: General Campus Improvements] (Berkeley, CA; educational)
- University of California: Cowell Hospital Area [see UC: General Campus Improvements] (Berkeley, CA; educational)
- University of California: Doe Library Area [see UC: General Campus Improvements] (Berkeley, CA; educational)
- University of California: Engineering Complex [see UC: General Campus Improvements] (Berkeley, CA; educational)
- University of California: Environmental Design Building [see UC: Wurster Hall] (Berkeley, CA; educational)
- UC: Forestry Building (Berkeley, CA; 1948; educational) Collaborator: SEE VAUGHAN COLLECTION
- University of California: General Campus Improvements (Berkeley, CA; 1967-1970; educational) [Ms, Dr]
- UC: LeConte Hall (Berkeley, CA; 1950; educational) Collaborator: SEE VAUGHAN COLLECTION
- University of California: Master Plans (Berkeley, CA; 1961, 1966; educational) [Dr]
- University of California: Northside Center (Berkeley, CA; 1966-1971; educational) Collaborator: Milono, G (architect) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Wurster Hall (Berkeley, CA; 1963-1965; educational) Collaborator: Esherick, J (architect) [Dr]
- UC: Plant Science Bldg (Davis, CA; 1949; educational) Collaborator: SEE VAUGHAN COLLECTION
- University of California: Soils and Irrigation (Davis, CA; 1948; educational) Collaborator: Vaughan, HL (architect) [Dr]
- University of California: Arboretum (Santa Cruz, CA; 1965; educational) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Athletic Fields (Santa Cruz, CA; 1964-1965; educational) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Bridges (Santa Cruz, CA; 1965-1969; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: College 2 (Santa Cruz, CA; 1963-1973; educational) Collaborator: Esherick, J (arch); Halprin, L (land arch) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: College 4 (Santa Cruz, CA; n.d.; educational) Collaborator: Royston, Hanamoto, Mayes, & Beck (land archs) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: College 5 (Santa Cruz, CA; 1968-1970; educational) Collaborator: Stubbins, H & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: College 7 (Santa Cruz, CA; 1972-1974; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: College 8 (Santa Cruz, CA; 1972-1974; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: College 9 (Santa Cruz, CA; 1972; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: East Courts (Santa Cruz, CA; 1973; educational) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Fire Station (Santa Cruz, CA; 1972; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: Garden Project (Santa Cruz, CA; 1969; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: General (Santa Cruz, CA; 1961-1975; educational) [Ms, Ph]
- University of California: Landscape School (Santa Cruz, CA; 1971; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: Library (Santa Cruz, CA; 1963-1969; educational) Collaborator: Warnecke, JC & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Lower Quarry (Santa Cruz, CA; 1966-1967; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: Marlowe Memorial Bench (Santa Cruz, CA; 1973; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: Parking Lots (Santa Cruz, CA; 1965-1970; educational) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Performing Arts Area (Santa Cruz, CA; 1966-1971; educational) Collaborator: Rapson, R & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Provost Residence, Stevenson College (Santa Cruz, CA; n.d.; educational) [Dr]
- University of California: Soccer Field (Santa Cruz, CA; 1971; educational) [Dr]
- University of California: Social Science I (Santa Cruz, CA; 1969-1973; educational) Collaborator: Milono, G (architect) [Ms, Dr]
- University of California: Stevenson College [see UC: College 2] (Santa Cruz, CA; educational)
- University of California: Student Health Center (Santa Cruz, CA; 1966; educational) [Ms]
- University of California: University House (Santa Cruz, CA; 1966-1970; educational) Collaborator: Kump, EJ (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• University of California: Upper Quarry (Santa Cruz, CA; 1967-1968; educational) Collaborator: Royston, Hanamoto, Mayes, & Beck (land archs) [Ms, Dr]
• University of Texas, School of Public Health at Houston [see Fay Addition to Texas Medical Center] (medical)
• Upham, Everett (Rio Vista, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Vaillancourt, Robert (Montecito, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Valencia Gardens (San Francisco, CA; n.d.; residential-multi) Collaborator: Wurster, WW, Thomsen Jr, HA (archs) [Dr]
• Valencia St/18th St Apartment Building (San Francisco, CA; n.d.; residential-multi) [Dr]
• Valentine, Edward R (Montecito, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Van Strum, Kenneth S (Hillsborough, CA; 1959-1968, 1975-1976; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Vandenburg, Josephine (San Francisco, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Varian Associates [see also Miscellaneous] (, , )
• Varian Associates: Building 1 (Palo Alto, CA; 1957-1963; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Building 2 (Palo Alto, CA; 1957-1960; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Building 3 (Palo Alto, CA; 1959-1962; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Buildings 4, 4A, 4B, 4C [see also Varian Ass: Bldgs 8, 9, 11] (Palo Alto, CA; 1956-1963; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Varian Associates: Building 6 (Palo Alto, CA; 1962, 1975; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Varian Associates: Building 7 (Palo Alto, CA; 1962-1964; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Buildings 8, 9, 11 [see also Varian Ass: Bldgs 4-4C] (Palo Alto, CA; 1956-1963; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Varian Associates: Building 9 (Palo Alto, CA; 1959-1961; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Varian Associates: Court II (Palo Alto, CA; n.d.; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Court, Building 8 (Palo Alto, CA; 1961-1962; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: El Camino (Palo Alto, CA; 1959-1963; commercial) [Ms]
• Varian Associates: Interior Court (Palo Alto, CA; 1955-1956; commercial) [Dr]
• Varian Associates: Parking Lots (Palo Alto, CA; 1961; commercial) [Ms]
• Varian Associates: Recreation Area [see Varian Ass: Court II]
• Varian Associates: Site Plans, Master Plans, General (Palo Alto, CA; 1959-1964; commercial) [Ms, Dr]
• Vaughn, Jim H (Woodside, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Veitch, Stephen (Atherton, CA; 1965-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Villa Taverna [see also office Records] (San Francisco, CA; 1969; commercial) [Ms]
• Villard Jr, Mrs Oswald G (Woodside, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms]
• Wachhorst, Wyn (Atherton, CA; 1973-1975; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Wade, Henry [see also Henry, JE] (Westridge, CA; 1965-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Wagner Jr, Corydon (Tacoma, WA; 1965-1977; residential) Photographer: Parker, M; Pearson, CR [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Wagner Jr, Corydon: Harvard St (Seattle, WA; 1969-1974; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Wagner III, Corydon (Tacoma, WA; 1961-1966; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Waldman, Murry J (Atherton, CA; 1967; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Walker, Brooks (San Francisco, CA; 1957-1958, 1974; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Walker Jr, Brooks (Atherton, CA; 1966-1967; residential) Photographer: Channing, Philip [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Walker, Mrs Clinton (Atherton, CA; 1952; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Walker, Mrs S (Atherton, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
• Wallace, Peter (Atherton, CA; 1961-1962; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Wallace, Peter (Woodside, CA; 1966-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Walt, Malcolm (Alamo, CA; 1960-1962; residential) Collaborator: Appleton & Wolfard (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Warden Jr, Herbert W [see Birnam Wood Golf Club: Warden Jr, HW] (Montecito, CA; 1969-70; ) [Dr]
- Wascana Centre Authority (Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada; 1961-1970; recreational) Collaborator: Yamasaki, Y & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Waters Jr, Robert A (Hillsborough, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Watling Jr, John W (Santa Barbara, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms]
- Watson, Charles (San Francisco, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms]
- Watt, RG (Redding, CA; 1949-1950; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wattis, Paul L (San Francisco, CA; 1958-1959; residential) Photographer: Baer, M [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Weber (Atherton, CA; 1940; residential) [Dr]
- Webster, Frank G (Woodside, CA; 1967-1970; residential) Photographer: Christiansen, GM [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Weidlein, John (Pittsburgh, PA; 1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Weingarten, John (Menlo Park, CA; 1956; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Wells, Mrs. George (San Francisco, CA; 1976; unknown) [Ms]
- Wells-Sloss et al Development [see Sloss Development]
- West, Frank (Stockton, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Western International Hotels: Del Monte Hotel [see Del Monte Hotel]
- Western International Hotels: Spanish Bay Hotel [see Spanish Bay Hotel];
- Westgate, Edward W. (Napa, CA; 1972; residential) Collaborator: MacKinlay, I & Winnacker, G & Ass (archs) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Weyerhaeuser, Mrs. George (Tacoma, WA; 1970-1971; residential) Collaborator: Burr, DF & Ass (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wheary, Eugene C (Carmel, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wheeler, Franklin (Hillsborough, CA; 1977; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wheeler, Leslie (San Francisco, CA; 1958-1960, 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wheeler, Mrs. Frederick (St. Helena, CA; 1946; residential) [Dr, Ph]
- Whelan, John (Palo Alto, CA; 1967-1968; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- White, Anthony (Hillsborough, CA; 1971-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Widrow, Sidney (Atherton, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wilbur, Brayton (Hillsborough, CA; 1972-1973; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wiley, Mrs James (San Francisco, CA; 1964-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Willard, Harry G. (Menlo Park, CA; 1954; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg (Williamsburg, VA; 1970-1975; mixed-use) Collaborator: Nelson, G & Chadwick, G (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Willoughby, Rodney E. (Hillsborough, CA; 1970-1972; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wilson, David K. (Nashville, TN; 1965-1967; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wilson Jr, Milton (Lincoln, CA; 1975; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Wilson Jr, Milton (San Francisco, CA; 1959-1960, 1968-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr]
- Wilson Jr, Milton (Wellington, NV; 1973; residential) [Ms, Ph]
- Winters, Ray R (Hillsborough, CA; 1963-1964; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wiselogel, Charles (Lafayette, IA; 1950; residential) [Dr]
- Witherspoon, Jackson T (Palo Alto, CA; 1964-1965; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Witter, Guy (Pasadena, CA; 1948-1949; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wolcott III, Mrs Samuel (San Francisco, CA; 1974; residential) [Ms]
- Wolff, George: Jordan Ave (San Francisco, CA; 1970-1971; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wolff, Mrs George (Jean): Chestnut St (San Francisco, CA; 1950-1951; residential-multi) Collaborator: Mendelsohn, E (architect); Photographer: Lyon, F; Fredrick, G; Manly, E; Channing, P. [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wood, Carter (New Canaan, CT; 1962-1963; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wood Jr, James T (Pasadena, CA; 1967-1969; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
- Wood, Marvin (Atherton, CA; 1947-1953; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Woodard, William R (Montecito, CA; 1972; residential) [Ms, Dr]
• Woodman, Dean (Atherton, CA; 1973; residential) [Ms]
• Woodside Priory School (Portola Valley, CA; 1969-1971; educational) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Woolpert, Bruce G (Watsonville, CA; 1959-1961; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Work Jr, Thomas A (Pebble Beach, CA; 1968; residential) Collaborator: Concolino, W (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Wright, Dale J (Peoria, IL; 1966; residential) [Ms, Ph]
• Wurtzburger, Mrs Janet: Wurtzburger Museum (Stevenson, MD; 1971-1973; cultural) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ying, Eugene (Selema, CA; 1964-1965; residential) Collaborator: May, C (architect) [Ms, Dr]
• Zall, Sam (Yuba City, CA; 1952-1956, 1969-1970; residential) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Zelinsky, Mervin G (Atherton, CA; 1947-1948, 1956; residential) Photographer: Robinson, J; Partridge, R [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Ziegler, RB [see also Tyson, WO] (Redwood City, CA; 1965; residential) Collaborator: Dailey, G (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Zischke, Peter H (Orinda, CA; 1969-1971; residential) Collaborator: Brandenburger, D (architect) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Zlot, Harold S (Ross, CA; 1970-1971; residential) Collaborator: Walker & Moody (architects) [Ms, Dr, Ph]
• Zweng, H Christian (Atherton, CA; 1975-1976; residential) Collaborator: Johnson, Leffingwell & Ass (landscape architects) [Ms, Dr]
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I. Office Records, ca. 1942-1977

A. Prospects

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged alphabetically by geographical region.
Contains a few sketches and correspondence between Church and prospective clients.

B. Public Relations

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged by record type, alphabetically within.
Correspondence, photographs, and a small number of clippings related to the publication of Church's work, articles by Church, and articles about him.

C. Photographic Subject Files

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged alphabetically.
Consists primarily of photographs, with clippings and printed material also included.
Images of landscape structures and details predominate.
I. Office Records, ca. 1942-1977

D. Photographs

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged alphabetically. Photographs of completed projects as well as portraits and photographic studies taken during foreign travel.

E. Exhibit Boards

Scope and Content Note
Mounted photographs and drawings of projects created for exhibitions and presentations.

F. Carolyn Caddes Files

Scope and Content Note
Photographs and correspondence files created by photographer Carolyn Caddes. The photographs include portraits of Church, photographs of his office, and some images of his completed projects.

Boxes 12-109, Tubes

II. Project Record, 1933-1977

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged alphabetically by client. Contains correspondence, drawings, photographs, clippings and drawings. The majority of drawings are interfiled with the textual records. Over two hundred projects are included. Though the bulk of the records relate to residential commissions, Church’s corporate and institutional projects are well-documented. These include the Caterpillar Company, Longwood Gardens, Stanford University, and University of California, Santa Cruz. Researchers should note that additional photographs are located in the first series, Office Records. Additional photographs and drawings can be found in the final series.

A. Files

B. Drawings

Digital Images

Blackwood (H.C.) Residence, Menlo Park, CA, 1949  ark:/28722/bk0000n5j97
Bradley (John D.) Residence, Hillsborough, CA, 1939-1940  ark:/28722/bk0000n5n41
Butcher (Preston) Residence, Menlo Park, CA, 1973-1975  ark:/28722/bk0000n5g9t
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, CA, 1953-1955, 1966-1967  ark:/28722/bk0000n5r8s
Dohrmann (Bruce) Residence, St. Helena, CA, 1963-1972  ark:/28722/bk0000n5v3k
Donnell (Dewey) Residence, Sonoma, CA, 1947-1954  ark:/28722/bk0000n5z6s
Halstead (Emine) Residence, Atherton, CA, 1944-1974  ark:/28722/bk0000n6413
Goldsmith (Louis R.) Residence, Palo Alto, CA, 1967-1968  ark:/28722/bk0000n658g
Henderson (Wellington) Residence, Hillsborough, CA, 1958-1959  ark:/28722/bk0000n687g
II. Project Record, 1933-1977

Digital Images

Thomas D. Church Collection, 1933-1977

Hunter, Jr. (Norman) Residence, Atherton, CA, 1960-1962
ark:/28722/bk0000n6b82

Kirkham (Francis) Residence, San Francisco, CA, 1948
ark:/28722/bk0000n6d5f

Longwood Gardens, Kennett Square, PA, 1970-1975
ark:/28722/bk0000n6g2t

Lyons (Richards) Residence, Berkeley, CA, 1959
ark:/28722/bk0000n6m7n

Martin (Charles D.) Residence, Aptos, CA, 1947-1948
ark:/28722/bk0000n6p0t

Meyer (Ernest W.) and Kuhn (Charles) Residence, Aptos, CA, 1948
ark:/28722/bk0000n6r1d

Mudd (Thomas) Residence, Woodside, CA, 1970-1972
ark:/28722/bk0000n6s8s

Raoul-Duval (Richard) Residence, Burlingame Hills, CA, 1938-1973
ark:/28722/bk0000n6v55

Rheem (R.S.) Residence, Orinda, CA, 1936-1939
ark:/28722/bk0000n6w44

Shuey (Charles S.) Residence, Claremont, CA, 1930
ark:/28722/bk0000n727v

Sperry (Leonard M.) Residence, Los Angeles, CA, 1952-1953
ark:/28722/bk0000n732m

Sullivan (Jerd) Residence, San Francisco, CA, 1935
ark:/28722/bk0000n757d

Tower (R. Lockwood) Residence, Montecito, CA, 1967
ark:/28722/bk0000n770k

Ross and Whipple Residences, Contra Costa County, CA, 1933
ark:/28722/bk0000n7b3s

University of California, Berkeley, CA, 1963-1971
ark:/28722/bk0000n7b8j

Varian Associates, Palo Alto, CA, 1956-1964
ark:/28722/bk0000n7d1q

United States Housing Authority (Valencia Gardens), San Francisco, CA, 1956-1964
ark:/28722/bk0000n7h0q

Wheeler (Mrs. Frederick) Residence, St. Helena, CA, 1946
ark:/28722/bk0000n7h9p

Phillips (Clarence A.) Residence, Belvedere, CA, 1956
ark:/28722/bk0000n7j8n

McAllister (Decker) Residence, Hillsborough, CA, 1945-1948
ark:/28722/bk0000n7m1t

Exhibit Panels, ca. 1940
ark:/28722/bk0000n7n0s

Clark (G.D.) Residence, Atherton, CA, 1952-1955
ark:/28722/bk0000n7r76

Gardiner (John) Residence, Kentfield, CA, 1962-1964
ark:/28722/bk0000n7t0c

Giffin (Michael) Residence, Fresno, CA, 1952-1953
ark:/28722/bk0000n7t9b

Russell (Leon B.) Residence, San Francisco, CA, 1949-1950
ark:/28722/bk0000n7w6q

Skewes-Cox (Martin V.) Residence, San Francisco, CA, 1957-1958
ark:/28722/bk0000n817t

Stanford University: Math Corner, Stanford, CA, 1962-1964
ark:/28722/bk0000n822k

Wolff (Mrs. George) Residence, San Francisco, CA, 1950-1951
ark:/28722/bk0000n831j

ark:/28722/bk0000n840n

Zelinsky (Mervin G.) Residence, Atherton, CA, 1947-1956
ark:/28722/bk0000n8458

Hiatt (R.S.) Residence, Modesto, CA, 1939-1940
ark:/28722/bk0000n858f

Flat Files

III. Display Boards, ca. 1939

Scope and Content Note
Contains thirteen multimedia boards illustrating projects completed with William Wurster and Gardner Dailey. These were assembled by Robert Royston for Church's store, Cargoes.

Boxes 110-114

IV. Additional Donations, ca. 1937, 1980s

Scope and Content Note
Arrangement
Arranged alphabetically within subseries.

Contains photographs and drawings of Church projects, donated separately. Photographs may be from the 1983 edition of "Gardens Are for People."
IV. Additional Donations, ca. 1937, 1980s

A. Photographs

B. Drawings

C. Rheem Residence Drawings

D. Shuey Residence Drawing
Drawing of proposed additions to the domestic tank house on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in the 1970s

Drawing of a proposed shelter trellis on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in the 1970s
GENERAL NOTES: (FOR PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE)

CONCRETE:
NEW CONC. FOOTING AS DETAILED.

CARPENTRY:
NEW FLOOR, FRAMING FOR TOP LIVING FLOOR,
NEW BALCONY, RAILINGS, SUPPORTS, ETC.,
NEW WALLS & PARTITIONS @ BEDROOM FLOOR & STAIR.
RECONSTRUCT AND/OR REPAIR EXISTING DOOR & FRAMING.
EXTERIOR WALLS: NEW RND. HORIZ. BOARDS

INTERIOR FINISH:
GYPS. BOARD @ ALL WALLS & CEILINGS

GLASS & GLAZING:
NEW WD. FRAMEO OR ALUM. WINDOWS IN EXISTING OPENINGS.
NEW ALUM. SLIDING GLASS DOOR @ TOP LIVING FLOOR,

INSULATION:
AT ALL EXTERIOR WALLS & TOP FLOOR CEILING: FIBERGLAS

RESILIENT FLOORING: 3/8" VINYL ASBESTOS TILE @ ALL FLOORS;
SHEET VINYL PLANKING @ KITCHEN & BATHRM

PAINTING:
ALL INTERIOR SURFACES PAINTED (GYPS. BD) 2 COATS LATER.
EXTERIOR: 2 COATS OIL STAIN

PLUMBING: NEW W.C. & LAV. & BATH, REUSE (3) TUBS,
NEW 50 GALL. WATER HEATER, REMOVAL (3) KITCHEN SINK,

ELECTRICAL:
NEW PANELBOARD, NEW CIRCUITS, OUTLETS, & RECEPTACLES

HEATING: INSTALL (3) NEW TEM. WARM AIR (BUTANE) FURNACES (1 PER FLOOR
(CIRCULATING WALL TYPE - NO FLUE) READY TO Retrofit

Notes on the proposed additions to the domestic tank house on Stern Ranch written by Germano Milono in the 1970s
Drawing of a proposed addition to one of the houses on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in 1971
Drawing of the domestic tank house on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in 1972
Drawing of the domestic tank house on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in 1972
Drawing of the pool house drawn by Germano Milono in 1974
Drawing of proposed additions to one of the houses on Stern Ranch drawn by Germano Milono in the 1970s
Photos of the Stern house and pool from the Germano Milono collection
Drawing of the landscape around the Stern house drawn by Thomas Church in 1971
Appendix G- Caretaker Document

*An unknown former caretaker of the Stern Ranch wrote this document about the responsibilities and duties of the caretaker staff. It was given to the author by Sugarloaf Ridge State Park management.
This can be a list of the responsibilities of the position which Diane and I occupy here at the ranch. Mrs. Stern asked for them and so I'll try to develop a list that includes everything. As well as a list I should include a description of the job, so as to capture some of the vital but tacit nuances that I have found to be a part of the job.

The position is an unsalaried one. Payment for the performance of our duties and responsibilities comes from free rent and utilities. It also derives in no small way from the exceedingly beautiful and peaceful surroundings here.

In return for this living situation, perform certain tasks and maintain general responsibility for certain aspects of the operation. Unless other arrangements are made we take instructions from Mrs. Stern, and are responsible to her. In this way I believe our relationship with the caretaking couple can best be described of any strain that might otherwise develop. We are neighbors, in close proximity, and it is very important that we are able to get along smoothly. Towards this end it is one of the main duties of this position to maintain a constant cooperative attitude with the other couple.

The responsibilities of the position are:

1. The watering of all the various plants in the compound and at the swimming pool.
   a. This includes adjustment and maintenance of the various watering systems. The caretaker of course may be asked for assistance if it is required.
   b. Tacit in this is responsibility for a continuous familiarity of the water system, from the springs, to the tanks, and including all the various pipelines and valves. During the dry months, especially late summer, an awareness of the amount of water available must be maintained. During exceptionally dry periods the water may have to be rationed.
   c. After the rains have begun in earnest, usually by mid-November, take in all the hoses and sprinkler attachments. Drain and coil the hoses and put them in one of the sheds for the rest of the winter.
   d. Follow the watering schedule religiously, it is a daily task which cannot be put off. If there is a need to be gone all day during the watering season, be sure to have the caretaker perform that day’s watering for you.

2. Sweeping the leaves from the deck around Mrs. Stern’s house.
   a. There is a large push broom, and several small brooms. Combining the two it is usually possible to get most of the detritus debris off the deck.
   b. When the deck was built, adequate spacing of the 2 x 6 decking was not provided. As a result it is usually clogged with detritus. There is not much we can do about this, but once, this last year the caretaker took an old pruning saw blade on the end of a pole and worked it through all the cracks of the deck. During the summer months, when the deck is dry, perhaps the saw could be used on small sections of the deck each week. Who is responsible for this is open for discussion.
   c. Leaves collect around the bases of the various oaks that are growing through the holes that have been provided for them in the deck. It is my feeling that they should be left in place to act as a mulch during the summer, but should be removed at the beginning of the rainy season so as not to encourage rot around the bases of the trees.

3. Helping Mrs. Stern one of the week-end days that she is here.
   a. One person of the couple should be here to help Mrs. Stern on one of the days that she is here. Usually the caretaker helps her on one of the other days.
   b. She does not always require help, so on such occasions that you need to take the weekend off, be sure to check with her ahead of time.

4. Being here so as to give the caretakers time off.
   a. Arrangements should be made with the caretakers as to providing them with time off as they need it. This can be either a regular day of the week that you are here, or it can be a floating day that you agree to in each week with them.
   b. From time to time longer periods of time away from the ranch might be desired by either the caretakers or yourselves. In either case arrangements should be made in advance to cover each other’s responsibilities. Mrs. Stern should always, of course, be kept abreast of your plans.
Aside from this list of specific responsibilities, there are some general responsibilities that are just as much a part of the job. Ownership goes beyond the legal definition. Act as though this was your land, in a way, it is. A nurturing sense of responsibility will no doubt develop. Listen to this sense and be guided by it. The backbone of our agreement with Mrs. Stern is, The ranch comes first." Ask, "What is best for the land?"

As part of these general responsibilities, it is good to keep a fairly regular watch on the off the road areas. The older couple might be somewhat less active or motivated to explore all the canyons and far flung boundary lines than yourselves. A sweep along the Bear creek drainage is every so often is a good idea. Camping just has to be discouraged, especially in the dry months when the fire danger often reaches the extreme. It is up to the younger couple here to do that. Although the park personnel are always co-operative, they do not keep a real close eye on the boundary lines between us.

Also, the old ranch house that you live in needs a certain amount of maintenance. General homeowner's repairs can usually be done by either yourselves or the caretaker. If something comes up which is too big for either of you then make arrangements for outside help. Mrs. Stern is usually glad to pay for materials. Always check with her before undertaking any such repair.

Each year wood must be gotten. There is a chainsaw on the ranch which is available. I have found that about 3 cords of good wood will keep the whole house warm all winter with little if any supplementary use of the gas heater, which is in the house. There is a rack on the south side of the house, under the overhang.
Appendix H- Department of Parks and Recreation Application and Permit to Conduct Archaeological Investigations/Collections
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Application and Permit to Conduct Archaeological Investigations/Collections

Instructions: Application must be Typewritten with original signatures on original and four photocopies of the application. USGS topographic map and other maps showing precise location of proposed work must be attached.

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION
Sonoma State University/Anthropological Studies Center
1801 East Cotati Avenue, Rohnert Park, CA 94928

PHONE NUMBER
(707) 664-2381

STATE PARK UNIT
Sugarloaf Ridge State Park
COUNTY
Sonoma

ETHNOGRAPHIC AREA/ANTIQUE PERIOD
USGS QUADRANGLE
1954 USGS Kenwood 7.5-minute quadrangle
TOWNSHIP(S) 7N
SECTION(S) 15 and 16
RANGE(S) 6W
UTM

1. The aims, purposes, and methods of this investigation will be as follows (attach continuation sheets as necessary. For excavations, provide a research design and an outline of the report to be provided):

The aim of this cultural resource investigation of the Stern Ranch property is to identify and record any cultural resources within the area, which will inform the management and interpretation of these cultural resources. The purpose of the investigation is to produce a plan to protect resources from future damage and to better our understanding of the history of the property. (See continuation sheet)

2. Expected duration of project (specify dates of field investigations, laboratory studies, and report completion):

Field work will be conducted during the fall and winter of 2013 and the spring of 2014. The estimated date of report is December 2014. DPR will be provided with a copy of the completed thesis.

3. General scope and nature of applicant organization's activities and goals:

Field work will include a pedestrian survey over most of the 500-acre Stern Ranch property in order to identify and cultural resources. This field work will inform a plan to manage, protect and interpret these resources.

4. Name, title, address, telephone, and affiliation of principal investigator (Attach resume or curriculum vitae):

Adrian Preatzelli, Ph.D., Director of the Anthropological Studies Center and professor at Sonoma State University,
1801 East Cotati Avenue, Bldg. 29 Rohnert Park, CA 94928
(707) 664-2381
5. Name, address, affiliation and telephone number of person in actual direct charge of field work (attach resume and curriculum vitae if different from #4):

Lacey Klopp, Archaeological Technician at the Anthropological Studies Center and student in the Cultural Resource Management program at Sonoma State University. 1801 East Cotati Avenue, Bldg. 29 Rohnert Park, CA 94928
(707) 664-2381

6. Laboratory work will take place at (institution, address, phone number, person to contact):

No Laboratory will be conducted.

7. Name and location of facility that has agreed to curate materials collected under this permit (must meet requirements under Standard Conditions and Restrictions):

No material will be collected.

I have read and agree to adhere to the Standard Conditions and Restrictions. I am currently holding the following Archaeological Permit(s) with the Department of Parks and Recreation (list all for which any part is incomplete):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT ARCHAEOLOGIST REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-24-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT APPROVAL</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>7-30-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT RESOURCE GEOLOGIST REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE CENTER ARCHAEOLOGIST REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURATOR OF STATEWIDE RECORDS REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL HERITAGE SUPERVISOR APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICANT MUST CARRY THIS PERMIT AT ALL TIMES WHILE COLLECTING

PERMIT VALID FROM 8-15-13 TO 8-15-14

PERMIT CONDITIONS:

DPR 412A
STANDARD CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS
(ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERMITS)

Only archaeological material may be collected under issuance of this permit. All artifacts and specimens collected remain the property of the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation. The applicant is responsible for arranging for the curation, accession, safeguarding, and preservation of all materials collected in accordance with accepted museum standards. These arrangements must be made with the Curator of Statewide Records (916-324-0192) prior to application for the permit. Any plan must address the continuing availability of the collection for public observation, scientific study, and display if curated (on loan) to institutions outside of DPR facilities. Artifacts must be cataloged using DPR accession numbers, which are to be obtained at the beginning of the project from the DPR Curator of Statewide Records (916-324-0192). It is the responsibility of the permit holder to provide DPR with four (4) copies of all catalogs, field notes, photographs, and reports, even if curation is arranged in a facility not under the control of DPR. Collection should be accomplished by methods that conserve resources and must be of some tangible benefit to the State Park System. The collections shall be used for scientific and educational purposes dedicated to public benefit only and shall in no case be used for commercial purposes or personal profit.

Permits must be approved by both the Cultural Heritage Supervisor and District Superintendent before work begins. All work to be accomplished shall be discussed with the District Superintendent prior to beginning of field work. The District Superintendent may specify additional restrictions or conditions due to site sensitivity, natural hazards in the area, visitor traffic patterns, etc. Field work shall be scheduled with the District Superintendent or Designee, who shall be contacted immediately upon arrival in the Park Unit. Should unanticipated changes in Park conditions occur during the course of the field work, additional restrictions may be required for reasons of health, safety, and resource protection. Direct any questions regarding this Permit to the Supervisor, Cultural Heritage Section, Cultural Resources Division.

Plant life and other features shall not be disturbed without permission of Department staff. After excavation, restore the area to as near its former condition as possible. Park unit staff should be consulted before and after backfilling for suggestions and approval.

Permits are issued for one year or a portion thereof. Within six (6) months of permit expiration and at least thirty (30) days prior to filing final reports with any other agency, Permittee agrees to provide the Department of Parks and Recreation with four (4) copies of all site survey records, survey and excavation reports, photographs, and artifact and specimen catalogs for review. A final report is required within a year. Two (2) sets of the above specified documents will be sent to the District Superintendent, and two (2) to the Cultural Heritage Supervisor. Copies of any materials published shall be submitted to the Department and should include an acknowledgement of the Department of Parks and Recreation. For continuing studies, submit a new application with four copies of a progress report. Permittee agrees to file copies of archaeological reports and site records with the appropriate Regional Information Center.

Applicant agrees to indemnify, save harmless, and defend the State of California, its officers, agents, and employees against any and all claims, demands, damages, losses or liability of its officers, agents, and employees due or incident to, either in whole or in part, whether indirectly connected with, the activities described in this Permit or arising out of or in any way connected with or incident to the Permit issued from this application. In the event State is named as defendant under the provisions of Government Code Section 895 et seq., the Permittee shall notify State of such fact and shall represent State in such legal action unless State undertakes to represent itself as defendant in such legal action, in which event State shall bear its own litigation costs, expenses and attorney’s fees. The Applicant, its officers, agents, employees, or others holding permits under this application, acting in the performance of this agreement, are not officers, agents, or employees of the State.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION ADDRESSES:

Supervisors
Cultural Heritage Section
Cultural Resources Division
Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Curator of Statewide Records
Museum Collections Section,
Cultural Resources Division
2505 Port Street
West Sacramento, CA 95691

DPR 412A
Continuation Sheet

Question 1 Continued:
Pertinent information will be gathered through archival research and a pedestrian survey that will be conducted of most of the 500-acre property. The on-foot mixed strategy survey will be conducted in 5- to 15- feet wide linear transects. Cultural resources found during survey will be recorded on DPR 523 forms. The data will contribute to a cultural resource management plan that will be produced as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Cultural Resources Management at Sonoma State University.
Permit Extension
1 message

Parkman, Edward@Parks  <Edward.Parkman@parks.ca.gov>  Mon, Aug 25, 2014 at 3:03 PM
To: Lacey Klopp <laceyklopp@gmail.com>

Hello Lacey:

The purpose of this e-mail is to extend your existing Archaeological Permit for conducting fieldwork at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park (Stern Ranch) for an additional year, effective immediately. Please print this message out and attach to the hard copy of your existing permit, which you should carry with you when working in the park. Thank you for your good work inventorying the cultural resources of the Stern Ranch at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. If you have any questions or requests, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Best Wishes, Breck

E. Breck Parkman, RPA
Senior State Archaeologist
California State Parks
845 Casa Grande Road
Petaluma, CA 94954
TEL: 707-769-5652 x216
FAX: 707-769-5675
edward.parkman@parks.ca.gov