

Appendix G-1

Cultural Resources Background Information

Appendix G. Cultural Resources Background Information

This information was compiled by ICF cultural resources specialists to provide additional background information to supplement the information contained in Section 2.5, Cultural Resources, of the Initial Study prepared for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection Project. Additionally, ICF prepared the Historic Resources Evaluation Report and the Archaeological Survey Report, which are separately bound documents (2014).

G.1. Ethnography

At the time of European contact, the Bay Area was occupied by a group of Native Americans whom ethnographers refer to as the Ohlone or Costanoan. The Ohlone are a linguistically defined group composed of several autonomous tribelets that spoke eight different but related languages. The Ohlone languages, together with Miwok, comprise the Utian language family of the Penutian stock. The territory of the Ohlone people extended along the coast from the Golden Gate in the north to just below Carmel to the south, and as far as 60 miles inland (Levy 1978:485–486).

The Project area lies within the tribal group known as the Huchiun. The Huchiun appear to have had extensive land along the East Bay shore, from Temescal Creek opposite the Golden Gate north at least to the lower San Pablo and Wildcat Creek drainages in the present area of Richmond. The first large groups of Huchiuns came to Mission San Francisco in the fall of 1794, where they were identified as “Jutchiunes-All from the northeast of the mission”. Somewhere before 1820, the Mission founded a cattle ranch in the Richmond, San Pablo area, which they called “San Ysidro of the Juchiunes”. That mission ranch, taken over during the 1820s by the Castro family, became the Mexican rancho called “San Pablo, alias Los Cuchiyunes” (Milliken 1995:243).

Seven Spanish missions were founded in Ohlone territory between 1776 and 1797. While living within the mission system, the Ohlone commingled with other groups, including the Esselen, Yokuts, Miwok, and Patwin. Mission life was devastating to the Ohlone population. It has been estimated that in 1776, when the first mission was established in Ohlone territory, the Ohlone population numbered around 10,000. By

1832, the Ohlones numbered less than 2,000 as a result of introduced disease, harsh living conditions, and reduced birth rates (Cook 1943a, 1943b in Levy 1978:486).

Under the Mexican government, secularization of the mission lands began in earnest in 1834. The indigenous population scattered away from the mission centers, and the few that were given rancherias from the mission lands were ill-equipped to maintain or work their land. Most of the former mission land was divided among loyal Mexican subjects, and the Ohlone who chose to remain in their ancestral territory usually became squatters. Some were given jobs as manual laborers or domestic servants on Mexican ranchos or, later, American cattle ranches. During the next few decades, there was a partial return to aboriginal religious practices, particularly shamanism, and some return to food collection as a means of subsistence (Levy 1978:486–487).

Although they have yet to receive formal recognition from the federal government, the Ohlone are becoming increasingly organized as a political unit and have developed an active interest in preserving their ancestral heritage. In the later part of the twentieth century, the Galvan family of Mission San José worked closely with the American Indian Historical Society and “successfully prevented destruction of a mission cemetery that lay in the path of a proposed freeway. These descendants incorporated as the Ohlone Indian Tribe, and now hold title to the Ohlone Indian Cemetery in Fremont” (Yamane 1994 in Bean 1994:xxiv). Many Ohlone are active in maintaining their traditions and advocating for Native American issues.

G.2. Prehistory

Milliken et al. (2007) present a series of culture changes in the Bay Area. The period of occupation during the cal 11,500 to 8000 B.C., when Clovis big-game hunters, then initial Holocene gatherers, presumably lived in the area, lacks evidence, because such evidence has likely been washed away by stream action, buried under more recent alluvium, or submerged on the continental shelf (Rosenthal and Meyer 2004:1). There is evidence, however, that an in-place forager economic pattern began around cal 8000 B.C., and was followed by five cycles of change that began at approximately cal 3500 B.C.

G.2.1. Early Holocene (Lower Archaic), cal 8000–3500 B.C.

During this time period, the archaeological record displays artifacts such as wide-stemmed point types that are typified by the relatively well-represented Borax Lake Wide Stem. Milling implements such as handstones and milling slabs were more prevalent, signifying the increased use of, and reliance on, plant resources. Small, far-ranging groups represented a mobile forager settlement pattern (Fredrickson 1989); however, their activities are more visible in the archaeological record. Furthermore, social systems appeared to develop and be more elaborate (Milliken et al. 2007:114).

G.2.2. Early Period (Middle Archaic), cal 3500–500 B.C.

Several technological and social developments characterize this period in the Bay Area. Rectangular *Haliotis* and *Olivella* shell beads, the markers of the Early Period bead horizon, continued in use until at least 2,800 years ago (Ingram 1998; Wallace and Lathrop 1975:19). The mortar and pestle were first documented in the Bay Area shortly after 4000 B.C., and by 1500 cal B.C., cobble mortars and pestles, and not millingslabs and handstones, were used at sites throughout the Bay Area, including ALA-307 (West Berkeley) and ALA-483 (Livermore Valley) (Wiberg 1996:373).

G.2.3. Lower Middle Period (Initial Upper Archaic), cal 500 B.C.–cal A.D. 430

Although it is unclear when the “major disruption in symbolic integration systems” originated, it is clear in the record around 500 B.C. and may have begun several hundred years earlier (Milliken et al. 2007:115). Rectangular shell beads disappeared from the Bay Area, Central Valley, and portions of Southern California during this time; and a whole new suite of decorative and presumed religious objects appeared during the Early Period-Middle Period Transition (EMT) (Elsasser 1978), which corresponds to the beginning of this period. Net sinkers, a typical early period marker throughout the Bay, disappeared from most sites, with the exception of SFR-112, where they continued in use well into the Middle Period (Pastron and Walsh 1988:90).

G.2.4. Upper Middle Period (Late Upper Archaic), A.D. cal 430–1050

Around 430 A.D., the *Olivella* saucer bead trade network collapsed, and over half of known bead horizon M1 sites were abandoned, while the remaining sites saw a large increase in sea otter bones. Additionally, the Meganos extended burial mortuary pattern began to spread in the interior East Bay (Bennyhoff 1994a, 1994c). At the

same time that these changes were happening, a series of *Olivella* saddle bead horizons that would come to be known as M2, M3, and M4 were developing (Milliken et al. 2007:116).

G.2.5. Initial Late Period (Lower Emergent), A.D. CAL 1050–1550

Fredrickson (1973) coined the term “Emergent” to describe this period, in recognition of the appearance of a new level of sedentism, status ascription, and ceremonial integration in lowland central California. The Middle/Late Transition (MLT) bead horizon, previously thought to have occurred around A.D. 300, is now largely believed to have occurred around cal A.D. 1000 (Milliken et al. 2007:116). During the MLT, burial objects became much more elaborate, and initial markers of the Augustine Pattern appeared in the form of multiperforated and bar-scored *Haliotis* ornaments, fully shaped show mortars, and new *Olivella* bead types. Classic Augustine Pattern markers, which appeared in Bead Horizon L1 (after cal A.D. 1250), include the arrow, flanged pipe, *Olivella* callus cup bead, and the banjo effigy ornament (Bennyhoff 1994b). The Stockton serrated series, the first arrow-sized projectile point in the Bay Area, also appeared after A.D. 1250 (Milliken et al. 2007:116-117).

G.2.6. Terminal Late Period: Protohistoric Ambiguities

Changes in artifact types and mortuary objects characterized A.D. cal 1500–1650. The signature *Olivella* sequin and cup beads of the central California L1 Bead Horizon abruptly disappeared, and clamshell disk beads, markers of the L2 Bead Horizon, spread across the North Bay (Milliken et al. 2007:117). Toggle harpoons, hopper mortars, plain corner-notched arrow-sized projectile points, clamshell disk beads, magnesite tube beads, and secondary cremation all also appeared in the North Bay first during this period (Milliken et al. 2007:117).

Another upward cycle of regional integration was commencing when it was interrupted by Spanish settlement in the Bay Area beginning in 1776. Such regional integration was a continuing characteristic of the Augustine Pattern, most likely brought to the Bay Area by Patwin speakers from Oregon, who introduced new tools (such as the bow) and traits (such as pre-internment grave pit burning) into central California. Perhaps the Augustine Pattern, with its inferred shared regional religious and ceremonial organization, was developed as a means of overcoming insularity, not in the core area of one language group but in an area where many neighboring language groups were in contact (Milliken et al. 2007:118).

G.3. History

G.3.1. Early Occupation and Development in Oakland

The land that is now Oakland was part of the Mexican land grant given to Luis Maria Peralta in 1820. The Rancho San Antonio encompassed approximately 44,800 acres of land, covering virtually all of today's Oakland, San Leandro, Alameda, Piedmont, Emeryville, Berkeley, and Albany. In 1842, Peralta divided his rancho among his four sons (Marschner 2001:149-153).

Oakland was incorporated by the state legislature in May of 1852. Commercial and industrial development concentrated around and near the wharves as early as 1854, when the ferryboat service to San Francisco was established. In 1863, the San Francisco and Oakland Railroad was completed and began operation along Railroad Avenue (now 7th Street), extending from Oakland Point (now West Oakland) to Broadway. However, the population as well as businesses in Oakland saw its first major boom when the transcontinental railroad terminus was completed in Oakland in 1869. Transportation developments, such as the Caldecott Tunnel and the Bay Bridge, connected the City of Oakland to the surrounding communities. World War I (1914–1918) and World War (1939–1945) brought heavy maritime industry to the area of Oakland known as West Oakland.

G.3.2. Development in West Oakland

For much of its history, West Oakland, also called Oakland Point, was a peninsula surrounded by the San Antonio Estuary, Lake Merritt tidal slough, and marshy shores at the Bay west of Pine and Cedar Street. It extended from 16th Street on the south to 28th Street on the north, coming inland as far as Adeline Street.

Development in West Oakland has been closely tied to its railroad, military and maritime industries. In 1869, the transcontinental railroad terminus created the wharf extension 2 miles inland to accommodate hefty ships carrying cargo. The railroad lines along 1st and 7th Streets brought residential, commercial and industrial development to West Oakland. As early as the 1870s, with the help of the transcontinental railroad, West Oakland would become a railroad town which gradually expanded over parts of the marshlands. The headquarters for the railroad's Northern California maintenance, construction, and shipbuilding operations were located in West Oakland, which employed about half of the local residents.

In 1909, Western Pacific Railroad added railroad tracks and a freight depot in West Oakland, about 2 miles south of the Project area. A lesser known industrial district developed in the Project area, but more slowly due to the obstacles created by the natural landscape (marshlands).

The Outer Harbor and area east of the railroad tracks did not see development until well into the 1920s, when automobile and truck transportation became more prevalent; and the Bay Bridge was constructed, enabling industrial and warehouse development away from the railroad lines. By 1920, there were some scattered strips of industrial development along Peralta Street and 22nd Street east of the tracks.

By 1935, this area was zoned for heavy industry, and several prominent industries were located west of Peralta Street. These include Pacific Coast Aggregates and Merco Nordstrom Valve Company at 24th and Peralta Streets, and the brick warehouse at 18th and Campbell Streets. However, complete industrial development of the Project area in West Oakland would not occur until the purchase of the Outer Harbor by the U.S. Army during World War II and the later boom of the post war years. The Army took control of the entire Outer Harbor by 1941 and developed the areas between Maritime Street and the railroad tracks. They filled marshlands, opening the area east of the tracks for further development.

In 1943, the port was completed and comprised of 13 deep draft ship berths, approximately 175 buildings and structures, 27 miles of rail tracks, and millions of square feet of open and covered storage. A majority of these facilities and structures were dedicated to operational aspects of the World War II mission. Military activities in the area continued with the Korean War in 1950, the Viet Nam war in the 1960s and 1970s, and Desert Storm in the early 1990s.

In 1995, the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommended the Oakland Army Base be closed. As a result, the Oakland Base Reuse Authority was created to oversee the closure and transfer to the Oakland Redevelopment Agency and the Port of Oakland. Military activity on the base officially ceased in 1999. The former base property was to be shared by the City and the Port, and the title was transferred on August 7, 2006 (Minor 2006: 3).

Currently, demolition of much of the Oakland Army Base is underway and is being redeveloped by the City of Oakland and the Port of Oakland.

G.4. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and National Register of Historic Places

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that, before beginning any undertaking, a federal agency must take into account the effects of the undertaking on historic properties and offer the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and other interested parties an opportunity to comment on these actions. Specific regulations regarding compliance with Section 106 state that, although the tasks necessary to comply with Section 106 may be delegated to others, the federal agency is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the Section 106 process is completed.

The Section 106 review process involves a five-step procedure.

1. Initiate the Section 106 process (assess the ability of the undertaking to affect historic properties, identify consulting parties, and plan to involve interested parties).
2. Identify historic properties in the Area of Potential Effect (APE).
3. Assess adverse effects.
4. Resolve adverse effects.
5. Implement the project according to the memorandum of agreement (MOA), or implement project without an MOA if no agreement is necessary.

Section 106 requires federal agencies or those they fund or permit to consider the effects of their actions on properties that are determined eligible for listing or are listed in the NRHP. To determine whether an undertaking could affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, architectural, and traditional cultural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for the NRHP. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must be at least 50 years old (or be of exceptional historic significance if less than 50 years old) and meet one or more of the NRHP criteria. To qualify for listing, a *historic property* must represent a significant theme or pattern in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture at the local, state, or national level. It must meet one or more of the four criteria listed below and have sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance. The criteria for evaluating the eligibility of a historic property for listing in the NRHP are defined in 36 CFR Section 60.4 as follows.

- Criterion A – Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

- Criterion B – Association with the lives of persons significant to our past.
- Criterion C – Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Criterion D – Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

In addition to meeting the significance criteria, a significant historic property must possess integrity to be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP. *Integrity* refers to a property's ability to convey its historic significance (U.S. Department of Interior 1991:44). Integrity is a quality that applies to historical resources in seven specific ways: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To be considered a significant historic property, a resource must possess two, and usually has more, of these kinds of integrity, depending on the context and the reasons why the property is significant. National Park Service (NPS) Bulletin 15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service 2002), discusses the types of integrity:

- *Location* – the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event took place.
- *Design* – the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- *Setting* – the physical environment of a historic property.
- *Materials* – the physical environments where combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- *Workmanship* – the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *Feeling* – a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* – the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. (National Park Service 2002)

The NRHP criteria also limit the consideration of moved properties because significance is embodied in locations and settings. Under NRHP, moving a building destroys the integrity of location and setting. A moved property can be eligible for listing if it is significant primarily for architectural value or if it is the surviving

property most importantly associated with a historic person or event (National Park Service 2002).

Section 106 regulations define an adverse effect as an effect that alters, directly or indirectly, the qualities that make a resource eligible for listing in the NRHP (36 CFR Part 800.5[a][1]). Consideration must be given to the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, to the extent that these qualities contribute to the integrity and significance of the resource. Adverse effects may be direct and reasonably foreseeable, or may be more remote in time or distance (36 CFR Part 8010.5[a][1]). Examples of adverse effects are listed below.

- Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.
- Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the *Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (Weeks and Grimmer 1995) and applicable guidelines.
- Removal of the property from its historic location.
- Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance.
- Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.
- Neglect of a property that causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to a Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization.
- Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

G.5. References

Bean, L. J. 1994. *The Ohlone Past and Present: Native Americans of the San Francisco Bay Region*. Menlo Park, California: Ballena Press.

Bennyhoff, J. A. 1994a. *The Napa District and Wappo Prehistory. Toward a New Taxonomic Framework for Central California Archaeology: Essays by James A. Bennyhoff and David A. Fredrickson*, R.E. Hughes, ed., pp. 49–56.

- Berkeley, CA: Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility 52.
- Bennyhoff, J. A. 1994b. Central California Augustine: Implications for Northern California Archaeology. Toward a New Taxonomic Framework for Central California Archaeology: Essays by James A. Bennyhoff and David A. Fredrickson, R.E. Hughes, ed., pp. 65–74. Berkeley, CA: Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility 52.
- Bennyhoff, J. A. 1994c. A Delta Intrusion to the Bay in the Late Middle Period in Central California. Toward a New Taxonomic Framework for Central California Archaeology: Essays by James A. Bennyhoff and David A. Fredrickson, R.E. Hughes, ed., pp. 7–13. Berkeley, CA: Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility 52.
- Cook, S. F. 1943a. The Conflict between the California Indians and White Civilization, I: The Indian Versus the Spanish Mission. *Ibero-Americana*. 21. Berkeley, California.
- Cook, S. F. 1943b. The Conflict between the California Indians and White Civilization, II: The Physical and Demographic Reaction of the Non-Mission Indians in Colonial and Provincial California. *Ibero-Americana*. 22. Berkeley, California.
- Elsasser, A. B. 1978. Development of Regional Prehistoric Cultures. In *California*, R. F. Heizer, ed., pp. 37-57. *Handbook of North American Indians*. Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Fredrickson, D. A. 1973. Early Cultures of the North Coast Ranges, California. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.
- Fredrickson, D. A. 1989. Spatial and Temporal Patterning of Obsidian Materials in the Geyser Region. In *Current Directions in California Obsidian Studies*, edited by R.E. Hughes, pp.95–109. Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility 48.
- Ingram, B. L. 1998. Differences in Radiocarbon Age Between Shell and Charcoal from a Holocene Shellmound in Northern California. *Quaternary Research* 49: 102-110.

- Levy, R. 1978. Costanoan. Pages 485–495 in R. F. Heizer (ed.) *California*. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general ed. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Marschner, J. 2001. *California 1850. A Snapshot in Time*. Coleman Ranch Press; Second edition: pp.149-153.
- Milliken, R. 1995. *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of the Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769–1810*. In T.C. Blackburn (ed.) Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 43. Novato, CA.
- Milliken, Randall, Richard T. Fitzgerald, Mark G. Hylkema, Randy Groza, Tom Origer, David G. Bieling, Alan Levant, Randy S. Wiberg, Andrew Gottsfield, Donna Gillette, Viviana Bellifemine, Eric Strother, Robert Cartier, and David A. Fredrickson. 2007. *Punctuated Cultural Change in the San Francisco Bay Area*. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Jones, Terry L, and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 99–124, AltaMira Press, Plymouth, United Kingdom.
- Minor, Woodruff. 2006. *Architectural Salvage Assessment, Contributing Building, Oakland Army Base Historic District, Oakland, California. Prepared for the Port of Oakland Environmental Planning and Permitting Department*.
- National Park Service. 2002. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* Bulletin 15.
- Pastron, A. G., and M. R. Walsh. 1988. *Archaeological Excavations at CA-SFR-112, the Stevenson Street Shellmound, San Francisco, CA*. Archives of California Prehistory 21. Coyote Press, Salinas, CA.
- Rosenthal, Jeffrey S., and Jack Meyer. 2004. *Landscape Evolution and the Archaeological Record: A Geoarchaeological Study of the Southern Santa Clara Valley and Surrounding Region*. Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publication 14, University of California, Davis.
- U.S. Department of Interior N. P. S. 1991. *National Register of Historic Places*. Submitted to Bulletin.

Wallace K. D. A. E. Lathrop. 1975. West Berkeley (CA-Ala-307): A Culturally Stratified Shellmound on the East Shore of San Francisco Bay. Contributions of the Archaeological Research Facility No. 29, November 1975.

Weeks and Grimmer. 1995. *Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnerships Heritage Preservation Services, Washington DC.

Wiberg, R. S. 1996 .Archaeological Investigations and Burial Removal at Sites CA-ALA-483, CA-ALA-483 Extension, and CA-ALA-555, Pleasanton, Alameda County, California. Holman and Associates, San Francisco. Submitted to Davidon Homes, Walnut Creek. Copies available from Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA.

Yamane L. 1994. Personal communication with L. J. Bean, in *The Ohlone: Past and Present*.