

Taggart, Michael

From: Taggart, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 3:14 PM
To: 'jay.correia@parks.ca.gov'
Subject: RE: NRHP Dist. Nom. Update: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Jay,

Thank you very much for the call and voice message. That all sounds good.

If you or any of the review staff have questions, please don't hesitate to call.

Thanks,
Mike

From: Taggart, Michael
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 10:08 AM
To: 'jay.correia@parks.ca.gov'
Subject: NRHP Dist. Nom. Update: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Jay,

I wanted to touch base on the Diablo Canyon National Register District nomination update (#75000477; *Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay*). The nomination was submitted several years ago (before my tenure at PG&E) and I'm hoping to wrap things up soon. Based on my review of the document I can see it needs some work, but would like to have OHP's comments before we spend any more time on it. Before I can get support in place to update the nomination, I will need to gauge the level of effort required.

Please let me know where things stand at your earliest convenience.

Best,
Mike

MIKE TAGGART, RPA
Sr. Cultural Resource Specialist
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2730 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 220
Sacramento CA 95833
Office: 916.923.7047 | Cell: 916.261.6523

Taggart, Michael

From: Taggart, Michael
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 1:32 PM
To: 'Crain, Amy@Parks'
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Amy,

Yes, my consultant completed some fieldwork last year. I have them under contract to revise the nomination this year. We are shooting for the fall of 2015 to submit a revised nomination. Thanks for checking in. I'll give you a heads up before resubmitting.

Best,
Mike

From: Crain, Amy@Parks [mailto: Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 1:28 PM
To: Taggart, Michael
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Michael,

Were you able to complete the fieldwork last year? I'm reviewing open nominations, and realize it has been just over a year since our last email exchange.

Thank you in advance for your update,
Amy

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit
California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009
PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY [Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov](mailto: Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov)



From: Taggart, Michael [mailto: M1Ti@pge.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Crain, Amy@Parks
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Amy,

Thanks for reaching out. I've been meaning to get back in touch. We have a consultant onboard to revise the nomination; however, it is going to take a fairly significant field effort and incorporation of a lot of new information (based primarily on PG&E-sponsored work on the Pecho Coast over the last six years). Due to the way my budget is structured, this will be a two year effort, with the fieldwork happening this summer and the nomination revision/submission in 2015. It may be for all of us to talk later this year, but we're a ways off right now.

If you have any specific questions, I'd be happy to give you a call to discuss.

Best,
Mike

From: Crain, Amy@Parks [<mailto:Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 1:38 PM
To: Taggart, Michael
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Mike,

Since it has been almost five months since we last exchanged emails, would you let me know the status of the nomination? Is there anything I can do to help?

Thank you,
Amy

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit
California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009

PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov



From: Crain, Amy@Parks
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:54 AM
To: 'Taggart, Michael'
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Thank you Mike. I am glad to hear the nomination is still active and that you are still the appropriate contact.

I look forward to hearing from you next year,
Amy

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit

California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009
PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov



From: Taggart, Michael [<mailto:M1Ti@pge.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:52 AM
To: Crain, Amy@Parks
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Amy,

Thank you for the additional comments. I am currently working to secure funding to revise the nomination. We hope to submit a revised nomination in 2014. We will be back in touch once things get moving.

Best,
Mike

From: Crain, Amy@Parks [<mailto:Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 13, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Taggart, Michael
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Mike,

As anticipated in our Request for Information letter of April 25, 2013 (attached), several National Register archaeology nominations were forwarded to a contract archaeologist for an in-depth content-based review. The **Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay Archaeological District** nomination was included in that review.

The contractor returned the nomination to us with a cover memo (attached) and an annotated electronic file copy of the nomination (attached). She is in agreement with the additional data needs indicated in the April 25, 2013 letter, and indicates further documentation needed to prepare the nomination for review by the State Historical Resources Commission.

Please let us know if you have questions, and how we can help move the nomination forward.

Sincerely,
Amy Crain

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit
California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009

PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov



From: Crain, Amy@Parks
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2013 4:52 PM
To: 'Taggart, Michael'
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Thank you for the quick acknowledgement Mike. You might also find helpful *National Register Bulletin 36: Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties*. If you don't already have a copy, it is available on line at <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/arch/>

Regards,
Amy

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit
California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009
PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov

From: Taggart, Michael [<mailto:M1TI@pge.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2013 4:48 PM
To: Crain, Amy@Parks
Subject: RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Amy,

Thank you very much for providing these comments. These will be very helpful as we revise the nomination over the coming months. I'm sure I will reach out to you as questions arise.

Best,
Mike

MIKE TAGGART, RPA
Sr. Cultural Resource Specialist
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2730 Gateway Oaks Dr., Suite 220
Sacramento CA 95833
Office: 916.923.7047 | Cell: 916.261.6523

From: Crain, Amy@Parks [<mailto:Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2013 4:38 PM

To: Taggart, Michael
Subject: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Hi Mike,

As noted in the attached Request for Information (RFI) letter, following your recent email exchange with Registration Unit Supervisor Jay Correia, I reviewed the Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay Archaeological District National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nomination identified as a Supplement to NRHP listing #75000477.

A hard copy of the letter will go out in Friday morning's mail.

Sincerely,
Amy

Amy H. Crain
State Historian II
Registration Unit
California State Office of Historic Preservation
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100
PHONE (916) 445-7009
PLEASE NOTE NEW EMAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY Amy.Crain@parks.ca.gov

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-7100
(916) 445-7000 Fax: (916) 445-7053
calshpo@parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov



April 25, 2013

Mike Taggert, RPA
Sr. Cultural Resource Specialist
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2730 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA 95833

**RE: Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay Archaeological District
Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places
Request for Information (RFI)**

Dear Mike:

Following your recent email exchange with Registration Unit Supervisor Jay Correia, I reviewed the above-referenced nomination received in June 2007, identified as a Supplement to NRHP listing #75000477.

The workload of the OHP archaeologists is such that the Registration Unit historians are doing a preliminary technical review to determine which nominations can be forwarded to a contract archaeologist for an in-depth content-based review.

Additional work is needed on the nomination to comply with the requirements of the National Park Service (NPS) in accordance with the instructions in *National Register Bulletin 16A, How to Complete the National Register Form* (Bulletin 16A). Once the nomination is resubmitted we will be pleased to review it in greater detail.

The National Park Service updates the nomination forms every three years, so the forms have been updated twice since the nomination was originally prepared. As you (or the consultant) revise the nomination please consider entering the information on new forms. Current forms are available on our website at http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/downloads/2012_10-900_final.doc.

We would be pleased to assist you if needed in the transfer of the document to the new forms. New photographs will also be needed, in compliance with the NPS Photo Policy, available at http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/guidance/Photo_Policy_final.pdf.

Please submit the revised nomination electronically as a Word document, either on compact disc or via email. This allows us to make minor technical adjustments to the form. When emailing, it can be helpful to send the nomination form as one document, and the Continuation Sheets as one or more separate documents. We have also received documents via various electronic dropbox services if that is convenient for you.

Amending National Register Forms is addressed in Section VI of Bulletin 16A. In particular,

Registration forms may be amended in any of the following ways:

1. Submit continuation sheets with the new information and an explanation of the amendment.
2. Complete a new form that incorporates former documentation, new information, and proposed changes.
3. For boundary changes, provide a form that documents just the area being added or deleted.

The section can be reviewed in full on pages 71-72 of the hard copy publication or online at http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16A/nrb16a_VI.htm. Once you determine which approach is most appropriate for you – documenting just the new sites or a more comprehensive nomination that incorporates former and new information – many sections of the nomination can be simplified without repeatedly explaining the different determinations (listed, proposed, “undetermined”).

It is not necessary or desirable to include the previous nomination or site records as Appendices. Cite them as pertinent, with appropriate footnote and bibliographic references, and note their primary location in Section 9.

Please be sure the nomination refers in all regards to the archaeological district and not to a proposed project that may affect the district, either the portion already listed, or the proposed amendment.

1. Name of Property

historic name

Enter Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay Archaeological District.

other names/site number

Include here the aka reference and site numbers. Remove any explanatory narrative such as “Additional sites proposed” and “Sites determined to be ineligible.”

5. Classification

Number of Resources within Property

Resources must be classified as Contributing or Noncontributing. Undetermined is not an option, and will not be accepted by the National Park Service.

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

At the most enter “17” and the previous listing number. It is not necessary or appropriate to list the individual resources by site number here.

Name of related multiple property listing

Enter N/A.

7. Description

Narrative Description

This section needs to describe the physical appearance of the site – how it looks at present, how it likely looked during the period of significance, and referencing the reason(s) for those

changes in appearance. There must be correlation with Section 5, describing the contributing and noncontributing resources counted in the table. Per Bulletin 16A, this section should also include a discussion of integrity.

Please note that components of a district are resources. Components of a site are features. "Elements" is an inconclusive and vague term that tends to be used inconsistently.

8. Statement of Significance

Period of Significance

Significant Dates

Please review Bulletin 16A for assistance. As presented they appear to be reversed.

Cultural Affiliation

If possible, please include the name commonly used to identify the cultural group, as in the Bulletin 16A example,

Cochise Red Ochra Hopewell Paleo-Indian Mississippian Late Archaic

Summary Paragraph

This introductory paragraph is currently missing. Per Bulletin 16A,

Identify the following items:

- Specific **associations or characteristics** through which the property has acquired significance, including historic events, activities, persons, physical features, artistic qualities, architectural styles, and archeological evidence that represent the historic contexts within which the property is important to the history of the local community, the State, or the nation.
- Specific ways the property meets the qualifying criterion and has contributed to each **area of significance** entered on the form.
- Role of any **important persons or cultural affiliations** entered on the form.
- Ways the property meets the special standards for any **criteria considerations** marked on the form.

Narrative Statement of Significance

This section currently appears to be more table than narrative. Where are the Research Questions required for nominations submitted under Criterion D? See the Bulletin 16A guidelines at http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16A/nrb16a_III.htm#statement

9. Major Bibliographical References

Primary location of additional data

Add Federal agency

Additional Documentation

Continuation Sheets

All additional documentation needs to be submitted on Continuation Sheets. You can either use the continuous text pages of the revised application form, or the stand alone pages that are available from both the NPS and OHP websites. If you use the older sheets, the Section is Additional Documentation and page numbering (in the header) begins with 1.

Items should be labeled as Figures. Description and source can be indicated on each page, or an Index of Figures can be presented, similar to the Photograph Log.

The nomination was also reviewed by State Parks Archaeologist and OHP intern Steve Hilton. He offered these comments to assist in revision of the nomination to meet NPS requirements:

Section 7 – The narrative description summary paragraph should be a succinct paragraph about the district. Paint a picture of the district in one paragraph. This summary paragraph points out preservation and impacts to sites, but does not even mention that the district includes X number of sites total, of which x are village sites, x are significant resource procurement sites, x are x, and so on. The summary paragraph should introduce the district to the reader. The first and last sentences are fine, just fill in two or three more specifically about the district.

The remainder of Section 7 needs to also focus on the district itself. The overall Environmental Setting section is appropriate for a compliance report, but for a nomination it needs to focus on the sites in the district. There is no need to repeat the entire culture history of the central coast that focuses on Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz and Monterrey Counties. All discussion about chronology should be district focused. E.g. these sites represent X period or the Paleo-Indian Period (12,000-8,500 B.P.) is represented by x sites within the district. The ethnographic section should be a paragraph focused on the ethnographic land use of the district, or the natural resources used by Native Americans within the district itself. The present section is a long discussion about Central California land use patterns.

The Archaeological Chronology discusses each archaeological period and lists sites that are representatives of these periods. However, it is unclear if any of the listed representative sites are located within the nominated district. Any discussion about the archaeological chronology should focus on the sites within the district. The discussion of Obispeno Chumash includes descriptions of the ethnographic lifeways and styles of the Obispeno Chumash. In these paragraphs it is stated on more than one occasion that archaeological evidence suggests that.....Or that archaeological evidence supports..... It is unclear if the archaeological evidence used within these examples is located within the district, or are located at some other location within San Luis Obispo County. Relate this section to the proposed district in Section 8. Please repeat the header across all pages of Table 7.2.

The Period of significance (Section 8) is from +12,000-150 Years BP, it should be noted what sites are representatives of each period since that is the way it is introduced. It is also imperative while discussing each period in Section 7, that a representative site of the Paleo-Indian period is highlighted, as it is unclear from the nomination if any such site representing this early period is within the district.

Section 8 - See NRB16A for guidance. The period of significance should be one or more time periods, broken down into sections that important for relating the significance of the site to the reader. The entire period must be significant. In this case the period of significance as reported is 12,000+ B.P. to 150 B.P. However you must demonstrate

why these sites are significant for this period of time in the Narrative Statement of Significance.

This section is better at representing the district. However the discussion of Radiocarbon dates state that the dates are from 10,000 +/-140 through 650 +/-90 years. There are no later radiocarbon dates, so how is the Historic Period (500-150BP) represented? It is unclear from the listing of sites and radiocarbon dates. There is also little to no correlation between the radiocarbon dates, type sites, and significance.

Section 10 – The Verbal boundary description should be more specific. The district boundaries need to be four or more points that delineate the complete district. Logically define the district, not individual sites within the district. The UTM's provided are for sites not the district. The boundary description needs to discuss what these boundaries are and why were they chosen to delineate the district. Information about lack of access to property, or other things that affected the boundaries of the district need to be discussed.

[Please note that Steve may not have been aware that ownership is insufficient justification to alter the boundaries. "Guidelines for Selecting Boundaries" in Bulletin 16A is available at http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16a/nrb16a_III.htm#geographical National Register staff discourage the creation of artificial boundaries that cannot be historically justified.]

Thank you for your attention to these many details. If you have questions, contact me at acrain@parks.ca.gov. We look forward to reviewing the revised application.

Sincerely,



Amy H. Crain
State Historian II