

4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

SETTING

A cultural resources evaluation report was prepared by Peak & Associates for the applicant (Peak & Associates, 2001). The report includes a prehistoric and historic site record and literature search completed by the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park in 2001. (The Peak & Associates report is available for review at the City of Dixon Community Development Department.) An updated records search was completed for this EIR by Basin Research Associates with similar results to the 2001 search.

In summary, the Peak & Associates report concludes that there are no historic structures on the property, except for a barn and a bungalow, neither of which are judged to be significant. The report also concludes that there is no surface evidence of archaeological resources.

Ethnographic Context

The Peak & Associates report notes that the Patwin occupied the southern Sacramento Valley west of the Sacramento River from the town of Princeton north to Colusa and south to San Pablo and Suisun bays. Patwin territory extended approximately 90 miles north to south and 40 miles east to west. Distinction is made between the River Patwin, who resided in large villages near the Sacramento River, especially between Colusa and Knights Landing, and the Hill Patwin, whose villages were situated in the small valleys along the lower hills of the Vaca Mountains and Coast Range, with concentrations in Long, Indian, Bear, Capay, Cortina, and Napa valleys.

Patwin territory includes the riverine environment of tule marshes, vines and brush near the Sacramento River, the flat grasslands dotted with oak groves, and the hills and small valleys of the Coast ranges. The villages situated on low bluffs near the river were often very large; in 1848, General Bidwell estimated at least 1,000 residents at Koru, near Colusa. In the hills, the Patwin settled in the small valleys, particularly along Cache and Putah creeks, where large populations were reported. The plains were least hospitable; villages were sparse there because of winter flooding and lack of reliable water sources during the dry months.

Pre-contact population is difficult to estimate, but a survey of various sources seems to indicate that the Patwin may have numbered 4,000 before their first encounter with non-Indians. The Patwin suffered from a succession of devastating impacts to their numbers: missionization, punitive military expeditions, and fatal confrontations with ranchers took their toll on the populace. John Work's party of trappers from the Hudson's Bay Company came down the Sacramento River in 1832, returning up the river in 1833.

They unintentionally introduced a disease deadly to native Californians and, in their wake, a malaria epidemic swept through the Sacramento Valley. Just four years later in 1837, smallpox raged through the villages and, as a result of these diseases, up to 75 percent of the Patwin died (Cook, 1955). Those who survived these tragedies eventually settled on small reservations or worked as ranch laborers. Throughout the 1800s and 1900s, the population decreased; in 1972, the Bureau of Indian Affairs counted only eleven Patwin in the entire territory. Three reservations, Colusa, Cortina, and Rumsey, remain active; they are occupied primarily by descendants of Wintun and other groups.

Historic Era

The Peak & Associates report discusses the history of the region around the City of Dixon, which has always been associated with agriculture. The development of the area centered on the development of farms and the transportation facilities necessary to bring the farm produce to market. An early settler in the vicinity was Elijah Silvey, who settled on property on the old road from Napa to Sacramento in 1852. He built a house and corral (he had established a herd of about 100 milk cows), which became a waystation on the road. Eventually a trade center named Silveyville developed around the spot. This was short-lived as the whole community was moved five miles east to the line of the railroad upon its construction in 1868 (Hoover, Rensch and Rensch, 1970). The name lives on in the designation of Silvey Township, but the town quickly disappeared after the establishment of Dixon as the main freight depot in the area. The Silveyville post office was discontinued in 1871.

The town of Dixon was originally to have been named Dickson, after Thomas Dickson who donated ten acres for the townsite and freight depot. How the spelling came to be changed is open to debate. Gudde (1969) ascribes it to an error by the postal service. Gregory (1912) indicates that the first load of freight sent to the new depot was labeled Dixon, and the practice continued. In any event, the correct spelling is retained in the name of the creek that borders the townsite on the north and east. Dixon grew as a shipping and marketing point for the extensive agricultural industry that developed in eastern Solano County.

History of Project Site

As noted in the Peak & Associates report, the project site is closely allied to the development of the Milk Farm restaurant and the commercial ventures that grew up around it. This began in 1923 when a restaurant was established here known as Hess Station. The restaurant featured “all-you-can-drink” milk or buttermilk for ten cents. This gave rise to milk-drinking contests, with records kept on an old blackboard. Mr. and Mrs. Homer R. Henderson acquired Hess Station in 1938, and renamed it the Milk Farm. The Hendersons had owned a delicatessen in the Public Market on J Street in Sacramento. The

“cow jumping over the moon” symbol was first used in 1939 and a trademark was granted in 1951 (Weber, 2001).

Although the Milk Farm site was along the route of the Lincoln Highway (U.S. Route 40), it was not part of the original route of this historic transit corridor begun in 1916. That went from Sacramento to Stockton then west to the Bay Area. The route now used by Interstate 80 was not available until the Carquinez Strait Bridge was completed in 1927.

The Hendersons continued to manage and enlarge the facilities, with the later assistance of Mrs. Henderson’s son, Boyd Weber, and his wife, Ilse. Over time, service stations were added and the Milk Farm became a favorite stop on the highway, serving an average of 3,000 customers a day. Originally, the restaurant had direct access to the highway, U.S. Route 40, but the road became a limited access freeway in 1948. The Milk Farm was accessed from a frontage road after that time (Jones, 1949), which became Milk Farm Road.

The restaurant lasted through the conversion of U.S. Route 40 to Interstate 80 in 1964, although the construction made access almost impossible for a time. This was also an era of expansion for the Milk Farm operation. The Milk Farm Land Corporation was formed and surrounding properties were purchased. The Milk Farm complex came to include the restaurant, a milk bar, a gift shop, five service stations, and such smaller food facilities as the Circus Wagon (with revolving popsicle on the roof), and “Webers Folly,” an octagonal booth selling cold drinks and snacks. All of this was served by a private wastewater treatment plant on the property.

Mrs. Henderson died in 1975 and, with family problems pushing him on, Boyd Weber sold the property in 1979 to the Milk Farm Limited Partnership. The restaurant closed in about 1984-1985 (Weber, 2001).

Records Search

A prehistoric and historic site records and literature search was completed by the California Historical Resources Information System, Northwest Information Center, California State University Sonoma, Rohnert Park for Peak & Associates in 2001, and a second records search was completed by Basin Research Associates in 2004.

In addition, Basin Research Associates also reviewed the *Historic Properties Directory* for Solano County (OHP, 2004) with the most recent updates of the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest, as well as other evaluations of properties reviewed by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). Other sources consulted included: the *California History*

4.6 Cultural Resources

Plan (OHP, 1973); *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (OHP, 1976); *Five Views: An Ethnic Sites Survey for California* (OHP, 1988); and *Historic Civil Engineering Landmarks of San Francisco and Northern California* (ASCE, 1977). In addition, a limited number of maps were consulted (e.g., Goddard, 1857; USGS, 1915 and 1981).

The Northwest Information Center review indicated that no formal cultural resources inventory has been conducted in the project area and no prehistoric or historic resources recorded in the project area. A large area opposite the project area on the south side of Interstate 80 has been surveyed (Peak & Associates, 1993) and the area of the new interstate exit ramp, just west of the project area, has also been surveyed (Parker, 1977). Neither of these surveys recorded cultural resources near the project area. This lack of sites in areas away from reliable water is normal in this area. As the Information Center noted in the record search conducted in 1993, prehistoric sites in the area “tend to be situated on alluvial flats near former and existing water courses.” The probability of identifying significant historic resources, prior to the Milk Farm era, was considered low. Neither the General Land Office Plat nor the 1908 Vacaville 15 minute USGS map indicated a structure or road in the project area.

The sources consulted by the Northwest Information Center included standard historical references and various registers of historic properties, among them, the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, and the California Inventory of Historic Resources. The City of Dixon has been very active in inventorying and evaluating potential historic buildings in the town, but since the project area is just outside the city limits, this has not included the structures on the Milk Farm property.

The Native American Heritage Commission was contacted in 2004 by Basin Research Associates regarding the presence of Native American resources within and adjacent to the project site. Their review failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the project area (Pilas-Treadway, 2004).

Field Investigation

A field inspection of the property was conducted by Peak & Associates on 5 November 2001. The survey technique employed was complete coverage. The project area was walked in parallel transects with no more than 20 meters of space between transects. Ground visibility was very good throughout the project site. Portions of the area have been in agricultural production until recently (irrigation trenches are readily visible), but all of the area not occupied by the ruins of the Milk Farm complex are now used as pasture. The vegetation has been cropped very low throughout the property and the ground surface was easily examined.

There are two residential complexes on the project site consisting of house, barn, and other outbuildings. Both residences are currently occupied. No prehistoric artifacts were observed in the project area. Historic artifacts, other than modern trash, are also absent.

There are no standing buildings from the Milk Farm operation still present. The only standing feature in place is the cow-jumping-over-the-moon sign located in the southwest corner of the project site. Evidence of the former service stations and the restaurant itself consists of concrete slabs, the basement of the restaurant, paved parking areas, and scattered trash, much of the latter scraped up into large piles. Four settling ponds from the former wastewater treatment plant are present north of the restaurant site. The northeast corner of the property, formerly a service station and Morgan's fruit stand, has been used for dumping and storage of salvaged construction material.

The northern farm complex includes a large frame barn with tin roof that will be retained if the proposed project is constructed. Structures that will be removed include a tack house/stable that is a long narrow frame structure with board-and-batten siding and composite shingle roof. The structure is not in very good shape; in particular, there are major sags in the roof. This structure includes aluminum slider windows that are probably a later addition. Another long narrow shed on the property is cobbled together from various materials and has since been vandalized, including some structural damage. The residence and garage, connected by a "breezeway," are constructed of cinder block walls with asphalt shingles on the hipped roofs. Windows are metal framed, some fixed and some swing-out, and appear original. The residence and garage are in good condition.

The southern building complex includes a small one story frame residence that appears fairly old, perhaps 1930s or late 1920s. There are clearly later additions, such as the composite shingle roof with air conditioner and some replacement windows, but the bulk of the structure is a very plain side-gabled residence with clapboard siding, closed eaves, and no other decoration. Where present, the original windows are four-over-four sashes. East of the residence is a shed with a large awning. The awning is obviously a later add-on, cobbled together from available materials, while the original shed is a very plain gabled shed with clapboard siding, open eaves, and a single-pane fixed window. Also on the property are the foundations of two other structures that have been almost entirely razed and two cobbled together sheds of recent origin. Also present is the Circus Wagon food service feature mentioned in the historic background section above. The revolving popsicle is gone and the structure is in generally poor condition.

The Peak & Associates report noted that examination of the Dixon 7.5 minute USGS map published in 1952 indicated that the only standing structure on the property that was present prior to that date was the southern residence. The other structures would not be

4.6 Cultural Resources

old enough for consideration as historic resources unless of unusual importance. This is not the case for this collection of utilitarian structures. Regardless of current condition, they were not architecturally unusual in the first place and, being associated with agricultural use of the property, they are not associated with unusually important people or events.

The one building older than fifty years has had some modification, as described above, but the original style and construction remain obvious. However, there is nothing unusual about either. It is a small, plain bungalow with no architectural embellishments. Regardless of age, this would not be considered an historic resource unless associated with unusually important persons or events, which is not the case with the site.

The absence of surface or prehistoric occupation does not necessarily prove that there are no archaeological resources on the property. This was the case with CA-SOL-3 63, located near Dixon in a setting similar to the current project area. This major site with numerous burials was discovered only after earth-moving for a subdivision had begun. However, there has been a lot of previous construction activity in this area, with no report of prehistoric artifacts. It is unlikely that archaeological resources are present on this property.

The structures related to the Milk Farm have all been razed and the significance of the structures or the complex considered as a district are now irrelevant. There are no artifacts or features characteristic of the Milk Farm on the property except the main sign, which will be preserved.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Dixon General Plan Policies

The Dixon General Plan includes several policies to identify, preserve, and enhance the historic and prehistoric cultural resources of the City, as listed below.

Dixon General Plan Policy	Project Consistency
URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY DESIGN	
13: The City shall promote the preservation of historic buildings and other landmarks that give residents a tie with the past.	Future development of the project site would retain the Milk Farm sign and name and is intended to capture the spirit of the original Milk Farm.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Significance Criteria

Based on the Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a proposed project could be considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines further indicates that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

... demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources.

Impacts Determined to Be Less than Significant

- **Destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features.**

The project site is in an area that has no recorded evidence of paleontological resources, and the site has no unique geologic features. Future development would therefore not result in any impacts.

- **Demolish a significant historical resource.**

The one residential building on the site that is older than 50 years would not be considered a historic resource. The structures related to the Milk Farm have all been razed; there are no artifacts or features characteristic of the Milk Farm on the property except the main sign, which would be preserved as part of the future site development.

Impacts Determined to Be Potentially Significant

- Affect an archaeological resource; and
- Disturb any human remains.

Anticipated Future Impact 4.6-1

Future construction as part of site development could affect unknown archaeological resources or human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.

Future construction in areas of native soil could result in the inadvertent exposure of significant buried cultural materials¹ that could be eligible for listing in the California Register. Such disturbance could result in significant impacts to the integrity of the archaeological deposit and the loss of information important to prehistory and history.

The Peak & Associates field investigation of the site documented the absence of surface evidence of prehistoric occupation, although this does not necessarily prove that there are no archaeological resources on the property. An archaeological site, CA-SOL-3 63, was recently discovered near Dixon in a setting similar to that of the project site. This major site with numerous burials was discovered only after earth-moving for a subdivision had begun.

However, there has been substantial construction activity in the area of the project site, notably south of Interstate 80, with no report of prehistoric artifacts. It is unlikely that archaeological resources exist on this property. As with any surface inspection, there is always a remote possibility that previous activities (both natural and cultural) have obscured prehistoric or historic period artifacts or habitation areas, leaving no surface evidence to identify the resources. If any bone is uncovered during future construction that

¹ Significant prehistoric cultural resources may include:

- a. Human bone - either isolated or intact burials.
- b. Habitation [occupation or ceremonial structures as interpreted from rock rings/features, distinct ground depressions, differences in compaction (e.g., house floors)].
- c. Artifacts including chipped stone objects such as projectile points and bifaces; groundstone artifacts such as manos, metates, mortars, pestles, grinding stones, pitted hammerstones; and, shell and bone artifacts including ornaments and beads.
- d. Various features and samples including hearths (fire-cracked rock; baked and vitrified clay), artifact caches, faunal and shellfish remains (which permit dietary reconstruction), distinctive changes in soil stratigraphy indicative of prehistoric activities.
- e. Isolated artifacts. Historic cultural materials may include finds from the late 19th through early 20th centuries. Objects and features associated with the Historic Period can include:
 1. Structural remains or portions of foundations (bricks, cobbles/boulders, stacked field stone, postholes, etc.).
 2. Trash pits, privies, wells and associated artifacts.
 3. Isolated artifacts or isolated clusters of manufactured artifacts (e.g., glass bottles, metal cans, manufactured wood items, etc.).
 4. Human remains. In addition, cultural materials including both artifacts and structures that can be attributed to Hispanic, Asian, and other ethnic or racial groups are potentially significant. Such features or clusters of artifacts and samples include remains of structures, trash pits, and privies.

appears to be human, then state law requires that the Solano County Coroner must be contacted.

Anticipated Future Mitigation Measure 4.6-1a

If, during construction activities at the time of future development, artifacts or non-native stone (obsidian, fine-grained silicates, basalt) are exposed or if unusual amounts of bone or shell are observed or if areas that contain dark-colored sediment that do not appear to have been created through natural processes are discovered, then work in the immediate area of the find shall be halted within 50 feet of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted immediately for an on-site inspection of the discovery and recommendations.

Anticipated Future Mitigation Measure 4.6-1b

If buried or suspected human remains are encountered during construction work at the time of future development, that area shall be immediately halted and the county coroner notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, then the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified by the coroner within 24 hours as required by Public Resources Code 5097. The Native American Heritage Commission will notify a designated Most Likely Descendant who will provide recommendations for the treatment of the remains within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission will mediate any disputes regarding treatment of remains.

Implementation of the mitigation measures above would reduce this anticipated future impact to a less-than-significant level.

4.6 Cultural Resources
