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Executive Summary

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) proposes to permit and construct the Solano 4 Wind Project (project) within the Montezuma Hills Wind Resource Area in southern Solano County. The project would involve constructing and operating wind turbine generators, an associated electrical collection system, and access roads. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) was contracted by SMUD to conduct research and complete a field investigation in support of the project. The project requires compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

An archival records search at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, identified 10 previous surveys that have covered the entire Area of Potential Effects (APE). Based on these surveys, one resource (P-48-524, a historic-era ranch complex) was recorded within the direct APE and one other resource (C-56, an undescribed resource) was identified but not formally recorded. In addition, 13 historic-era ranching resources (P-48-41, P-48-124, P-48-125, P-48-126, P-48-128, P-48-139, P-48-140, P-48-415, P-48-416, P-48-518, P-48-519, P-48-521, and P-48-523) and one historic-era road (P-48-981) have been recorded within the indirect (visual) APE.

No sacred sites or known resources were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. SMUD sent letters to the Native Americans listed by the commission, informing them of the project and requesting their input. To date, only Chairperson Marcos Guerrero of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria has responded, requesting a site visit and formal consultation. SMUD has been in communication with the United Auburn Indian Community to schedule a site visit, but the visit has not yet taken place.

Far Western Anthropological Research Group (Far Western) conducted a geoarchaeological sensitivity assessment of the majority of the APE south of Montezuma Hills Road (Scher and Whitaker 2016) and concluded that the majority of the APE is not sensitive for buried archaeological sites. Such sensitivity within the APE is limited to very narrow areas along creeks and drainages, such as the unnamed creek east of and parallel to Talbert Lane in Solano 4 West, and along Montezuma Hills Road. Far Western considered these areas to have the potential to contain buried archaeological sites.

To avoid impacts on unidentified archaeological sites that may be buried in the APE, no ground-disturbing activities should be conducted in the few locations with high or highest potential for buried sites. If these areas cannot be avoided and the project activities in those areas would be sufficient (i.e., deep enough) to potentially encounter buried archaeological resources, then additional actions may be necessary to mitigate any impacts on as-yet-unidentified buried resources. These minimization efforts could include conducting subsurface testing before project construction and/or monitoring during the construction period.

AECOM conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the entire direct APE within Solano 4 East, the majority of the Homerun (limited portions were not available for the survey because of landowner access constraints), and the portions of the APE of Solano 4 West that had not been previously surveyed in recent years (Scher and Whitaker 2016; Whitaker and Kajjankoski 2010). No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within the APE, although an isolated basalt projectile point (SMUD-2) was identified within Solano 4 East approximately 140 feet outside the direct APE.

Four historic-era resources were identified during the field survey: SMUD-5 (abandoned fenceline), SMUD-6 (isolate ceramic plate), SMUD-3 (concentration of habitation debris), and SMUD-1 (remnant livestock watering feature). All of these historic-era resources, identified within the direct APE, date to the 20th century and do not appear to be associated with any significant events or individuals important in the history of Montezuma Hills, Solano County, or California. Similarly, none of the identified historic-era resources embody a distinctive type of construction, and they do not appear to have the potential to yield information important in history. In addition to lacking historic significance, the historic-era resources lack integrity, given their deterioration and alteration. Thus, no historic properties (National Register of Historic Places) or historical resources (California Register of Historical Resources) were identified within the direct APE.

Built-environment resources within the indirect APE are analyzed in the separate Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, attached as an appendix to this report.
1 Introduction

1.1 Project Location

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) proposes to permit and construct the Solano 4 Wind Project (project) within the Montezuma Hills Wind Resource Area (MHWRA) in southern Solano County (Figure 1). The project would involve constructing and operating wind turbine generators (WTGs), an associated electrical collection system, access roads, and minor upgrades to the existing Russell Substation. The MHWRA is situated within the Antioch North, Birds Landing, and Jersey Island, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles (Figure 2), north of the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, and southwest of the city of Rio Vista.

The project would be implemented primarily on two properties, Solano 4 East and Solano 4 West, which total approximately 2,237 acres. These properties occupy 881 acres and 1,390 acres, respectively (Figure 3). Solano 4 East is approximately 3.5 miles southwest of Rio Vista and Solano 4 West is adjacent to the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta (Delta) near Collinsville, California.

1.2 Project Site and Surrounding Area

The project site is located in the MHWRA. In the Solano County Wind Turbine Siting Plan and Environmental Impact Report (Solano County 1987), Solano County designated this area as suitable for wind energy development, based on wind energy monitoring and assessment studies prepared in the late 1970s and 1980s by the California Energy Commission, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. These studies determined that the MHWRA experiences enough strong and steady winds to support commercial wind plants.

1.2.1 Topography and Natural Habitat

The MHWRA consists of a series of gently rolling hills of similar texture and size. The hills have a relatively constant crest elevation, generally between 150 and 250 feet above mean sea level. Valleys in the project area transition to sloped hillsides with relatively flat ridgelines.

The vegetation in the MHWRA and the project area is generally monotypic (i.e., annual grassland or dryland farming) and mostly treeless, and supports limited wetlands or other distinctive biological communities. The few trees in the Montezuma Hills are mostly nonnative and associated with rural farmsteads. Permanent and seasonal wetlands occur on the project lands and adjacent to Suisun Marsh; some of the land has been reclaimed with levees. Vegetation is primarily pasturelands and grain crops, with intermittent wetland swales and sporadic eucalyptus windbreaks. Varied shrub vegetation is present only in the drainage swales and around existing and abandoned settlements. Natural vegetation is limited; most of the area is nonnative grassland. Some of the lowland vegetation includes native willows, blackberry, rushes, and tules. Marsh vegetation is present in some of the shallow sloughs, which drain portions of the project area into the Sacramento River to the south.

1.2.2 Existing Land Uses

The project area is designated for agricultural use (dryland farming and grazing) and is sparsely populated. Residential development is precluded by the water-dependent industrial zoning and the property’s conditions, covenants, and restrictions. Other visible developments include electric transmission towers, as well as WTGs on the surrounding hilltops. Interior roads that connect these buildings and structures with each other are generally located at the lower elevations.

The project area is owned in fee title by SMUD. Solano 4 East (Phase 1) is an approximately 881-acre property, owned by SMUD, that is dominated by nonnative grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing. Solano 4 East supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs, gravel pads and roads, underground collection lines, and pad-mounted transformers. Solano 4 West (the Collinsville and Roberts Properties) is a 1,390-acre property, owned by SMUD, that is dominated by nonnative grasslands. Solano 4 West supports 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy, gravel access roads, and underground collection lines.
To maintain current land uses to the extent practicable, land is leased to farmers for dryland farming and grazing.

1.3 Project Description

The project would remove 23 existing WTGs from Solano 4 East and 62 WTGs from Solano 4 West; the existing towers have a maximum height of 410 feet. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs, 10 at Solano 4 East and 12 at Solano 4 West. The new facilities would generate a combined total of up to 90 megawatts of electricity. Associated access roads and collection lines would be installed to support the new WTGs. Power generated by the new WTGs would be transmitted to the existing Russell Substation on Montezuma Hills Road, where it would be distributed via the adjacent Birds Landing Switching Station through the existing 230-kilovolt (kV) Vaca–Dixon–Contra Costa transmission line (two circuits) and 500-kV Vaca-Dixon-Tesla line, which run through the MHWRA.

1.3.1 Wind Turbine Generators

The WTGs to be used for this project have not yet been selected. The maximum hub heights of the individual WTGs would range from 263 feet to 345 feet, and the maximum rotor diameter would be 492 feet. Figure 3 shows the potential Phase 4 siting areas (footprints) within which the WTGs would be installed. The WTGs would be assembled on hollow, tubular steel towers. Each tower would be up to either 263, or 345 feet tall, depending on the model. To reduce their visibility, the towers would be painted a neutral color, with a nonreflective exterior finish.

Each tower foundation would require excavation to a depth of approximately 36 feet. The tower foundations would consist of reinforced concrete structures, poured in place, with tower anchor bolts embedded between approximately 10 feet and 40 feet below the base. Construction of the tower foundations and associated structures would require the delivery and placement of aggregate base, reinforcing steel, and concrete.

Each WTG would each have three rotor blades attached to a central hub at the top of the tower. The rotor blades are expected to be either 446 feet (136 meters) or 492 feet (150 meters) in diameter (twice the length of the rotor blade), depending on the model. The tip speed of the blades is estimated to be 180 miles per hour at maximum speed.

As required by Federal Aviation Administration regulations, red flashing lights would be installed on WTGs at spacing intervals of approximately 1,000–1,500 feet and at the ends of WTG strings to form perimeter warning lights. Safety lighting would be installed on the exterior of select nacelles to comply with Federal Aviation Administration rules for structure lighting.

1.3.2 Power Collection System

The proposed power collection system would transport power generated by each WTG to the Russell Substation (Figure 3). The proposed WTG towers would include integral transformers and circuit protection. The power, which would leave each WTG at 34.5 kV, would be interconnected with other adjacent WTGs. These joined circuits would convey power to Russell Substation via new underground electrical cables. The trench for the new cables would be 4 feet deep and 1 foot wide. A new homerun line and easement would be required for the Solano 4 East homerun circuits, and are planned adjacent to the existing Phase 1 collection line and easement. A collection line and easement also would be needed for the Solano 4 West homerun circuits. From the Solano 4 West property, the new electrical lines would be located generally adjacent to the 500-kV Vaca-Dixon-Tesla line.

1.3.3 Meteorological Towers

As part of the project, two meteorological towers would be installed in the project area, one in Solano 4 East and one in Solano 4 West, to measure weather and wind resources. The towers would be constructed to a height comparable to the hub height of the WTGs selected for the project. They would be constructed as freestanding towers (without guy wires). Each tower foundation would consist of three piers measuring approximately 5 feet in diameter. The final locations of the meteorological towers in the project area would be defined during the installation process.
1.3.4 Russell Substation

New collection lines would run to the existing Russell Substation for distribution into the transmission system. Only minor improvements would be necessary at the substation, which has existing capacity to handle electricity generated by the project. From the Russell Substation, power would be distributed via the Birds Landing Switching Station through the existing 230-kV Vaca–Dixon–Contra Costa transmission line (two circuits) and 500-kV Vaca-Dixon-Tesla line, running through the MHWRA.

1.3.5 Access Roads and Staging Areas

Existing public and private roads would be used to access the WTGs and other facilities for routine operations and maintenance. State Route 12 provides regional access to the project area. Montezuma Hills Road provides local access to Solano 4 East and Collinsville Road provides local access to Solano 4 West. It may be necessary to improve existing public roads during construction to accommodate construction equipment. Should such improvements be required, SMUD would consult with the Solano County Public Works and Building divisions and other permitting/reviewing agencies (e.g., the State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO]) as needed to address potential environmental impacts.

Access roads must be at least 16 feet wide to accommodate project components. Roadways would be wider in some areas to accommodate the turning radius necessary to bring the WTGs to their specific locations via truck. Separate staging areas would be established in Solano 4 East and Solano 4 West. Staging areas would be cleared, grubbed, and graded. Each staging area would be approximately 26 acres. At the completion of construction activities, staging areas and widened areas of the new access roads would be returned to preproject conditions and revegetated with a seed mix that is consistent with the surrounding vegetation.

1.4 Area of Potential Effects

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist” (Title 36, Section 800.16[b] of the Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] [36 CFR 800.16(b)]).

The direct APE includes all areas where ground disturbance would occur during installation of project facilities such as WTGs, access roads, and underground collection lines. The APE is primarily restricted to hilltops, ridgelines, and steep slopes with minimal cultural sensitivity. Figure 3 depicts the direct APE for this project.

A separate indirect APE was established for the project to account for indirect effects (e.g., visual) on aboveground historic-era built-environment resources. This indirect APE and associated effects are discussed in the attached Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report (Appendix A).

1.5 Personnel

All cultural resources work for this project has been carried out by the following individuals who meet (or were supervised by individuals who meet) the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (48 CFR 44716 [1983]), consistent with the procedures for compliance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (36 CFR 800):

- **Karin Goetter Beck, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), Registered Professional Historian**, acted as principal investigator and authored this report. Ms. Beck has a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has 22 years of experience in conducting archaeological and built-environment investigations and historical research in California. Ms. Beck meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology and history.

- **Annamarie Leon Guerrero, RPA**, acted as crew chief for portions of the field survey. Ms. Leon Guerrero has a bachelor’s degree in English and anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has more than 10 years of
experience in cultural resources management in California, as well as archaeological experience in Alaska, Arizona, and Montana. Ms. Leon Guerrero meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology.

- **Jennifer Redmond, RPA**, acted as crew chief for portions of the field survey. Ms. Redmond has a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has more than 10 years of experience in cultural resources management and archaeology throughout California and the Midwest. Ms. Redmond meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology.
2 Regulatory Context

Numerous federal, state, and local laws and ordinances provide guidance for the consideration and protection of cultural resources. Key cultural resources regulations that are most relevant to the project are summarized in this chapter.

The project would require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1977 (United States Code [USC], Title 33, Section 1344 [33 USC 1344]). Issuance of a permit by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers constitutes a federal undertaking and mandates compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

2.1 National Historic Preservation Act

The NHPA (54 USC 300101 et seq.) establishes federal policy on historic preservation and the programs, including the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), through which this policy is implemented. Under the NHPA, significant cultural resources, referred to as "historic properties," include any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, object, or landscape included or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. A property is considered historically significant if it meets one of the NRHP criteria and retains sufficient historic integrity to convey its significance. This act also established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent agency that is responsible for implementing Section 106 of the NHPA (54 USC 306108) by developing procedures to protect cultural resources included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP. Regulations are published in 36 CFR Parts 60, 63, and 800.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires that effects on historic properties be taken into consideration in any federal undertaking. The process contains five steps:

1. Initiate the Section 106 process.
2. Identify historic properties.
3. Assess adverse effects.
4. Resolve adverse effects.
5. Implement stipulations in an agreement document.

Section 106 affords the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the SHPO, as well as other consulting parties, a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP. SHPOs administer the National Historic Preservation Program at the state level, review NRHP nominations, maintain data on historic properties that have been identified but not yet nominated, and consult with federal agencies during Section 106 review.

The NRHP uses the following eligibility criteria (in accordance with 36 CFR 60.4) to evaluate the significance of properties:

(a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
(b) are associated with the lives of persons significant to our past; or
(c) 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; or
(d) have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 101(d)(6)(A) of the NHPA allows properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to a Native American tribe to be determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. A broader range of traditional cultural properties is also considered and may be determined eligible for or listed in the NRHP. Traditional cultural properties are places associated with the cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that community’s history, and may be eligible because of their association with cultural practices or beliefs of living communities that (a) are rooted in that community’s history and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. In the NRHP programs, “culture” is understood to mean the traditions, beliefs, practices, lifeways, arts, crafts, and social institutions of any community, be it an Indian tribe, a local ethnic group, or the nation as a whole.
2.2 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15064.5) provide specific guidance for determining the significance of impacts on historic architectural and archaeological resources. Under CEQA, these significant resources are called “historical resources,” whether they are of historic-era or prehistoric age. CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.1) defines historical resources as those listed, or eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or those listed in the historical register of a local jurisdiction (county or city). Cultural resources listed in the NRHP and located in California are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The CRHR criteria for listing cultural resources are based on, and are very similar to, the NRHP criteria. CEQA (PRC Section 21083.2) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5[c]) provide further definitions and guidance for archaeological sites and their treatment.

Under CEQA, a historical resource is defined as any resource that:

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 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; or
4. has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

CEQA Section 15064.5 also prescribes a process and procedures for addressing the existence or probable likelihood of Native American human remains, and the accidental discovery of any human remains in the project area. The process includes consulting with appropriate Native American tribes about the treatment of known or found Native American human remains, before such remains are recovered.

Guidelines for the implementation of CEQA define the procedures, types of activities, persons, and public agencies required to comply with CEQA. Appendix G in Section 15023 provides an environmental checklist of questions that a lead agency should normally address if relevant to a project’s environmental impacts.

CEQA also addresses impacts on unique archaeological resources. CEQA Section 21083.2 defines “unique archaeological resource” as “any archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and show 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.
3 Cultural Setting

3.1 Prehistoric Archaeological Context

The project area is located in the Delta, a region where rapid alluvial and colluvial deposition has occurred over the last 10,000 years, resulting in the presence of deeply buried archaeological deposits throughout much of the region. The following prehistoric context is from the *Archaeological Survey and Geoarchaeological Sensitivity Report for the Proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, Solano County, California* published by Far Western Anthropological Research Group (Far Western) (Scher and Whitaker 2016).

The following discussion focuses on cultural assemblages from a sequence of time periods in Solano County and neighboring counties to the south. Five time periods are used to order the local archaeological record (Groza 2002; Groza et al. 2011; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997): Lower Archaic (10,000–6000 years Before Present [B.P.]), Early Middle Archaic (7000–4500 B.P.), Terminal Middle Archaic/Early Period (4500–2500 B.P.), Upper Archaic or Middle Period (2500–1300 B.P.), and Emergent Period or Late Period (1300–200 B.P.).

3.1.1 Lower Archaic (10,000–6000 B.P.)

The oldest archaeological component found so far in the San Francisco Bay–Delta region derives from the Los Vaqueros Reservoir area in eastern Contra Costa County. Two sites at the reservoir (CA-CCO-637 and CA-CCO-696) have recently produced artifact assemblages and human burials dated between 9,870 and 6,600 years ago (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997, 1998). These deposits were buried at depths of 2–4 meters below the surface in alluvial fan/floodplain sediments along Kellogg Creek.

The combined Lower Archaic assemblage at Los Vaqueros Reservoir included handstones and milling slabs, cobble-core tools, and a wide-stemmed obsidian projectile point, reminiscent of archaeological deposits found in the southern Clear Lake Basin and elsewhere in California at this time (Fredrickson 1966). At least three human burials from Los Vaqueros Reservoir are known to date to this time period, one of which was buried under a stone cairn. Small but diverse floral and faunal assemblages indicate that a variety of animal and plant species were used by the site inhabitant. Large nuts (acorns and wild cucumber) and berries (manzanita) were the dominant plant resources represented in the archaeological deposits. Obsidian from both the North Coast Ranges and the eastern Sierra Nevada was used. Overall, the Lower Archaic assemblage from Contra Costa County appears to have affinities with assemblages assigned to the Borax Lake Pattern in the North Coast Ranges and “Milling Stone Horizon” assemblages to the south. Sites of this age are known from Solano County.

3.1.2 Early Middle Archaic (7000–4500 B.P.)

Extensive early Middle Archaic deposits are rare in central California, but two sites of this age are known from Los Vaqueros Reservoir (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997, 1998). Site CA-CCO-637, located in a small valley, included deeply buried components found in an alluvial fan adjacent to Kellogg Creek. The site was contained in buried soil and included a diverse assortment of habitation debris, several human burials, and residential and processing features.

Several characteristics of this important deposit, including exclusive use of the mortar and pestle, suggest that this assemblage may be affiliated with the Berkeley Pattern (associated with the West Berkeley Shellmound), previously placed no farther back in time than the Terminal Middle Archaic or Early Period (see below) (Fredrickson 1973). Among the distinctive artifacts associated with this component is one of the oldest dated shell bead lots in central California (4160 B.P.) and a unique type of pestle apparently used with a wooden mortar (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997).

3.1.3 Terminal Middle Archaic/Early Period (4500–2500 B.P.)

A number of archaeological sites in Contra Costa and Solano counties date to the Terminal Middle Archaic Period, including portions of CA-CCO-637 and CA-CCO-696 at Los Vaqueros Reservoir (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997, 1998), CA-CCO-308 in the San Ramon Valley (Fredrickson 1966), and CA-SOL-315 (Wiberg 1992) and CA-SOL-391 (Wohlgemuth and Rosenthal 1999) in Green Valley, just west of Vacaville. These latter two sites are the oldest well-dated archaeological deposits in Solano County. Initial use of the shell mound sites along the San Francisco estuary also appears to have begun during this
time interval (Banks and Orlins 1985; Broughton 1997; Lightfoot 1997; Waechter 1992). The Terminal Middle Archaic is equivalent to the Early Period in Dating Scheme B, the earliest time period covered by that scheme.

All Terminal Middle Archaic sites in Solano and Contra Costa counties have produced human remains and most contain intact burials. A variety of artifacts are associated with this time period, including side-notched and stemmed projectile points, rectangular *Halioitis* (abalone) ornaments, shaped and unshaped mortars and pestles, and rectangular *Olivella* shell beads (Fredrickson 1966; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997). Of particular interest is the vibrant Windmiller Culture that existed in the lower Sacramento Valley during this period; however, no evidence of its distinctive mortuary pattern has been discovered in Solano County.

Obsidian from the North Coast Ranges and the eastern Sierra Nevada continued to be used during this period (Jackson 1974; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Waechter 1992; Wiberg 1996); however, in Solano County, obsidian from a source in the northern Napa Valley was now used almost exclusively (Wiberg 1992; Wohlgemuth and Rosenthal 1999). Nut and berry crops (acorn, manzanita, and pine nut) appear to have been the primary plant resources targeted during this time period (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997). Along the bayshore, marine shellfish species were an important subsistence resource (Banks and Orlins 1985; Waechter 1992), as were marine fishes and mammals (Broughton 1997; Simons 1992). Interior sites include a similar assortment of faunal resources, but with the notable absence of marine resources.

### 3.1.4 Upper Archaic/Middle Period (2500–1300 B.P.)

The Upper Archaic is equivalent to the Early/Middle Transition and the Middle Period in Dating Scheme B of Bennyhoff and Hughes (1987). Upper Archaic deposits are found throughout the lowland valleys of the Coast Ranges and along the shores of San Francisco and Suisun bays. These sites are typically located near freshwater streams, and many have been found in buried contexts (Banks and Orlins 1979, 1981, 1985; Cook and Ellasser 1956; Fredrickson 1966, 1968; Hammel 1956; Heizer 1949; Holman and Clark 1982; Lightfoot 1997; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Waechter et al. 1995). Several excavated sites in Solano County date to this time interval, including sites in Green Valley (CA-SOL-11 and CA-SOL-355/H [Rosenthal 1996; Snoke 1967; Wiberg 1993]); in Vaca Valley (P-48-816, CA-SOL-320/H, CA-SOL-357, CA-SOL-425/H, and CA-SOL-451 [Whitaker and Carpenter 2010; Rosenthal et al. 2009; Whitaker et al. 2009]); and in the Sacramento Valley near Dixon (CA-SOL-363, CA-SOL-379, and CA-SOL-380 [Chatten et al. 1997; Rosenthal and White 1994; Shapiro and Tremaine 1995]).

Upper Archaic sites are typically composed of well-developed midden deposits containing hundreds of human burials and habitation features, representing long-term residential villages. The earliest Upper Archaic sites contain classic Berkeley Pattern assemblages, characterized by well-developed bone tool and ornament industries, numerous saucer- and saddle-shaped *Olivella* shell beads, steatite disk beads, *Halioitis* ornaments and pendants, and both unshaped and well-shaped mortars and pestles (Rosenthal 1996; Wiberg 1993). Projectile points are typically shouldered lanceolate forms, although side-notched and stemmed points also occur, along with large lanceolate bifaces. Well-made charmstones from various types of stone, as well as baked clay, are frequently found at sites in Solano County. Human interments are typically placed in flexed position with distinct burial postures and orientations identified at different sites (Fredrickson 1973; Rosenthal 1996). In the North Bay, obsidian from Napa Valley appears to have remained an important toolstone (Rosenthal and White 1994; Shapiro and Tremaine 1995; Wiberg 1992).

Subsistence remains indicate that acorns and other large nut and seed crops were an important part of the diet, with a growing emphasis on small-seeded resources (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Rosenthal and White 1994; Rosenthal et al. 2009; Whitaker et al. 2009; Wiberg 1993; Wohlgemuth 1996). Faunal assemblages continue to reflect either marine or terrestrial taxa, depending on the location of the site (Broughton 1997; Fredrickson 1966, 1968; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Wiberg 1992); although during the Upper Archaic, marine shellfish first occurred in appreciable amounts in interior valley sites (Fredrickson 1966, 1968).

Well entrenched social boundaries have been identified through analysis of burial patterns at sites in Suisun, Fairfield, Vacaville, and Dixon (Rosenthal 1996; Whitaker and Carpenter 2010; Whitaker et al. 2009). Rosenthal (1996) identified a difference between the Green Valley and Dixon aspects during this time: the Green Valley Aspect showed a regimented burial pattern, with north- and west-facing burials interred on their right or left sides, while the Dixon Aspect showed no pattern in burial orientation for interments. Whitaker et al. (2009) and Rosenthal et al. (2009) incorporated data from several sites in Vacaville (CA-SOL-320, CA-SOL-425, CA-SOL-451, and P-48-816) and deduced that the social boundary lies somewhere between Ulatis and Alamo creeks, with Alamo Creek making up the northern boundary of the Green Valley Aspect. The stark
delineation of social boundaries is thought to have reduced the ability of people to access distant resource patches, perhaps requiring them to increase the diversity of resources exploited and the intensity of use for lower-ranking resources, and to rely on trade networks for exogenous resources.

3.1.5 Emergent Period/Late Period (1200–200 B.P.)

The distinctive cultural pattern of the Emergent Period is marked by the appearance of small, arrow-sized projectile points, beautifully trimmed “show” mortars, flanged pestles, flanged steatite pipes, and chevron-designed bird bone tubes. Emergent Period sites have been excavated at several locations in Solano County: CA-SOL-356 in Green Valley (Wiberg 1996), CA-SOL-30 in Lagoon Valley, the Nakamura and Glasshoff sites in Suisun Valley (Phebus 1990), the Peterson Mounds (CA-SOL-1, CA-SOL-2, and CA-SOL-3) west of Vaca Valley, and the Glenn Cove site (CA-SOL-236) near the Carquinez Bridge (Beardsley 1954).

Emergent Period deposits are documented in most interior valleys and bayshore locations, and in upland contexts, where habitation and task-specific sites are reported (Atchley 1994; Baker 1987; Banks and Orlins 1979; Bramlette 1989; Fredrickson 1966, 1968; Holson et al. 1990; Lillard et al. 1939; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Wills 1994). Buried sites dating to the Emergent Period have been found in some of the interior valleys (Fredrickson 1966; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Wiberg 1996), although most of the recorded sites are located at the surface. Typically, these sites are well-developed midden deposits containing both human cremations and standard burials. Residential features, including house floors, are common (Phebus 1990; Wiberg 1996).

It was also during the Emergent Period that bedrock mortar milling stations were first established, beginning in the East Bay area around 1,300 years ago (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997). Portable mortars and pestles continued to be used, although smaller specimens were preferred. Changes in the size of these tools may have occurred in response to the increased use of small-seeded plant resources (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Wohlgemuth 1996). *Olivella* and clam shell disc beads are frequently found with Emergent Period burials and in midden deposits. Manufacturing debris has been found, suggesting that at least some of these beads were made locally (Hartzell 1991; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997; Palumbo 1964; Wiberg 1996).

Large mammals appear to have taken a more prominent role in the diet during this period, as did small-seeded resources. Marine shellfish and marine fishes moved inland in much larger quantities during the Emergent Period (Baker 1987; Fredrickson 1968; Meyer and Rosenthal 1997). Large villages with hundreds of people are thought to have been located in the Delta region, while smaller hamlets composed of one or two extended families were located in some of the smaller valleys (Meyer and Rosenthal 1997).

3.2 Ethnographic Context

The project area is located primarily within the ethnographic boundaries of the Patwin; however, the Plains Miwok occupied both banks of the Sacramento River form Rio Vista to Freeport. The Montezuma Hills were not the sole domain of any one group, and were used by several Native American groups in recent prehistory and the historic period. It is believed that the Southeastern Patwin, the Plains Miwok, and the Bay Miwok all used the Montezuma Hills and the surrounding regions. The following discussion is summarized from Levy (1978) and Johnson (1978).

The term *Patwin* is a native word for “people” that several tribelets used to describe themselves. Patwin groups speak dialects of the Southern Wintuan language group, which belongs to the Penutian language family, along with Miwok, Maidu, and Costanoan Yokuts.

Patwin territory extends along the southern portion of the Sacramento River Valley, from Princeton (in Colusa County) to San Pablo and Suisun bays. The earliest reports from this area described this territory as being occupied by several different tribes, later referred to as “tribelets”; many distinct dialects were spoken. The Patwin had relatively early contact with explorers and settlers from Spain and elsewhere in Europe. As early as 1800, individuals were taken from Patwin settlements to the Spanish Mission Dolores and Mission San Jose, and later to Mission Sonoma. Other contact came from explorers such as Jedediah Smith and employees of the Hudson’s Bay Company. The Sacramento Valley and lower parts of the Delta were settled by the mid-1800s; and with increasing pressure from the Euro-Americans, the remaining Patwin became partially assimilated into American culture, taking temporary jobs on ranches, or were placed on federal reservations.
Central to the Patwin ritual life was the Kuksu cult, common throughout much of north-central California. Young boys and occasionally high-status women were initiated into one of three secret societies. Shamanism was also important, primarily for curing and ritual healing. The primary political unit was the tribelet: a primary village and satellite villages (Johnson 1978:354). Each tribelet was self-governing and occupied a defined territory. Small cultural differences existed between each group. Subsistence activities consisted of hunting, fishing, and collecting a wide variety of plants and seeds. Acorns were particularly important to the diet and were owned communally by each group.

The Bay Miwok tribelet, Ompin, is known to have had a village approximately 1.5 miles east of the project area; therefore, the Bay Miwok likely used the Montezuma Hills most intensively into the historic period.

Bay Miwok territory extended from the southeastern portion of the Montezuma Hills south to Mount Diablo, and from the present-day city of Walnut Creek east as far as Plains Miwok territory near Sherman Island. The Bay Miwok distributed themselves into tribelet groups that consisted of a village or groups of villages that shared linguistic and/or kinship affinities and are described variously as ranging from 20 to 300 people. Settlements were located on permanent watercourses and intermittent streams (in drier areas) and on high ground in areas near the Delta.

The Bay Miwok were semi-nomadic, employing a hunting and gathering subsistence pattern. Acorns were their principal dietary component; however, fishing in the adjacent San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers was also important. Boats were built from tule bundles. Miwok technology included bone, stone, antler, wood, and textile tools. The Bay Miwok constructed several types of structures, including conical thatch structures and semi-subterranean earth-covered lodges. Contact between the Bay Miwok and Europeans occurred in the second half of the 18th century, when Spanish explorers arrived in the area, leading to a period of hostilities, missionization, and population decline. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, subsistence through hunting and gathering was increasingly augmented by seasonal wage labor on ranches and farms.

### 3.3 Historic Context

#### 3.3.1 Spanish and Mexican Periods

As described above, the Delta region was first visited in historic times by Spanish explorers, including Pedro Fages and Juan Bautista de Anza, in the 1770s. Exploration of the region by the Spanish continued into the 1800s, and in 1815, Spanish missionaries made a concerted effort to bolster native populations in their mission system after an epidemic devastated the neophyte population at Mission San Francisco de Asís (in San Francisco) in 1795, and in anticipation of founding another mission: San Francisco Solano (in Sonoma) which opened in 1823 (California Mission Resource Center 2018). In 1817, a military expedition ventured into what is now Solano County from the Carquinez Straight for the purposes of exploring the countryside and recruiting natives into Christianity (Munro Fraser 1879: 2-3). The subsequent confrontation was hard-fought by the natives, who were eventually overcome by the Spanish, leaving the region less protected and available for settlement by Euro-Americans from east. Early Euro-American settlement of the project vicinity began in 1844 when the Mexican government granted John Bidwell the 17,726-acre Rancho Los Ulpinos, located along the Sacramento River to the east of the APE. The rancho took its name from the Julpun, a subtribe of Miwok Indians who occupied the western banks of the Sacramento River.

Individual settlers like Lansford W. Hastings also trickled into the Montezuma Hills, so named by Hastings who arrived in 1846. Lansford W. Hastings laid out Montezuma City at the head of Suisun Bay in 1847, with plans to subdivide and develop the area to establish his own republic (Gudde 1998:246). When Hastings’ plan to develop a Mormon settlement unraveled because of the United States’ annexation of California, he left his adobe home at the head of Suisun Bay and headed to Sacramento, participating in California’s entry into the United States, serving as a representative of the Sacramento District at California’s First Constitutional Convention.

#### 3.3.2 American Period

Lindsay Power Marshall and his sons purchased Hastings’ land in 1854 and subsequently reoccupied Hastings’ land grant. They developed the first agricultural operation in the hills and later began selling portions of the large landholding they had.

---

1 Portions of this section were taken from the Solano Wind Project, Solano County, California. Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report (JRP 2007).
acquired to other pioneers like John Kierce, Edward Jenkins, and Samuel Stratton. Settlement along the Sacramento River increased as swamp reclamation projects created fertile and available farmland. Emery Upham, one of the more successful early pioneers of the area, owned 8,100 acres in the Montezuma Hills by 1880. Upham’s lands were divided and sold upon his death in 1897.

An 1878 directory lists 23 ranches in the Montezuma Hills area, and census records indicate that immigrants came from such diverse places as England, Ireland, and Chile, and from a variety of U.S. locations, such as Pennsylvania, Maine, South Carolina, Kentucky, and Massachusetts. Area ranches distributed products via Birds Landing to San Francisco and Sacramento. Collinsville, founded by C. J. Collins in 1861, was developed as a port along the Sacramento River near the southwestern edge of the project area.

The principal economic activities in the Montezuma Hills during the late 19th and 20th centuries were wheat (dry) farming and ranching (JRP 2007). Independent farms and ranches began to grow along watercourses and in the low valleys during the first quarter of the 20th century, as shown in the 1906 Birds Landing 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1906). These farms and ranches were linked by a road system that followed well-established routes that were in place by the late 19th century, many of which are still in use today.

In the first quarter of the 20th century, the open range of the Montezuma Hills, located on the outskirts of the ever-expanding California population, became the focus of planned industrial and energy production. In the 1920s, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) began to prospect in the area for a new supply of natural gas. This exploration was unsuccessful but did not deter PG&E from returning 40 years later with a proposal for a nuclear power plant near Collinsville. The plan was not adopted, but during the 1970s, Dow Chemical Company purchased large tracts of agricultural land in hopes of establishing a multimillion-dollar industrial development. At the same time, ARCO Chemical Company attempted to develop a billion-dollar petrochemical plant near Toland Landing, but this proposal was ultimately rejected as well.

Instead, in the late 1980s, wind farms were established in the Montezuma Hills to exploit the strong winds on the area’s hilltops and ridges (Righter 1996:240,280). SMUD purchased land in the early 1990s and established wind facilities in the Montezuma Hills by the late 1990s (Cutting, pers. comm., 2018). Today, the area’s economic activities continue to be both ranching and wind energy production, with multiple companies producing wind energy.
4 Identification of Historic Resources

4.1 Records Search

A records search (Appendix B) was conducted on May 14, 2018, by AECOM archaeologist and historian Karin G. Beck at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park (NWIC File No. 17-2697). The NWIC, an affiliate of the California Office of Historic Preservation, is the official state repository of cultural resources records and studies for Solano County. Site records and previous studies were accessed for the APE and a 0.5-mile radius as shown on the Antioch North, Birds Landing, and Jersey Island, California, USGS 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. The following references also were reviewed:

- NRHP
- CRHR
- Historic Property Data File for Solano County (OHP 2012)
- California State Historical Landmarks (OHP 1996)
- California Inventory of Historic Resources (State Parks 1976)
- California Points of Historical Interest (OHP 1992)
- Antioch North, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1953a, 1978a)
- Birds Landing, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1906, 1953b, 1978b)
- Jersey Island, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1952, 1978c)
- Rio Vista, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1953c)
- Antioch, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1907)
- Jersey Island, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1910a)
- Rio Vista, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1910b)
- Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California (OHP 1988)
- California Place Names (Gudde 1998)
- Historic Spots in California (Kyle et al. 2002)
- Historical Atlas of California (Beck and Haase 1974)

The records search identified 10 studies previously conducted within portions of the APE (Table 1), covering the entire APE. Of these, two studies (S-24272 and S-23674) identified one cultural resource (P-48-524) within the direct APE; this resource, a historic-era ranch complex, is addressed in the historical resources evaluation report (Appendix A), along with other previously identified resources within the indirect APE. No previously recorded archaeological sites are present within the APE. The nearest recorded prehistoric resource is P-48-949, an isolated handstone approximately 75 feet west of the Southern Homerun APE, near Solano 4 West. Fifteen resources were identified within 1 mile of the APE (Table 2).

One study of the APE (not filed at the NWIC) that is of particular interest is the geoarchaeological sensitivity assessment by Far Western (Scher and Whitaker 2016) of most of the APE south of Montezuma Hills Road. That assessment concluded that the majority of the APE is not sensitive for buried archaeological sites. However, Scher and Whitaker (2016) suggested that areas of creeks and drainages, such as the unnamed creek east of Talbert Lane in Solano 4 West and along Montezuma Hills Road, have the high or highest potential for encountering buried archaeological sites (Figure 4).
# Table 1. Cultural Resources Studies within the Direct Area of Potential Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Survey Year</th>
<th>NWIC Study Number</th>
<th>Project Location(s)</th>
<th>Resource Identified within APE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holman, Miley. <em>Archaeological Literature Review and Field Inspection of Areas 1 through 9, Montezuma Hills, Solano County, California</em>. Holman &amp; Associates, San Francisco, CA.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>11766</td>
<td>Solano 4 East, Northern Homerun, Solano 4 West</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: APE = Area of Potential Effects; NWIC = Northwest Information Center
Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2018 based on records search at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University
### Table 2. Cultural Resources Identified within 1 Mile of the Direct Area of Potential Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proximity to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-56</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>No site description provided; not relocated during 2010 survey by Far Western</td>
<td>Approximately 0.75 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-41/CA-SOL-33</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Hastings’ Adobe</td>
<td>Approximately 0.25 mile southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-124/CA-SOL-283H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era homestead (possibly Knox Marshall), with extant barn, several depressions, collapsed water tower, and artifact scatter</td>
<td>Approximately 1,000 feet west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-125/CA-SOL-284H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era homestead (possibly Charles Dadami), with old well, modern well, and artifact scatter</td>
<td>More than 0.25 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-126/CA-SOL-285H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Historic-era structural debris and several depressions; recorded as the former site of the Catholic church and a school</td>
<td>More than 0.75 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-128/CA-SOL-287H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Recorded (based on ethnographic accounts) as a historic-era homestead with very little surface evidence remaining; site revisited and found no evidence of archaeological remains</td>
<td>Approximately 0.5 mile southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-139/CA-SOL-298H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era vegetation and fenceline that represent the remains of the Simpson homesite; site disturbed by illegal off-road motorcyclists</td>
<td>Approximately 0.25 mile southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-140/CA-SOL-299H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era vegetation that represent the remains of the Whitman homesite; site severely disturbed by illegal off-road motorcyclists</td>
<td>Approximately 0.25 mile southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-415/CA-SOL-399H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era homesite (possibly Esperson), with structural debris, a possible privy location, and artifact scatter</td>
<td>More than 0.5 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-416/CA-SOL-400H</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era homesite (possibly Charles Rice), with structural debris and a radio tower and gravel road on-site</td>
<td>Approximately 0.75 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-981</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Grizzly Island Road, Collinsville Road, and Chadbourne Road, which provide access to the interior islands of Suisun Marsh; recommended not eligible for the NRHP/CRHR</td>
<td>More than 0.5 mile west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-518</td>
<td>Northern Homerun, Southern Homerun</td>
<td>Remnant historic-era ranching- or farming-related buildings or structures and vegetation; contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape</td>
<td>Approximately 1,000 feet south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-519</td>
<td>Northern Homerun</td>
<td>Historic-era ranch buildings and residence; contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape</td>
<td>Approximately 700 feet south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-521</td>
<td>Solano 4 West</td>
<td>Historic-era ranch buildings and residence; contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape</td>
<td>Approximately 0.5 mile east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-48-523</td>
<td>Northern Homerun</td>
<td>Historic-era ranch buildings and residence; contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape</td>
<td>Approximately 700 feet south</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: APE = Area of Potential Effects; CRHR = California Register of Historical Resources; Far Western = Far Western Anthropological Research Group; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2018 based on records search at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University
5 Native American Consultation

A letter was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on May 10, 2018, requesting a search of the Sacred Lands File and a list of Native American contacts for the project. All three individuals on the NAHC's list were contacted by SMUD on April 5, 2018, for the purposes of CEQA/Assembly Bill 52 compliance. See Appendix C for Native American consultation efforts and results.
6 Field Methods and Results

6.1 Survey Methods

A pedestrian survey of the eastern portion of the APE (Solano 4 East) was conducted May 22–24, 2018. The remainder of the APE (the north-south and east-west Homerun stretches and the portions of Solano 4 West not surveyed previously [Scher and Whitaker 2016; Whitaker and Kaijankoski 2010]) was surveyed between June 18 and June 22, 2018. The survey was conducted by AECOM archaeologists who meet (or were supervised by those who meet) the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology.

The previous surveys conducted in areas of Solano 4 West (Figure 5) involved walking transects no wider than 20 meters apart, with “100% of the ground surface visible due to the recent disking [sic]” (Scher and Whitaker 2016; Whitaker and Kaijankoski 2010). During the 2018 surveys, the AECOM archaeologists walked 10- to 15-meter-wide transects across the entire APE and buffer area. Where possible, transects followed topographic contours. However, given the irregular shape of the APE, many transects instead followed the shape of the APE.

Visibility varied greatly between parcels under different ownership. Solano 4 East was primarily disced and visibility was excellent. The northern portion of Solano 4 West was covered in dense, low grasses and visibility was poor (less than 25%). In these areas, vegetation was periodically boot-scraped to provide a better view of the ground surface, and rodent burrow back dirt piles were inspected closely for indicators of archaeological deposits. The majority of the southern portion of Solano 4 West had been recently grazed and visibility was moderate (40–50%). Steeper slopes and slopes facing the river in Solano 4 West were typically covered in more dense grass with lower visibility (Photograph 1).

Within each of the Homerun transmission areas, visibility ranged from 100% in disced parcels to low (20–30%) in grazed parcels (Photographs 2 and 3).
Photograph 2. North-south Homerun in the northwest APE, view south. Note disced ground with good visibility.

Photograph 3. East-west Homerun in the north-central APE, view east. Note grazed ground with low grasses.
6.2 Survey Results

Five previously unrecorded historic-era resources were identified within the direct APE as a result of the survey efforts: two livestock watering features (SMUD-1 and SMUD-4); one abandoned fenceline (SMUD-5); one isolate ceramic plate (SMUD-6); and a concentration of habitation debris (SMUD-3) (Table 3 and Figure 3)(Appendix D). In addition, a single prehistoric basalt projectile point isolate (SMUD-2) was identified approximately 140 feet east (outside) of the APE within Solano 4 East (Figure 3). These resources are discussed below, with reference to the portion of the project area within which they were identified, and their locations are depicted in Figure 3.

Table 3. Resource Designations and Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Number (Field Designation)</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-48-524</td>
<td>Historic-era ranch complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-1</td>
<td>Livestock watering feature (remnant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-2**</td>
<td>Basalt biface (isolate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-3</td>
<td>Concentration of habitation debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-4 (JR 0618_01)</td>
<td>Livestock watering feature (extant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-5 (JT 0621_01)</td>
<td>Fenceline (abandoned remnant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUD-6 (JT 0622_01)</td>
<td>Ceramic plate fragments (isolate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Resource was identified outside the Area of Potential Effects
Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2018.

6.2.1 Solano 4 West

One linear feature (SMUD-5) and one historic-era isolate (SMUD-6) were identified in Solano 4 West. A second isolate, a concrete fence pier (field recording number: JT 0622_02), was also noted, but this is likely a component of SMUD-5.

6.2.1.1 SMUD-5
SMUD-5 is an abandoned northeast-southwest trending fenceline with only a small portion of the alignment within the APE (Photograph 4). The fence consists of upright square posts generally 4 feet high; some posts have been augmented/stabilized with standard two-by-fours. The barbed wire connecting the posts has mostly been removed. All visible nails are wire cut. A concrete fence pier was found in a dry swale on the east edge of Solano 4 West. On aerial photographs, it appears that this feature is in line with SMUD-5, so it was included as part of this resource.

The fenceline, located in the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 25, is likely associated with the ranch property acquired by John Kierce from Lindsay Powell Marshall Sr. in 1880, when Marshall divested some of his lands to Kierce and Edward Jenkins (Gregory 1912; Theodoratus et al. 1980:131) (Figure 6). John and his wife Ann (O’Loughlin) Kierce (also Kerce, Kearce), were natives of Ireland, and emigrated to the United States sometime in the early 1860s (U.S. Census Office 1900). John and Ann appear in the 1870 U.S. Census as residents of Denverton, northwest of the APE, in Solano County; John is listed as a farmer with real estate valued at $3,600 (U.S. Census Office 1870). When John drowned in Collinsville in January 1893 (Solano County 1893) while tending to his business interests in the area (San Francisco Call 1893a), this property passed to Ann and her four remaining living children, Francis, Mary (Griffin), Veronica, and Theresa. The eldest daughter, Mary, and her husband Stephen Griffin were Collinsville residents at the time of John’s death (San Francisco Call 1893a; Woodland Daily Democrat 1893), while Francis (Frank) was a patent attorney living in Oakland (San Francisco Call 1893b). The remaining members of the Kierce family were residents of San Francisco (San Francisco Call 1893a).

This property has maintained (roughly) its 1890 borders and acreage into the 21st century. In about 1912, the U.S. government acquired a small portion of the parcel in the south through eminent domain, for the purpose of widening the mouth of the Sacramento River to improve navigation (Herbert and Kennedy 2007; San Francisco Call 1911; Solano County 1890, 1915, 2018) (Plate 1).
6.2.1.2 SMUD-6
SMUD-6 is a broken, 9-inch-diameter, white improved earthenware dinner plate. Two pieces were identified (Photograph 5). The rim is scalloped and the brim is decorated with a blue floral and geometric decal pattern. The base of the plate has a green mark reading “中国唐山 [China Tangshan]/Made in China,” surrounded by a green ribbon. Tangshan was a major center of ceramics in China in the 20th century (Koh 2014). This mark may date to the 1960s or 1970s (eBid 2018; Nilsson 2018). The plate was found in a dry swale within what was once Edward Jenkins’ property, more recently belonging to James W. Roberts (Herbert and Kennedy 2007) (Photograph 6). No other artifacts were found in the vicinity.
Photograph 5. Two plate sherds (Isolate SMUD-6)

Photograph 6. Overview of Isolate SMUD-6 in area with low, grazed grasses. View west.
6.2.2  Solano 4 East

6.2.2.1  SMUD-1
SMUD-1 consists of the structural remains of an old water pump/cistern and a low-density artifact scatter, located on the south bank of an unnamed waterway, on the north side of Toland Lane (Photograph 7). The structural remains consist of finished lumber, two concrete slabs/foundation fragments, corrugated metal, one red (common) brick and one fire brick, and one fragment of flat, aqua-colored glass. The finished lumber included two 4 by 4 by 4-foot-long boards, two 2 by 10 by 8-foot-long boards, and seven 2 by 6-foot-long boards of varying lengths. The concrete slabs/foundation fragments measured (respectively) 48 inches long by 14 inches wide by 8 inches thick and 28 inches long by 14 inches wide by 8 inches thick. A 1-inch-diameter threaded pipe was observed among the structural remains. The pipe appeared to be oriented toward the creek and likely acted as part of a water-delivery system. A length of an approximately 6-inch-diameter flexible polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe was also observed near the metal pipe. Two “Square D,” 60-ampere breaker boxes were observed within the structural remains. The structural remains appear to be similar to other areas in the vicinity where cattle are watered (see SMUD-4). The electrical breaker boxes would have been used to pump water into a tank or cistern. Schneider Electric has listed the trademark “Square D” on conduit boxes and switches since 1917, and the trademark is still in use today (Schneider Electric 2018).

Several artifacts were identified in the vicinity of the structural remains: three fragments of cobalt-colored glass (less than 1 inch); one fragment of curved, aqua-colored glass; and two curved, colorless glass fragments. Two 21-inch-diameter, ferrous metal, concave “discs” with a 6-inch opening in the center were also observed (Photograph 7). These are likely the remains of worn-out tilling equipment used to disc the fields. In addition to the artifact deposit and structural remains, two 12-inch-diameter concrete post foundation fragments were identified approximately 15 feet southeast of the location of the structural remains. The materials at SMUD-1 appear to be a mixture of mid-20th-century and modern materials associated with farming and ranching.
6.2.2.2 SMUD-3

SMUD-3 is a moderately dense historic-era artifact deposit located on a disced, east-facing hillside, approximately 68 feet upslope of Montezuma Hills Road (Figure 3 and Photograph 8). The artifact deposit consisted of highly fragmentary ceramics, glass (vessel) fragments, and metal hardware. Ceramics included 15 fragments of nondiagnostic white improved earthenware and two fragments of brown glazed earthenware. The glass fragments included three green, eight aqua, and three amethyst-colored sherds (Photograph 9). One of the green glass fragments was a partial neck with a crown top finish and one of the amethyst fragments included a partial neck and blob finish. The metal fragments included two railroad spikes, 10 cast iron brackets/hooks, and several fragments of miscellaneous scrap metal. Although diagnostic artifacts were largely absent, the materials identified suggest an age range from the late 19th to early 20th century.

Given the disced nature of the field, it is unlikely that the artifacts are in situ; however, the fact that the artifacts were concentrated in one primary location, intermixed and even embedded in the disced dirt—as opposed to just overlying the dirt—indicates that the artifacts were likely in this general location when the field was disced. A sparse number of artifacts were identified as far as 145 feet north of the primary deposit. These artifacts may have been relocated across the landscape during the discing process. A review of historic-era maps and aerials does not indicate that a structure was ever recorded in this location; thus, a determination of association is difficult.
Photograph 9. Examples of artifacts identified at SMUD-3: nondecorated, white improved earthenware and aqua and amethyst-colored glass sherds.

6.2.2.3 SMUD-4
SMUD-4 consists of three features associated with cattle ranching: a galvanized steel water tank, a metal cattle trough, and a concrete pad for a pump and electrical outlet with an associated utility pole (Photograph 10). The site is north of Montezuma Hills Road and is bordered on the north and east by roads constructed in the 1990s and 2000s to service the Vestas V-47 WTGs. Aerial photographs suggest that the location has been used for watering cattle since at least 1957 (UCSB 1957). The site is in active use.

Photograph 10. Overview of SMUD-4, view northeast.

Locus A is a galvanized steel water tank that measures approximately 9 feet in diameter and 10 feet in height. The tank is supported by wood four-by-four posts that rest on two parallel board-formed concrete footings that measure approximately 15 feet long, 1 foot wide, and 1.5 feet in height. The tank is marked with a modern nonpotable-water warning sign and is piped
with a mixture of metal and modern PVC piping. The tank is behind an ad-hoc fence made of scavenged wood, metal posts, and barbed wire fencing.

Locus B is a modern approximately 4-foot by 5-foot-wide concrete pad, also located behind the ad-hoc fencing and west of the tank. The pad supports a pump and electrical outlet, which is apparently associated with the tank. A modern utility pole with a utility meter and pump control box are adjacent to the pad.

Locus C is a metal cattle trough located 50 feet east of the tank. The oval trough is approximately 7 feet long, 4 feet wide, and 3 feet in height. The trough is partially covered with wood planking and wooden posts are placed on either end to prevent the trough from being pushed over. It appears that the trough was not made as a trough, but has instead been repurposed.

6.2.3 Homerun

No cultural resources were identified in the Homerun stretches of the APE during the survey effort.
7 Study Findings

7.1 Findings and Conclusions

The background research, literature review, records search, and field survey identified no prehistoric archaeological sites within the APE, and six historic-era resources: P-48-524, SMUD-4, SMUD-3, and SMUD-1 in Solano East and SMUD-5 and SMUD-6 in Solano West. P-48-524 is addressed in the historical resources evaluation report (see Appendix A).

SMUD-4 is an actively used water location for livestock, with a water trough, tank, and concrete pad with modern pump and electrical service. Historic-era aerials and topographic quadrangle maps revealed that this is a modern feature erected after 1993 (NETR 1993). Therefore, SMUD-4 will not be discussed further.

SMUD-1 likewise appears to be remnants of a watering location for livestock, including concrete and other structural fragments, mixed with modern discing debris and PVC water pipe, and a small assortment of glass bottle fragments. Topographic quadrangle maps and historic-era aerials dating to the mid-1950s first depict a building/structure and water tank in the vicinity of SMUD-1 (NETR 1957; USGS 1955). These features were razed during the 21st century; the building/structure was removed between 2002 and 2005 (NETR 2005), and the water tank was replaced before 2009 (NETR 2009) when the lot on which these features were standing appeared to have been stripped and graded, then covered in gravel. Therefore, the integrity of SMUD-1 has been lost, as it appears to be just a secondary deposit of remnant debris from these previous structures, mixed with modern debris. SMUD-1 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion A/1, given its inability to convey its historical association as a ranching feature because of its lack of integrity, nor does it have any research potential as an archaeological resource (Criterion D/4).

SMUD-3 is a moderately dense historic-era artifact scatter that appears to have been dispersed by recent and previous discing. The scatter appears to be on the surface, just north of Montezuma Hills Road, with no potential for associated buried deposits (e.g., privy). An analysis of historic maps and aerial photographs depicts no buildings or structures in the area (UCSB 1937, 1952, 1970; USGS 1908, 1918, 1955, 1978a). The proximity to Montezuma Hills Road and the surficial extent of the scatter suggest that SMUD-3 could have been a roadside dumping spot, and the artifacts were subsequently strewn across a larger area as a result of discing. SMUD-3 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion A/1, given its lack of an identifiable association; likewise, with no diagnostic artifacts present, it has limited data potential (Criterion D/4). In addition, SMUD-3 does not retain sufficient integrity to be determined eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.

SMUD-5 is an abandoned fenceline and concrete fence pier that was identified within a dry swale within what was once the Kierce property. Wire cut nails were present in the fence posts, dating the feature to the 20th century. An analysis of historic-era topographic quadrangles and property maps depict no fenceline in the area (Solano County 1890, 1915; USGS 1908, 1918, 1955, 1978a). However, evidence of the fenceline is present in historic-era aerial photographs. Although these photographs are not detailed enough to show the fence itself, the variations in how the land was plowed (or not) on either side of the fenceline are visible (NETR 1987, 2002; UCSB 1937, 1965, 1981). Also evident from the aerials, but not during the ground survey, is a dirt road that was located on the west side of the fenceline. This road appears to be a connector between Stratton and Talbert lanes (NETR 1993); the concrete fence pier aligns with the roadway and appears to be part of a gate near Talbert Lane (UCSB 1937), which is on Jenkins’ (later Roberts’) property (Herbert and Kennedy 2007; Solano County 1890, 1915; UCSB 1937).

John Kierce’s widow Ann and their children owned the property, farming wheat (and perhaps other crops), into the early part of the 20th century (Solano County 1915). Although Kierce did well for himself as a farmer, his death in 1893 and Ann’s death in 1918 (San Francisco Chronicle 1918) likely ended the family’s farming in Solano County, as the professions of the surviving Kierce children show they were not inclined toward this work: Frank (attorney), Mary Griffin (housewife), and Theresa Hogan (teacher). (The other daughter, Veronica, died in 1894 [San Francisco Call 1894].) Research does not indicate that the Kierce family (or later owners of the property) were important persons to our past (Criterion B/2), nor was SMUD-5 (or the property) associated with important events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history (Criterion A/1). SMUD-5 does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (Criterion C/3), nor does it have any research potential (Criterion D/4). In addition, SMUD-5 does not retain sufficient integrity to be determined eligible for the NRHP/CRHR. Therefore, SMUD-5 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.
SMUD-6 consists of two fragments of a ceramic plate that date to the 1960s or 1970s, located on Roberts’ property north of the road and gate mentioned in the SMUD-5 discussion. This isolated find does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion A/1, given its lack of an identifiable association; likewise, it has limited data potential (Criterion D/4). Therefore, SMUD-6 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.

Based on the geoarchaeological sensitivity assessment conducted by Far Western (Scher and Whitaker 2016), there are areas of the APE—limited to very narrow areas along creeks and drainages—where there is an increased potential for encountering buried archaeological sites. These areas, eight in total, lie north of Montezuma Hills Road where unnamed creeks/drainages drain into the creek that parallels Montezuma Hills Road; in the eastern edge of Solano 4 West where the unnamed creek parallels Talbert Lane; and where the same creek traverses the location of the Homerun between Solano 4 West and Solano 4 East. These areas are considered moderate, high, or highest in their sensitivity and should be avoided if possible. If the project cannot avoid these areas and project activities in those areas are sufficient (i.e., deep enough) to potentially encounter buried archaeological resources, then additional actions may be necessary to mitigate potential impacts on as-yet-unidentified buried resources. These minimization efforts could include subsurface testing in advance of project construction and/or monitoring during the construction period.

AECOM conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the entire direct APE within Solano 4 East, the majority of the Homerun (limited portions were not available to survey because of landowner access issues), and the portions of the APE of Solano 4 West that had not been previously surveyed in recent years (Scher and Whitaker 2016; Whitaker and Kaijankoski 2010). No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within the APE, although an isolated basalt projectile point (SMUD-2) was identified within Solano 4 East approximately 140 feet outside the direct APE. Four historic-era resources were identified during the field survey: SMUD-5 (abandoned fenceline), SMUD-6 (isolate ceramic plate), SMUD-3 (concentration of habitation debris), and SMUD-1 (remnant livestock watering feature). All of these historic-era resources, identified within the direct APE, date to the 20th century and do not appear to be associated with any significant events or individuals important in the history of the Montezuma Hills, Solano County, or California. Similarly, none of the identified historic-era resources embody a distinctive type of construction, and they do not appear to have the potential to yield information important in history. In addition to lacking historic significance, the historic-era resources lack integrity, given their deterioration and alteration. Thus, no historic properties (NRHP) or historical resources (CRHR) were identified within the direct APE.

### 7.2 Unanticipated Discovery and/or Changes in the Project

Should previously unidentified cultural resources be unearthed during project activities, work would be halted in the area until a qualified archaeologist could assess the significance of the find. An additional archaeological survey would be needed if the project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits. If human remains are encountered during project activities, all work in that area would halt and the Solano County Coroner would be contacted, pursuant to PRC Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are Native American, he or she would contact the NAHC by telephone within 24 hours.

### 7.3 Statement of Limitations

This report has been prepared based on certain key assumptions made by AECOM that substantially affect the conclusions and recommendations of this report. These assumptions, although thought to be reasonable and appropriate, may not prove to be true in the future. The conclusions and recommendations of AECOM are conditioned on these assumptions.

The cultural resources assessment was performed based on information provided by the NWIC of the California Historical Resources Information System, on April 9, 2018, and by the NAHC on April 10, 2018, and from direct observation of site conditions and other information that generally were applicable as of May 2018. The conclusions, and therefore the recommendations herein, are applicable only to that time frame.

Information obtained from these sources in this time frame is assumed to be correct and complete. AECOM will not assume any liability for findings or lack of findings based on misrepresentation of information presented to the AECOM cultural resources assessment team or for items not visible, made available, accessible, or present at the site at the time of the project area survey.
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Executive Summary

Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) proposes to permit and construct the Solano 4 Wind Project (project) within the Solano County Wind Resource Area (WRA) in southern Solano County. The project would involve decommissioning existing wind turbines, constructing and operating wind turbine generators and associated electrical collection system, and access roads. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM) was contracted by SMUD to conduct historical research and complete a field investigation in support of the project. The project requires compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Built-environment resources within the indirect APE are analyzed in this Historical Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, which is attached as an appendix to the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Prepared for the Solano 4 Wind Project (SMUD 2018) prepared for the project.

The sole historical resource/historic property that could be potentially affected by the project is the Hastings Adobe (P-48-41). The project would not result in direct or indirect adverse effects or adverse change to the Hastings Adobe, which is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA and a historic property under Section 106 of the NHPA.

1. Introduction

1.1 Project Location

The project is within the Solano County Wind Resource Area (WRA) in southern Solano County (see Appendix A, Figure 1). The WRA is situated within the Antioch North, Birds Landing, and Jersey Island, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles, north of the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, and southwest of the city of Rio Vista (see Appendix A, Figure 2 and Figure 3).

The project would be implemented primarily on two properties, Solano 4 East and Solano 4 West, and the collection and home run lines, which total 2,549 acres. These properties occupy 881 acres and 1,390 acres, respectively. Solano 4 East is approximately 3.5 miles southwest of Rio Vista and Solano 4 West is adjacent to the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta (Delta) near Collinsville, California.

1.2 Project Site and Surrounding Area

The project site is located in the WRA. In the Solano County Wind Turbine Siting Plan and Environmental Impact Report, Solano County designated this area as suitable for wind energy development, based on wind energy monitoring and assessment studies prepared in the late 1970s and 1980s by the California Energy Commission, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. These studies determined that the WRA experiences enough strong and steady winds to support commercial wind plants. There are eight separate wind energy facilities (including SMUD’s existing three Solano Wind Project phases) currently in operation in the area.

2. Project Description

The following project characteristics and components have the potential to affect built environment cultural resources and were derived from the most recent April 2019 version the Solano 4 Wind Project description.

The Solano 4 Wind Project would involve:

- decommissioning of existing wind turbine generators (WTGs);
- construction of new, more technologically advanced WTGs, an associated electrical collection system, and access roads, along with minor upgrades to the existing Russell Substation; and
- operation and maintenance of the new WTGs.
The project site comprises two geographically distinct areas owned by SMUD, Solano 4 East and Solano 4 West, and the collection and home run lines, which total 2,549 acres (see Exhibit 1). The project proposes to repower facilities in both project subareas. Solano 4 East is approximately 3.5 miles southwest of Rio Vista and Solano 4 West is adjacent to the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta near the town of Collinsville. State Route (SR) 12 provides regional access to the project area. Montezuma Hills Road and Birds Landing Road provide local access to Solano 4 East, while Collinsville Road and Shiloh Road provide local access to Solano 4 West.

SMUD would construct up to 22 new WTGs: up to 10 in Solano 4 East and up to 12 in Solano 4 West. Associated access roads and collection lines would be installed to support the new WTGs. Power generated by the new WTGs would be transmitted from Solano 4 East and West to the existing Russell Substation on Montezuma Hills Road via new, underground direct-buried electrical cable (Collection and Home Run lines). The power would be distributed from the substation via the adjacent Birds Landing Switching Station through the existing 230-kilovolt Vaca–Dixon–Contra Costa transmission line (two circuits), which runs through the WRA.

2.1 Wind Turbine Generators

The WTGs to be used for the Solano 4 Wind Project have not yet been selected. WTG selection criteria include efficient wind power collection facilities, siting considerations, construction and operating costs, product availability, product life, ability to meet SMUD’s design criteria, project schedule, and delivered cost of power. Various manufacturers offer WTGs in the size ranges proposed for the project. The sizes contemplated for the project reflect the current state-of-the-industry standards for land-based WTGs that are deployed throughout the United States and overseas. In keeping with these standards, individual WTGs would have a maximum height of approximately 492–591 feet (150–180 meters) and a maximum rotor diameter of approximately 446–492 feet (136–150 meters). The existing 107 WTGs in the Solano Wind Project Phases 1, 2, and 3 have maximum heights of 410 feet (125 meters). Exhibit 1 shows the potential siting areas (footprints) within which WTGs would be installed for the Solano 4 Project. Although the final locations of WTGs would be determined after SMUD completes the procurement process, this analysis assumes that the 136-meter or 150-meter rotor diameter WTGs would be located in or near the locations shown in Exhibit 1.
2.3 Towers

The WTGs would be assembled on hollow, tubular steel towers erected at each pad site or possibly precast steel reinforced section for the tower bases. The height of each tower would depend on the turbine selected. Turbine technology available at the time of procurement would likely include tower heights of approximately 269–345 feet (82–105 meters), depending on the manufacturer’s model. To reduce their visibility, the towers would be painted a neutral color, with a nonreflective exterior finish.

2.4 Rotor Blades

Each WTG would have three rotor blades attached to a central hub at the top of the tower. Rotor blades would vary in size depending on the selected model (see Exhibit 2 for an illustration of each WTG model under consideration). Individual WTGs would have a maximum height of approximately 492–591 feet (150–180 meters) and a maximum rotor diameter of approximately 446–492 feet (136–150 meters). For all designs, the maximum tip speed of the blades is estimated to be up to 211 miles per hour.

Exhibit 2 Typical Wind Turbine Generators

2.5 Power Collection System

The Solano 4 Wind Project’s power collection system would ultimately deliver power to PG&E’s high-voltage transmission grid. The system would interconnect with PG&E’s transmission grid via the existing connection between the generation step-up transformer at the Russell Substation, owned by SMUD, and the Birds Landing Switchyard, owned and operated by PG&E. The Russell Substation’s generation step-up transformer is near Montezuma Hills Road, 1 mile east of the intersection of Montezuma Hills Road and Birds Landing Road. Components of the collection system include the WTG interties, underground cable, a step-up transformer, and associated protective switching.

The proposed WTG towers may include an integral transformer or a pad-mounted transformer at the base of the tower and circuit protection. The power, which would leave each WTG transformer at a medium voltage, typically 34.5 kilovolts, would be interconnected with adjacent WTGs. These joined circuits would convey power to the Russell Substation via new underground electrical cable. A typical cable and trench conveys the power to a splice box, which would then send the combined power from multiple WTGs in a direct-buried trench within the “home run” alignment. The home run alignment is the corridor containing cables that would conduct electricity generated by the turbines to the Russell Substation. From Solano 4 East, the new electrical lines would be placed within the home run easement, then travel west to reach the Russell Substation; electrical lines along that part of the home run alignment connecting with Solano 4 West would travel north to reach the substation.
Approximately 17.1 miles of trenching would be required to install the collection and home run lines for the Solano 4 Wind Project. All collection and home run lines would be insulated underground, and buried directly in accordance with California Public Utilities Commission regulations.

2.6 Meteorological Towers

As part of the Solano 4 Wind Project, up to two meteorological towers could be installed in the project area, one in Solano 4 East and one in Solano 4 West, to measure weather and wind resources. The towers would be constructed to a height of up to 345 feet (105 meters), essentially comparable to the hub height of the WTGs selected for the project. They would be constructed as freestanding towers (without guy wires). Each tower’s foundation would consist of three piers measuring approximately 5 feet in diameter.

2.7 Russell Substation Upgrades

The existing Russell Substation has capacity to handle electricity generated by the project. Improvements to the substation would be limited to installation of new disconnect switches. All improvements would occur within the footprint of the existing substation.

2.8 Roads

A number of existing and newly constructed roads as well as paved and gravel roads would be used for construction and operation of the Solano 4 Wind Project. The roads can generally be categorized either as transport roads, used to convey equipment to the project area, or as access roads, which would be gravel roads leading to the WTGs and used during construction and routine O&M. It may be necessary to improve existing public roads or use areas adjacent to the roads during construction to accommodate transportation of material. These improvements could be temporary or permanent, depending on the agreement. If such improvements are required, SMUD or the project contractor would consult with the Solano County Public Works and Building divisions, as needed.

Approximately 5.5 miles of new access roads would be constructed and 3 miles of roads would be improved to access the new WTGs within the project area boundary. The new access roads would have a minimum width of 16 feet and would be sited along existing contours to ensure safe passage of heavy construction equipment. Roadways would be wider in some areas to accommodate the turning radius necessary to bring WTG components to their specific locations by truck. Where a road crosses a drainage, reinforced concrete culverts would be placed in the drainage and reinforced with concrete headwalls, then covered with soil and compacted gravel. Riprap and straw wattle or similar best management practices would be installed downstream to avoid erosion, if necessary. The surface and embankment or subgrade of new roads would be designed with appropriate materials, gradation, thickness, soil stabilization, and/or auxiliary support (e.g., geotextile and/or geogrid) specifically for the site and anticipated weather conditions. Some access roads would no longer be needed after completion of the project, and would be restored to grassland, grazing lands, or other agricultural uses. These improvements would total approximately 14.2 acres.

3. Area of Potential Effects

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined as the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist” (Title 36, Section 800.16[b] of the Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] [36 CFR 800.16(b)]).

The direct APE includes all areas where ground disturbance would occur during installation of project facilities such as WTGs, access roads, and underground collection lines (project footprint). The direct APE is primarily restricted to hilltops, ridgelines, and steep slopes with minimal cultural sensitivity and was studied as part of the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Prepared for the Solano 4 Wind Project (SMUD 2018). The background research, literature review, records search, and field survey identified four historic-era resources which were inventoried and evaluated: SMUD-5 (abandoned fence line), SMUD-6 (isolate ceramic plate), SMUD-3 (concentration of habitation debris), and SMUD-1 (remnant livestock watering feature). All of these historic-era resources, identified within the direct APE, date to the 20th century and lack historic significance and integrity given their deterioration and alteration. Thus, no historic properties potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or
historical resources potentially eligible to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) were identified within the direct APE.

A separate indirect APE was established for the project to account for indirect effects on above ground historic-age built environment resources that may potentially be affected through visual, audible, atmospheric intrusions, shadow effects, vibrations from construction activities, and other aspects of a resource’s setting by project improvements. Because the setting of the project has been previously altered through the construction of extensive existing WTG facilities, transmission lines, access roads, and other infrastructure associated with eight separate wind energy facilities (including SMUD’s existing three Solano Wind Project phases) currently in operation in the area, the indirect APE is limited to historic-age built environment resources adjacent to and within the full extent of the Project Area. Figure 3 in Appendix A depicts the indirect APE for this project.

4. Regulatory Context

Numerous federal, state, and local laws and ordinances provide guidance for the consideration and protection of cultural resources. Key cultural resources regulations that are most relevant to the project are summarized in this chapter.

The project would require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1977 (United States Code [USC], Title 33, Section 1344 [33 USC 1344]). Issuance of a permit by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers constitutes a federal undertaking and mandates compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

4.1 National Historic Preservation Act

The NHPA (54 USC 300101 et seq.) establishes federal policy on historic preservation and the programs, including the NRHP, through which this policy is implemented. Under the NHPA, significant cultural resources, referred to as “historic properties,” include any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, object, or landscape included or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. A property is considered historically significant if it meets one of the NRHP criteria and retains sufficient historic integrity to convey its significance. This act also established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent agency that is responsible for implementing Section 106 of the NHPA (54 USC 306108) by developing procedures to protect cultural resources included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP. Regulations are published in 36 CFR Parts 60, 63, and 800.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires that effects on historic properties be taken into consideration in any federal undertaking. The process contains five steps:

1. Initiate the Section 106 process.
2. Identify historic properties.
3. Assess adverse effects.
4. Resolve adverse effects.
5. Implement stipulations in an agreement document.

Section 106 affords the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), as well as other consulting parties, a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP. SHPOs administer the National Historic Preservation Program at the state level, review NRHP nominations, maintain data on historic properties that have been identified but not yet nominated, and consult with federal agencies during Section 106 review.

The NRHP uses the following eligibility criteria (in accordance with 36 CFR 60.4) to evaluate the significance of properties:

1. are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
2. are associated with the lives of persons significant to our past; or
3. 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; or
4.2 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15064.5) provide specific guidance for determining the significance of impacts on historic architectural and archaeological resources. Under CEQA, these significant resources are called “historical resources,” whether they are of historic-era or prehistoric age. CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.1) defines historical resources as those listed, or eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or those listed in the historical register of a local jurisdiction (county or city). Cultural resources listed in the NRHP and located in California are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The CRHR criteria for listing cultural resources are based on, and are very similar to, the NRHP criteria:

Under CEQA, a historical resource is defined as any resource that:

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 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; or
4. has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Guidelines for the implementation of CEQA define the procedures, types of activities, persons, and public agencies required to comply with CEQA. Appendix G in Section 15023 provides an environmental checklist of questions that a lead agency should normally address if relevant to a project’s environmental impacts.

5. Background Research

Cultural resources investigations for the proposed project consisted of a staged approach that included pre-field research, field surveys, resource documentation, and evaluation. All aspects of the cultural resources study were conducted in accordance with the federal Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Identification of Cultural Resources (48 CFR 44720–44723) and the California Office of Historic Preservation’s Instructions for Recording Historical Resources.

An updated records search was conducted for the project site on May 14, 2018, by AECOM archaeologist and historian Karin G. Beck at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park (NWIC File No. 17-2697). The NWIC, an affiliate of the California Office of Historic Preservation, is the official state repository of cultural resources records and studies for Solano County. Site records and previous studies were accessed for the APE and a 0.5-mile radius as shown on the Antioch North, Birds Landing, and Jersey Island, California, U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. The following references also were reviewed:

- The NRHP
- The CRHR
- Historic Property Data File for Solano County (OHP 2012)
- California State Historical Landmarks (OHP 1996)
- California Inventory of Historic Resources (State Parks 1976)
- California Points of Historical Interest (OHP 1992)
- Antioch North, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1953a, 1978a)
- Birds Landing, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1906, 1953b, 1978b)
- Jersey Island, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps (USGS 1952, 1978c)
- Rio Vista, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1953c)
- Antioch, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1907)
- Jersey Island, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1910a)
• Rio Vista, California 15-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1910b)
• Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California (OHP 1988)
• California Place Names (Gudde 1998)
• Historic Spots in California (Kyle et al. 2002)
• Historical Atlas of California (Beck and Haase 1974)

The full results of the records search is included in the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Solano 4 Wind Project, Montezuma Hills, Solano County, California prepared by AECOM in 2018, to which this report is attached. The results of the NWIC record search included four historic-age ranch properties were previously recorded in 2001 by consultant Jones & Stokes (P-48-519; -521; -523; -524). All four properties were identified as contributing elements of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape, but neither the landscape as a whole or the individual properties were evaluated for the NRHP or CRHR at that time (Jones & Stokes 2001). See Appendix B for the DPR 523 forms prepared by Jones & Stokes in 2001.

Several built-environment historical resource studies not on file at the NWIC, which include information regarding previously identified and recorded historic-era resources in the Montezuma Hills region, were also reviewed. These include the following reports prepared by consultant JRP Historical Consulting, LLC for SMUD and PG&E:

• Solano Wind Project, Solano County, California, Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report (SMUD 2007)
• Solano Wind Project, Solano County, California, Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Update (SMUD 2009)
• Collinsville Wind Project CEQA Analysis: Hastings Adobe (PG&E 2010)

The 2007 and 2009 SMUD reports recorded two historic-era ranch clusters that are located within the project boundaries of the Solano 4 West project subarea, and the 2010 report analyzed impacts on the NRHP-listed Hastings Adobe residence (P-48-41). See Appendix B for the DPR 523 forms for the historic-era ranch clusters (Ranch Cluster 1 and Ranch Cluster 2) and the 1972 NRHP nomination form for the Hastings Adobe.

The 2009 SMUD report also included an evaluation of the previously identified but not yet evaluated potential rural historic landscape within the larger Montezuma Hills region that Jones & Stokes identified in 2001, using National Register Bulletin Number 30, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes,” to determine whether the area could be considered a rural historical landscape under NRPH and CRHR criteria. The 2009 report concluded that the project study area and surrounding area are unlikely to be considered a rural historical landscape because of their overall loss of historic integrity caused by WTGs, power lines, and other features that interrupt the continuity of the historic scene and introduce ahistorical characteristics. Since 2009, additional WTGs have been installed throughout the Montezuma Hills region, including east of Solano 4 West and south of Solano 4 East, further affecting the setting (SMUD 2009).

In addition, the California Digital Newspaper Collection database (CDNC 2018) and U.S. Census records from 1900 to 1930 (Ancestry.com 1900, 1910, 1920, 1930) were reviewed to determine if any of the individuals associated with the historic-age ranch complexes are significant at the local, regional, state, or national level. Historic aerial photography of the project area dating from 1937 to 1970 were also collected and reviewed for changes to the properties and setting over time (UCSB 1937, 1952, 1957, 1965, 1970, 1981).
6. Historical Context

The following historic context has been extracted from the Solano Wind Project Historic Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Update (SMUD 2009) and the Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Prepared for the Solano 4 Wind Project (SMUD 2018).

6.1 Spanish and Mexican Periods

The Delta region was first visited in historic times by Spanish explorers, including Pedro Fages and Juan Bautista de Anza, in the 1770s. Exploration of the region by the Spanish continued into the 1800s, and in 1815, Spanish missionaries made a concerted effort to bolster native populations in their mission system after an epidemic devastated the neophyte population at Mission San Francisco de Asís (in San Francisco) in 1795, and in anticipation of founding another mission: San Francisco Solano (in Sonoma), which opened in 1823 (California Mission Resource Center 2018 as cited in SMUD 2018).

In 1817, a military expedition ventured into what is now Solano County from the Carquinez Strait to explore the countryside and recruit natives into Christianity (Munro Fraser 1879:2-3). The subsequent confrontation was hard-fought by the natives, who were eventually overcome by the Spanish, leaving the region less protected and available for settlement by Euro-Americans from the east.

Early Euro-American settlement of the project vicinity began in 1844 when the Mexican government granted John Bidwell the 17,726-acre Rancho Los Ulpinos, located along the Sacramento River to the east of the area of potential effects (APE). The rancho took its name from the Julpun, a subtribe of Miwok Indians who occupied the western banks of the Sacramento River.

Individual settlers like Lansford W. Hastings also trickled into the Montezuma Hills. The area was so named by Hastings, who arrived in 1846. Lansford W. Hastings laid out Montezuma City at the head of Suisun Bay in 1847, with plans to subdivide and develop the area to establish his own republic (Gudde 1998:246 as cited in SMUD 2018). When Hastings’ plan to develop a Mormon settlement unraveled because of the United States’ annexation of California, he left his adobe home at the head of Suisun Bay and headed to Sacramento. Hastings then participated in California’s entry into the United States, serving as a representative of the Sacramento District at California’s First Constitutional Convention.

6.2 American Period

Lindsay Power Marshall and his sons purchased Hastings’ land in 1854 and subsequently reoccupied Hastings’ land grant. They developed the first agricultural operation in the hills and later began selling portions of the large landholding they had acquired to other pioneers like John Kierce, Edward Jenkins, and Samuel Stratton. Settlement along the Sacramento River increased as swamp reclamation projects created fertile and available farmland. Emery Upham, one of the more successful early pioneers of the area, owned 8,100 acres in the Montezuma Hills by 1880. Upham's lands were divided and sold upon his death in 1897.

An 1878 directory lists 23 ranches in the Montezuma Hills area, and census records indicate that immigrants came from such diverse places as England, Ireland, and Chile, and from a variety of U.S. locations, such as Pennsylvania, Maine, South Carolina, Kentucky, and Massachusetts. Area ranches distributed products via Birds Landing to San Francisco and Sacramento. Collinsville, founded by C. J. Collins in 1861, was developed as a port along the Sacramento River near the southwestern edge of the project area.

The principal economic activities in the Montezuma Hills during the late 19th and 20th centuries were wheat (dry) farming and ranching (SMUD 2007 as cited in SMUD 2018). Independent farms and ranches began to grow along watercourses and in the low valleys during the first quarter of the 20th century, as shown in the 1906 Birds Landing 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1906 as cited in SMUD 2018). These farms and ranches were linked by a road system that followed well-established routes that were in place by the late 19th century, many of which are still in use today.

In the first quarter of the 20th century, the open range of the Montezuma Hills, located on the outskirts of the ever-expanding California population, became the focus of planned industrial and energy production. In the 1920s, PG&E
began to prospect in the area for a new supply of natural gas. This exploration was unsuccessful but did not deter PG&E from returning 40 years later with a proposal for a nuclear power plant near Collinsville. The plan was not adopted, but during the 1970s, Dow Chemical Company purchased large tracts of agricultural land in hopes of establishing a multimillion-dollar industrial development. At the same time, ARCO Chemical Company attempted to develop a billion-dollar petrochemical plant near Toland Landing, but this proposal was ultimately rejected as well. Instead, in the late 1980s, wind farms were established in the Montezuma Hills to exploit the strong winds on the area's hilltops and ridges (Righter 1996:240,280 as cited in SMUD 2018). SMUD purchased land in the early 1990s and established wind facilities in the Montezuma Hills by the late 1990s (Cutting, pers. comm., 2018 as cited in SMUD 2018). Today, the area's economic activities continue to be both ranching and wind energy production, with multiple companies producing wind energy.

7. Historic-age Built Environment Resources

The following are located within the indirect APE for the project. See Appendix A, Figure 3 for locations.

P-48-519 Ranch
This historic-era ranch property on Montezuma Hills Road was recorded in 2001 as a pre-1908 Craftsman-style house, wood barn, and modern wood shed with metal roof and was identified as a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills Rural Historic Landscape. Neither the ranch nor the landscape was evaluated for NRHP or CRHR eligibility for the 2001 recordation. As noted above, the Montezuma Hills region lacks sufficient historic integrity to be considered a rural historic landscape and, therefore, this individual property would not be a contributor to a historic landscape. Based on reconnaissance level survey, the pre-1908 house has undergone alterations including the replacement of a metal casement window with a two-part vinyl window and mounted air conditioning unit on the north facing side of a shed roof addition on the house that appears to date between 1957-65 (UCSB 1957; 1965) from aerial photographs, which has diminished the design, materials, workmanship, and feeling of historic integrity of the pre-1908 house. This property does not appear eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 because it is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history. It appears to be one many farms in the Montezuma Hills region and there is no evidence in the historic record that farming activities on the property are historically significant. It also is not associated with individuals significant at the local, regional, or national level (Criteria B/2). Research did not reveal that previous owners H.C. Markham or Peter Anderson are historically significant persons. The site does not imbue those distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, nor does it reflect the work of a master craftsman or reflect high artistic value (Criteria C/3). It is not likely to yield any additional important information about our history (Criteria D/4). In addition, the site does not retain historical integrity to its pre-1908 house construction date and the setting has also been negatively impacted with the constriction of nearby WTGs and transmission lines along Montezuma Hills Road. This property does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, is not an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. See Appendix A for previous recordation. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are buried cables and new turbines would be further away and less visually obtrusive than existing nearer turbines.

P-48-521 Ranch
This historic-era ranch property on Talbert Lane was recorded in 2001 as a collapsed structure, two barns, and a corral and was identified as a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills Rural Historic Landscape. Neither the ranch nor the landscape were evaluated for the NRHP or CRHR for the 2001 recordation. As noted above, the Montezuma Hills region lacks historic integrity to be considered a rural historic landscape and, therefore, this individual property would not be a contributor to a historic landscape. Since 2001, the property has deteriorated further with what appears to be materials scavenging resulting in collapse of both barns, resulting in a further loss of historic integrity as a historic-age farm settlement. This property does not appear eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 because it is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history. It appears to be one many farms in the Montezuma Hills region and there is
no evidence in the historic record that farming activities on the property are historically significant. It also is not associated with individuals significant at the local, regional, or national level (Criteria B/2). Research did not reveal that John Talbert, the owner of the property in 1890, is historically significant and no other individuals associated with the development or use of the property were revealed in the historic record. While Talbert Lane is assumedly named for John Talbert, he appears to have been one of many farmers in the region and the remnants of this building cluster are not a good representation of Talbert’s productive life as a farmer. The site does not imbue those distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, nor does it reflect the work of a master craftsman or reflect high artistic value (Criteria C/3). The buildings are vernacular and in poor condition. It is not likely to yield any additional important information about our history (Criteria D/4). In addition, the site does not retain historical integrity and the setting has also been negatively impacted with the constriction of nearby WTGs and transmission lines. This property does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, is not an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. See Appendix A for previous recordation. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are construction of new access roads upslope on hills more than 0.40-miles to the southwest and construction of new turbines that would be further away than existing nearer turbines.

P-48-523 Sheep Ranch
The historic-era ranch buildings on Montezuma Hills Road were recorded in 2001 as five wooden outbuildings, two barns, and a corrals dating from circa 1908 to 1953 and was identified as a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills Rural Historic Landscape. Neither the sheep ranch nor the landscape had been evaluated for the NRHP or CRHR for the 2001 recordation. As noted above the Montezuma Hills region lacks historic integrity to be considered a rural historic landscape. Based on review of historic aerial imagery, a large barn on the property was removed and a large addition constructed on the house post-1970 (UCSB 1937, 1970). The spatial organization of the property appears to have been largely retained from the historic-period; however, the setting has been negatively impacted with the constriction of nearby WTGs and transmission lines along Montezuma Hills Road. Based on reconnaissance level survey from the public vantage points from Montezuma Hills Road, the property does not appear eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 because it is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history. It appears to be one many farms in the Montezuma Hills region and there is no evidence in the historic record that farming activities on the property are historically significant. It also is not associated with individuals significant at the local, regional, or national level (Criteria B/2). Research did not reveal that previous owner Peter Anderson or any other persons association with the use and development of the property are historically significant persons. The site does not imbue those distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, nor does it reflect the work of a master craftsman or reflect high artistic value (Criteria C/3). It is not likely to yield any additional important information about our history (Criteria D/4). In addition, the setting of the site does not retain historical integrity. This property does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, is not an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. See Appendix A for previous recordation. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are buried cables and new turbines would be further away and less visually obtrusive than existing nearer turbines.

P-48-524 Ranch
The 2001 recordation of this historic-era ranch complex on Montezuma Hills Road described the property as a pre-1908 house and barn with additional structures built to 1953 with a total of nine structures and two features and as a contributing element to the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills Rural Historic Landscape, but neither the landscape nor the property as an individual resource was evaluated for listing in the NHRP or CRHR. Based on review of historic aerials from 1937 to 1970, the design, setting, materials, and feeling of the property as a whole has been diminished from any potential period of significance through the removal of outbuildings associated with the house and farming outbuildings, corrals, fencing, and vegetation, and the construction of a modern barn at the northern end of the property (UCSB 1937, 1957, 1970). This ranch property does not appear eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 because it is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history. It appears to be one many farms in the Montezuma Hills region and there is no evidence in the historic record that farming activities on the property are historically significant. It also is not associated with individuals significant at the local, regional, or national level (Criteria B/2). Research did not reveal that previous owner M. Callaghan or any other persons association with the use and development of the property are historically
significant persons. The site does not imbue those distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, nor does it reflect the work of a master craftsman or reflect high artistic value (Criteria C/3). It is not likely to yield any additional important information about our history (Criteria D/4). In addition, the site does not retain historic integrity based on review of historic aerial imagery and the setting has also been negatively impacted with the constriction of nearby WTGs and transmission lines. This property does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, is not an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are buried cables below the roadway of the property that will be covered and new turbines that would be further away and less visually obtrusive than existing nearer turbines.

Ranch Complex 1
The 2007 and 2009 recordation and evaluations of this ranch complex flanking Talbert Lane did not meet any of the NRHP or CRHR criteria. In addition to lacking historic significance, the property was found to have suffered a loss of historic integrity. Since 2009, buildings and structures have been removed from the complex, which has left the barn and two small sheds as the property’s only extant built-environment resources, resulting in a further loss of historic integrity (SMUD 2007, 2009). Ranch Complex 1 is not a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. See Appendix A for previous recordation. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are buried cables and new turbines would be further away and less visually obtrusive than existing nearer turbines. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are buried cables and site access.

Ranch Complex 2
The 2007 and 2009 recordation and evaluations of this abandoned ranch complex on Talbert Lane did not meet any of the NRHP or CRHR criteria. In addition to lacking historic significance, the property was found to have suffered a loss of historic integrity. Since 2009, buildings and structures have been removed from the complex, which has left the barn and two small sheds as the property’s only extant built-environment resources, resulting in a further loss of historic integrity (SMUD 2007, 2009). The setting has also been negatively impacted with the constriction of nearby WTGs and transmission lines. The Ranch Complex 2 is not a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA or a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA. See Appendix A for previous recordation. Furthermore, the project improvements have no potential to affect any historical resources/historic properties within the vicinity of this property as the only nearby activities are small extension of existing access road for the construction of new turbines within an existing row of WFTGs sited southwest of the property.

Hastings Adobe (P-48-41)
The Hastings Adobe is formally listed in the NRHP (Reference No. 72000260) and listed in the CRHR. The property is significant under NRHP Criterion B and CRHR Criterion 2 for its association with Lansford W. Hastings, an early California pioneer and land promoter perhaps most notable for his *Emigrants’ Guide to Oregon and California*, an overland guide for would-be settlers (including the ill-fated Donner Party). The Hastings Adobe is also significant under NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3 as a significant example of 19th century adobe construction. The period of significance for the Hastings Adobe is 1846, the year of the adobe’s original construction, and the area of significance is the theme of community planning and development, and architecture (PG&E 2010). This property is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA and a historic property for Section 106 of the NHPA.

8. Impacts Assessment to Historical Resources/Historic Properties
The sole historical resource/historic property that could potentially be affected by project improvements is the Hastings Adobe. The project would involve constructing new gravel access roads and WTGs at sites at least 0.25 mile northeast and less than 0.75 mile northwest of the Hastings Adobe. At these distances, these project activities have no potential to cause a direct adverse change to the Hastings Adobe because they would not result in the direct physical destruction or material alteration of the historical resource/historic property. Because of its general proximity
to the historical resource/historic property, however, the project does have the potential to cause indirect adverse changes to the building. These indirect adverse changes include potential changes caused by nearby construction or operational vibration and the introduction of additional visual changes to the setting of the historical resource/historic property.

The Hastings Adobe is located approximately 1,100 feet from the nearest proposed project construction area of the Solano 4 West subarea. Using Caltrans’s recommended level of 0.08 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) with respect to the prevention of structural damage for historical buildings, modeled vibration levels would not exceed Caltrans’s recommended standard of 0.08 in/sec PPV nor 0.2 in/sec PPV with respect to the prevention of structural damage for historical structures (AECOM 2019).

Constructing a new gravel access road would not cause a substantial adverse change to the historical resource/historic property. The approximately 20-foot-wide road would not introduce new visual elements to the immediate viewshed of the resource because it would be at grade and similar to the existing gravel corridors throughout the area, including an existing road directly to the north of the adobe.

The rural setting of the Montezuma Hills surrounding the Hastings Adobe is a character-defining feature of the property (PG&E 2010); however, this setting has already been compromised by the placement of WTGs in the general vicinity to the north, northeast, and northwest of the historical resource/historic property. The proposed project has the potential to further diminish this rural setting further with the construction of taller WTGs at Solano 4 West and Solano 4 East. Solano 4 West includes strings of WTGs in the southern portion of the project area along the crest of the hillside 0.25 mile north of the historical resource/historic property. The existing 107 WTGs in the Solano Wind Project Phases 1, 2, and 3 have maximum heights of 410 feet (125 meters). WTGs are currently visible from the Hastings Adobe (see Exhibit 3); however, the WTGs proposed by the project would be closer and taller, and therefore potentially more intrusive to the visual setting (see Exhibit 4 and 5 for simulated conditions from the Hastings Adobe). The 150m model in Exhibit 4 has a maximum height of 590 feet (180 meters) and the 136m model in Exhibit 5 has a maximum height of 492 feet (150 meters). Still, the integrity of the historic setting in the vicinity of the Hastings Adobe has already been diminished with the construction of WTGs throughout the viewshed. Therefore, the indirect visual impact of the installation of taller WTGs as part of the project on the Hastings Adobe would be less than significant.

In addition, the project improvement to construct the home run collection lines in a trench north of Montezuma Hills Road would not result in direct or indirect adverse impacts to historical resources/historic properties, if any should exist.
Exhibit 3    Existing WTGs viewed from Hastings Adobe looking north
Exhibit 4  Simulation with 150m turbines as viewed from Hastings Adobe looking north
Exhibit 5  Simulation with 136 turbines as viewed from Hastings Adobe looking north
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10. Personnel

All cultural resources work for this project has been carried out by the following individuals who meet (or were supervised by individuals who meet) the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology, History, and Architectural History (48 CFR 44716 [1983]), consistent with the procedures for compliance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (36 CFR 800):

- **Chandra Miller, MA** acted as principal investigator and author of this historical resources inventory and evaluation report. Ms. Miller has a bachelor's degree in History from Humboldt State University, Arcata, a certificate in Historic Preservation and Restoration Technologies from College of the Redwoods, Eureka, and a master’s degree in public history with a cultural resources management concentration from California State University, Sacramento. She has more than 10 years of experience in conducting built-environment investigations and historical research in California. Ms. Miller meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in history and architectural history.

- **Karin Goetter Beck, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), Registered Professional Historian**, acted as principal investigator and author for the cultural resources report. Ms. Beck has a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has 22 years of experience in conducting archaeological and built-environment investigations and historical research in California. Ms. Beck meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology and history.

- **Annamarie Leon Guerrero, RPA**, acted as crew chief for portions of the field survey. Ms. Leon Guerrero has a bachelor’s degree in English and anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has more than 10 years of experience in cultural resources management in California, as well as archaeological experience in Alaska, Arizona, and Montana. Ms. Leon Guerrero meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology.

- **Jennifer Redmond, RPA**, acted as crew chief for portions of the field survey. Ms. Redmond has a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley, and a master’s degree in cultural resources management from Sonoma State University (California). She has more than 10 years of experience in cultural resources management and archaeology throughout California and the Midwest. Ms. Redmond meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for work in archaeology.
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Appendix B  Previous Recordations
**P1. Other Identifier:** na

**P2. Location:** Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted ☐ Restricted

* a. **County:** Solano

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

* b. **USGS 7.5' Quad** Antioch North (4814) Date 1978

 c. Address Montezuma Hills Road

d. **UTM:** (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone: 10

 e. **Other Locational Data:** (e.g. parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

From the town of Dixon travel south on Highway 113 to Highway 12 junction. Cross over Highway 12 and continue south on what is now Birds Landing Road to Montezuma Hills Road. Continue east for approximately 1 mile. The site is on the south side of the road.

**P3a. Description** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

HW-C-12 has three structures, lettered A through C. Structure A is a square-plan, Craftsman-style house with a front-gable, normal-pitch roof. Structure B is a square plan wooden barn with a wood shingled roof. Structure C is a small, modern wooden shed with a metal roof. Site is located on a small clearing that is part of an isolated, shallow, lowland area at the foot of a hill. The residence is still lived in.

HW-C-12 is a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape. The ranches present in the Montezuma Hills represent consistent historic land uses established in the 1860s. The current spatial patterning of ranches was established between 1890 and 1908. Neither the landscape or HW-C-12 have been evaluated for National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources (Jones & Stokes 2001).

**P4. Resources present:** ☒ Building ☒ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☒ Element of District ☐ Other (isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photograph or Drawing** (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**

☐ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

Building appears on the 1908 USGS map. (See Continuation)

**P7. Owner and Address:**

Nellie Anderson

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address)

Dylan Stapleton & Gabriel Roark. Jones & Stokes 2600 V street Sacramento, CA 958118

**P9. Date Recorded:** 7-24-01

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)

Mixed strategy survey for CEQA project. Highly sensitive areas were defined as seasonal and year-round (See Continuation Sheet)

**P11. Report Citation:** (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Jones & Stokes. 2001. Cultural Resources Inventory Report for High Winds, LLC’s Proposed Wind Turbine Project in the Montezuma Hills of Solano County, California.

*Attachments: NONE ☒ Location Map ☒ Sketch Map ☒ Continuation Sheet ☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record ☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record ☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (List):*

DPR 523A (1/95) *Required Information

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Resources (Continued): H.C. Markham is listed as owner of the site (comprising the top northeastern 1/4 of section 12) on the 1890 Solano County map and E.I. Upham owning the remainder of the section. Peter Anderson is listed as partial owner of neighboring sections 6, 7 and 8 in 1890 and sole owner of the site on the 1909 and 1926 Solano County maps.

P10. Survey Type (Continued): watercourses, wetlands, flat areas surrounding streams and wetlands, and ridges that afforded easy access to sources of water. Low-sensitivity areas were defined as the majority of ridges and steep slopes. Highly sensitive areas were surveyed intensively using transects spaced 15 meters between surveyors. Low-sensitivity areas were surveyed at a cursory level using transects spaced 30 meters between surveyors.

B12. References:

Official Map of the County of Solano, California
1890 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1909 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1926 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.

USGS (United States Geological Survey)
1908 Antioch Quadrangle. 15-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
1968 Antioch North Quadrangle. 7.5-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
**P1.** Other Identifier: Historic ranch

**P2.** Location:  
- x Not for Publication  
- Unrestricted  
- *a. County Solano  

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

- b. USGS 7.5' Quad Antioch North (4814)  
  Date 1978  
  T 3N; R 1E; SE 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 13  
  M.D. B.M.  
  c. Address na  
  d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources)  
  Zone: 10  
  City na  
  Zip na  
  603,675 m/E  
  4,217,080 mN

*From the town of Dixon travel south on Highway 113 to Highway 12 junction and proceed straight across the intersection to Birds Landing Road. Travel south on Birds Landing road approximately seven miles to Collinsville Road. Turn south (left) on Collinsville Road and proceed approximately two miles to Talbert Lane. Drive east (left) on Talbert Lane for two miles. HW-C-1 is located behind a barb wire fence north of Talbert Lane.*

**P3a.** Description (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The resource is a ranch complex comprising a collapsed structure, an associated concrete pad, two barns, and a coral. Near the barn is a boarded-formed concrete pad (approximately 1.5 feet high) with dimensions of approximately 8 feet in length (east to west) and 12 feet in length (north to south). There are also milled lumber fragments, wire nails, scattered corrugated tin sheets and other miscellaneous metal debris in the vicinity of the concrete foundation. The barns are wooden board-and-batten structures fully two stories high with corrugated metal roofs. Non-native palm trees planted to the southwest of the barn. The area is located in a flat saddle between two plateaus near a minor creek that forms from the drainage of two nearby creeks—one to the northwest and one to the northeast of this site. Historical landscaping is evident by the presence of several non-native plants such as fig and palm trees. This ranch coincides with the structures indicated on historic topographic quadrangles (USGS 1908, 1953).

HW-C-1 is a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape. The ranches present in the Montezuma Hills represent consistent historic land uses established in the 1860s. The current spatial patterning of ranches was established between 1890 and 1908. Neither the landscape nor HW-C-1 have been evaluated for National Register of Historic Places or California Register of (see Continuation Sheet)

**P3b.** Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)  
HP33. Farm/Ranch, AH2. Foundations/structure pads. (See Continuation Sheet)

**P4.** Resources present:  
- x Building  
- Structure  
- Object  
- x Site  
- District  
- x Element of District  

**P5a.** Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects)

**P5b.** Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #)  
Barn A, view to northwest, 7/17/2001  
Roll 1, exposure 19.

**P6.** Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  
- x Historic  
- Prehistoric  
- Both

Two of the structures were built prior to 1908, based on their inclusion on the 1908 USGS 7.5' map. (See Continuation Sheet)

**P7.** Owner and Address:  
Douglas McCormack and Janet McCormack Lambesson. Address unknown.

**P8.** Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)  

**P9.** Date Recorded:  7-17-01.

**P10.** Survey Type: (Describe)  
Mixed strategy survey for CEQA project. Highly sensitive areas were defined as seasonal and year-round (See Continuation Sheet)

**P11.** Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none.”)  
P2b. UTM (Continued). UTMAs were calculated based on the North American Datum of 1927 (NAD 27).

P3a. Description (Continued). Historical Resources eligibility (Jones & Stokes 2001).

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources (Continued): The 1890 Board of Supervisors map of Solano County indicates that John Talbert initially owned the lower 2/3rds of section 13 (the upper 1/3 was unclaimed wild land) down to the watercourse that cuts through the far southwest corner of the section, while a William B. Brown owned the small plot of remaining land within the boundary of section 13 in the far southwestern corner below the seasonal watercourse.


P10. Survey Type (Continued); watercourses, wetlands, flat areas surrounding streams and wetlands, and ridges that afforded easy access to sources of water. Low-sensitivity areas were defined as the majority of ridges and steep slopes. Highly sensitive areas were surveyed intensively using transects spaced 15 meters between surveyors. Low-sensitivity areas were surveyed at a cursory level using transects spaced 30 meters between surveyors.

References:

Official Map of the County of Solano, California
1890 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.

USGS (United States Geological Survey)
1908 Antioch Quadrangle. 15-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

LOCATION MAP

Page 4 of 4
Resource Name or #: HW-C-1
Map Name: Antioch North, California
Scale: 1:24,000 (1"=2,000')
Date of Map: 1978

Scale = 1:24,000
Base map: USGS 7.5' series quadrangles
Antioch North, California (1979) and
Birds Landing, California (1953, PR 1968, MR 1992)

*Required information
P1. Other Identifier: Sheep Ranch

P2. Location: Not for Publication Unrestricted
   *a. County Solano
   *b. USGS 7.5' Quad Antioch North (4814) Date 1976 T3N R2E NW ¼ of NW ¼ of Sec 7 M.D.B.M
   c. Address: City Birds Landing vicinity
   d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone: 10 605,200 mE 4,219,890 mN
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g. parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

From the town of Dixon travel south on Highway 113 to Highway 12 junction. Cross over Highway 12 and continue south on Birds Landing Road to Montezuma Hills Road. Turn left and follow the road east for approximately 3.5 miles. The ranch is located on the south side of the road.

P3a. Description (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

HW-C-9 is a sheep ranch that includes five wooden outbuildings. The ranch is located on a series of small hummocks that grade into larger hills to the south. A seasonal watercourse is located about 2,000 feet to the east of the ranch, and another runs east-west, paralleling Montezuma Hills Road. Vegetation is sparse, consisting of low grasses and approximately one dozen trees, including an oak and a eucalyptus. The ranch is still in use, although the majority of buildings on the property appear to be unused. Three buildings are rectangular-plan, wood cabins with side-gabled, normal-pitch roofs. The roof cladding consists of wood shingles. The primary elevations of the cabins face north, toward Montezuma Hills Road. One cabin has an extended, open porch attached to the north elevation. The cabins do not appear to be in use. A roughly square-plan wooden barn with an associated corral and stable dominates the eastern portion of the ranch complex. The barn has a front-gable roof clad in what appears to be steel metal panels. A low wooden corral surrounds the barn on all sides; the stable is located near the southeast corner of the barn. The barn is apparently used to store hay, and sheep were observed in the corral.

HW-C-9 is a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape. The ranches present in the Montezuma Hills represent consistent historic land uses established in the 1860s. The current spatial patterning of ranches was established (see Continuation Sheet)

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)


P4. Resources present: Building Structure Site District Element of District Other (isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) View to south, 7/24/2001. Roll 2, exposure 10.

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

   Historic
   Prehistoric
   Both

At least one building was present in 1908. The others were constructed by 1953 (USGS 1908, 1953).

P7. Owner and Address:

   Frank Marino. Address is unknown.

P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)


P9. Date Recorded: 7-17-01

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

   Mixed strategy survey for CEQA project. Highly sensitive areas were defined as seasonal and year-round (See Continuation Sheet)

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Jones & Stokes. 2001. Cultural Resources Inventory Report for High Winds, LLC's Proposed Wind Turbine Project in the Montezuma Hills of Solano County, California.

Attachments: NONE Location Map Sketch Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List):

DPR 523A (1/95) *Required Information
P3a. Description (Continued), 1690 and 1908. Neither the landscape or HW-C-9 have been evaluated for National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources (Jones & Stokes 2001).

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Resources (Continued). Peter Anderson appears as the owner of the site on the 1890 Solano County map, with M. Callaghan owning the eastern 1/2 of section 7. This division continues unaltered through 1926, based on the 1909 and 1926 Solano County maps.

P10. Survey Type (Continued), watercourses, wetlands, flat areas surrounding streams and wetlands, and ridges that afforded easy access to sources of water. Low-sensitivity areas were defined as the majority of ridges and steep slopes. Highly sensitive areas were surveyed intensively using transects spaced 15 meters between surveyors. Low-sensitivity areas were surveyed at a cursory level using transects spaced 30 meters between surveyors.

References:

Official Map of the County of Solano, California
1890 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1909 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1926 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.

USGS (United States Geological Survey)
1908 Antioch Quadrangle. 15-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
1968 Antioch North Quadrangle. 7.5-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
LOCATION MAP

Resource Name or #: HW-C-9
Map Name: Antioch North, California
Scale: 1:24,000 (1"=2,000')
Date of Map: 1978

Base map: USGS 7.5'-series quadrangles Antioch North, California (1978) and Birds Landing, California (1953, PR 1968, MR 1992)
P1. Other Identifier: Historic ranch complex

*P2. Location: Not for Publication [ ] Unrestricted  *a. County Solano

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Antioch North/Birds Landing Date 1978/1986 T 3 N : R 2 E : ¼ of NE ¼ of Sec 7: M.D.B.M

*c. Address Montezuma Hills Road (4814 / 4811) City Birds Landing (vicinity) Zip na.

d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone: 10 See Continuation mE See Continuation mN

e. Other Locational Data: (e.g. parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

From the town of Dixon travel south on Highway 113 to Highway 12 junction. Cross over Highway 12 and continue south on what is now Birds Landing Road to Montezuma Hills Road. Turn left and follow the road east for approximately 5.5 miles. The ranch is located on the north side of the road.

*P3a. Description (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

This site is a single family residence and sheep ranch consisting of 9 structures and 2 features, labeled A through K inclusively. Feature A is a palm tree. Structure B is a metal A-frame, Aeromotor windmill. Structure C is a wood barn with a normal pitch, front-gabled roof clad in corrugated metal. On the west elevation of Structure C is a small shed add-on, also with a corrugated metal roof. To the south of the barn is a wooden corral. Structure D is a wooden rectangular garage/shed with the door on its south elevation. There is a single window set into the west and east elevations of the building as well. Structure E is a wooden open shed that houses ranching equipment. Structure F is a front-gable Craftsman style house. Structure G is a wooden water tower platform 15 feet tall and is missing its water tank. Structure H is a shed used to feed and/or water livestock. It is a wooden shed with a corrugated metal roof. Structure I is a white-painted wooden barn with a normal pitch, front-gable, corrugated metal roof. There is a doorway on the south elevation of the barn. Structure J is a 20-feet tall steel barn that is open to the north and south. Feature K is a private, gravel road. This site is located along the mouth of a seasonal drainage that extends well into the hills to the north for about 1.5 miles (See Continuation Sheet).

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP2. Single family property, HP4. Ancillary building, (See Continuation)

*P4. Resources present: [ ] Building [ ] Structure [ ] Other (isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects)


*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

[ ] Historic [ ] Prehistoric [ ] Both

1908 is construction date for both the house and structure I, based on USGS 1908 map. Structure J built between 1908 and 1953, based on 1938 and 1958 USGS maps. (See Continuation)

*P7. Owner and Address:

Douglas McCormack

Dylan Stapleton & Gabriela Roark. Jones & Stokes 2600 V street Sacramento, CA 958118

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)

*P9. Date Recorded: 7-24-01

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Mixed strategy survey for CEQA project. Highly sensitive areas were defined as seasonal and year-round (See Continuation Sheet)

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter none.) Jones & Stokes. 2001. Cultural Resources Inventory Report for High Winds, LLC's Proposed Wind Turbine Project in the Montezuma Hills of Solano County, California.

*Attachments: NONE [ ] Location Map [ ] Sketch Map [ ] Continuation Sheet [ ] Building, Structure, and Object Record

[ ] Archaeological Record [ ] District Record [ ] Linear Feature Record [ ] Milling Station Record [ ] Rock Art Record

[ ] Artifact Record [ ] Photograph Record [ ] Other (List):
P2d. UTMs. SW corner: 506,020 mE, 4,219,955 mN; SE corner: 606,200 mE, 4,219,890 mN; NW corner: 605,690 mE, 4,220,620 mN; and 606,020 mE, 4,220,630 mN.

P3a. Description. HW-C-11 is a contributing element of the potentially eligible Montezuma Hills rural historic landscape. The ranches present in the Montezuma Hills represent consistent historic land uses established in the 1860s. The current spatial patterning of ranches was established between 1890 and 1908. Neither the landscape or HW-C-11 have been evaluated for National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources (Jones & Stokes 2001).


P6. Date Constructed/Age and Resources (Continued): M. Callaghan is the owner of this site with Peter Anderson owning the western ¼ of section 7. This division continues unaltered through 1926, based on the 1909 and 1926 Solano County maps.

B12. References:

Official Map of the County of Solano, California
1890 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1909 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.
1926 Solano County Board of Supervisors series. Microfiche on file, California State Library, Sacramento, California.

USGS (United States Geological Survey)
1908 Antioch Quadrangle. 15-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
1968 Antioch North Quadrangle. 7.5-minute topographic series. Map on file, California Division of Mines and Geology Library, Sacramento, California.
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

LOCATION MAP

Page 3 of 3  *Resource Name or #: HW-C-11

*Map Name: Antioch North and Birds Landing, California  *Scale: 1:24,000 (1"=2,000')  *Date of Map: 1978/1992

Base map: USGS 7.5' series quadrangles
Antioch North, California, (1978) and
Birds Landing, California (1953, PR 1968, MR 1992)

DPR 523J (195)

*Required information
P1. Other Identifier: Ranch Complex 1

*P2. Other Locational Data: APN: 0900-100-280

*P3a. Description: (See attached form-no changes since 2007)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (HP33) Ranch/Farm

*P8. Recorded by: Rand Herbert & Chandra Miller, JRP Historical Consulting, LLC, 1490 Drew Ave, Suite 110, Davis, CA 95618

*P11. Report Citation: None

*B10. Significance: (See attached form)

Historic Context (See attached form)

Evaluation (See attached form)

*B14. Evaluator: Rand Herbert & Chandra Miller  *Date of Evaluation: June 5, 2009

Photographs:

Photograph 1: Ranch Complex 1, camera facing north, June 2009.
Photograph 2: Ranch Complex 1, camera facing south, June 2009.

Previous Historic Resources Inventory
(See attached form)
**P1. Other Identifier:** Ranch Complex 1

**P2. Location:** □ Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted

- **a. County:** Solano
- **b. U.S.G.S. 7.5' Quad:** Antioch North Date 1978 T3N; R 1E; SE3 of Sec 24; MD B.M.
- **c. Address:** City Zip
- **d. UTM:** (give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone __________; __________ mE/ __________ mN
- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

APN: 0900-100-280

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

Ranch Complex 1 is located on a 505 acre agricultural parcel north of the Sacramento River on a valley floor among the rolling Montezuma Hills, which are occupied by scattered herds of cattle, goats, and sheep, as well as wind farms. The complex features three single-family residences, two barns, four sheds, an equipment shelter, a pump house, a water tower, two culverts, three modern storage tanks, eight grain silos, and a series of corrals (Photograph 1). The property has an entrance gate at the south end of the complex. The tree modern tanks, Photograph 2, sit west of the gate. Two of the tanks are metal barrel style tanks laying on their sides on raised metal pipe stands. The third tank is a larger molded plastic tank that stands upright without a foundation or support. North of the tanks, Building 1, a wood frame equipment storage building standing on a concrete foundation and topped with a low-pitched side gable roof. The walls are clad with vertical wood board siding and the roof is clad with corrugated metal. The building has four open sided vehicle bays at the north end and an enclosed storage shed on the south end. Three square posts support the roof on the west side and two square posts, the third is missing, support the roof on the east side (Photograph 3). The letters “LMM OMlC” and the date 7.23.54 are inscribed on the concrete foundation at the northwest corner. North east of Building 1, the drive crosses over a culvert (Culvert 1), which carries water from a ditch that bisects the complex north to south along the valley floor. (See Continuation Sheet)

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) (HP33) Farm/ranch

**P4. Resources Present:** ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #) Photograph 1, camera facing northeast, June 1, 2007

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- ☐ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both
c. 1900 and 1920s, county maps

**P7. Owner and Address:**
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
PO Box 15830
Sacramento, CA 95852-0-830

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, address)
Rand Herbert & Kathleen Kennedy
JRP Historical Consulting, LLC
1490 Drew Ave, Suite 110
Davis, CA. 95618

**P9. Date Recorded:** June 1, 2007

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe) Intensive
B1. Historic Name: ______________
B2. Common Name: ______________
B3. Original Use: Ranch  B4. Present Use: Ranch

* B5. Architectural Style: Building 4: Bungalow; Building 8: Folk; all remaining buildings: utilitarian.
* B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alteration, and date of alterations) Building 8: c. 1900; Buildings 4, 6, & 7: 1920s; Buildings 10 & 11: 1930s. Buildings 1, 5 & 9: 1950s; Building 2: 1960s; alterations unknown.

* B7. Moved? ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: Original Location:
* B8. Related Features: __________


* B10. Significance: Theme n/a Area n/a
    Period of Significance n/a Property Type n/a Applicable Criteria n/a
    (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The ranch complex on parcel 0090-100-280 has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5 (1)(2)-(3) of the CEQA Guidelines using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code. The property lacks significance, and therefore does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). This ranch property was first developed in the early 1900s and occupies a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 24, Township 3 North, Range 1 East. In 1872, the parcel that includes this ranch complex was part of 91,010 acres patented to the State of California under the authority of the Swamp Land Grant-Patent (9 Stat. 519) of 1850. However, ranchers began homesteading in the Montezuma Hills as early as 1850s and 1860s. The Montezuma Hills where sparsely populated during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, dominated by large landholders, who cultivated grain and maintained herds of cattle, sheep, and goats. (See continuation sheet).

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

* B12. References:

Solano County Assessor Records (as reported to First American Real Estate Solutions); U.S.G.S., Antioch, Calif., 15’ series, 1908 (surveyed 1906-1908, reprinted 1950), Antioch North, Quadrangle, California, 7.5’ series. 1953 and 1978; aerial photographs from University California, Davis map collection, 1937, 1962, and 1972; Official Map of the County of Solano (1872, 1890, 1909, 1915, and 1925) History of Solano County (San Francisco: Wood, Alley & Company, 1879. See footnotes.

B13. Remarks:

* B14. Evaluator: Kathleen Kennedy
* Date of Evaluation: June 2007

(This space reserved for official comments.)
P3a. Description (continued):

Culvert 1 features a corrugated metal pipe braced with chunks of concrete and topped with heavy timber boards and secured with two timber posts on the north and south sides (Photograph 4). A dirt and gravel roadbed crosses over the culvert. Southeast of Culvert 1 is a fenced pasture with a tree, piles of old equipment and lumber, the water tower, and pump house. The water tower is a wood frame tower without cladding on the sides. Remains of the wood water tanks are located both on the tower platform and adjacent to the platform on the ground, see Photograph 5. Between the tower and the pile of refuse (southeast) the wood frame pump house (Building 2) stands with a rectangular footprint. The small building has walls sheathed with vertical boards and is topped with low-pitched front gable roof clad with wood shingles (Photograph 6). A square post on the north side provides support for electrical wirings.

The largest shed (Building 3) stands northeast of Culvert 1. This wood frame building has a rectangular footprint. The walls are clad with vertical wood planks and topped with a side gable roof sheathed with corrugated metal. Access is granted on the east side by three sets of battened wood plank double doors, see Photograph 7. Across the drive (east) from Building 3, stands the first residence (Building 4). This single-family house is a one story, wood frame building stands on a board formed concrete foundation and is topped by a cross gable roof sheathed with composition shingles (Photograph 8). The house has an addition across the south side that creates an irregular footprint. The walls are clad with flush wood siding and fenestration consists of a mixture of 1/1 double hung wood windows and horizontal sliding windows, all with wood trim. Some windows feature metal hoods and some windows have been broken. The addition enclosed the front half-porch and added a room on the east side. A single modern metal panel door covered with a metal screen door provides access on the south side. The door is accessed by five concrete steps and a concrete walk. The yard is enclosed with a low picket fence.

Behind (east) of Building 4 are two small wood-frame sheds with rectangular footprints. The larger shed (Building 5) has walls sheathed in corrugated metal and a side and is topped with a front gable roof. The smaller shed (Building 6) has vertical wood board siding and is topped with a side gable roof clad with wood shingles. A battened wood plank door on the south side provides access, see Photograph 9. A wood frame storage building (Building 7) with a rectangular footprint is located southeast of Building 4. This large shed has walls sheathed with vertical wood planks and is topped with a front gable roof clad with corrugated metal. The large battened wood plank doors on the west side feature large metal hinges and sag leaving openings above, below, and between them, see Photograph 10. Windows on the south side have been boarded over. North of Building 4 are several wood frame chicken coops enclosed with chicken wire and a metal “Sheldon” gas tank (Photograph 11).

The second residence (Building 8) is located north of the first (Building 4). The wood frame, single-story residence has a generally rectangular footprint and a wood post foundation. As seen in Photograph 12, the walls are clad with flush horizontal wood siding and topped with a side gable roof sheathed in composition shingles. Fenestration consists of 6/6 double hung wood windows in wood frames. Many windows are missing panes of glass and muntins. The entrance is sheltered on a full-length porch and consists of a wood panel door with wood trim. Five square posts support the shed roof that covers the porch. A metal chimney pipe is located at the northeast side of the building.

The third residence (Building 9) sits north of Building 8 and is also a single-story wood frame residence. Building 9 stands on a concrete foundation with a L-shaped footprint. The walls are sheathed with board and batten siding topped with a cross gable roof clad with composition shingles (Photograph 13). The roof features a plain fascia boards at the gable ends and narrow eaves with exposed rafters. The roof is extended on the west side to shelter the entrance porch and supported by two square posts. Five wood steps without a handrail lead to the entrance porch. Fenestration consists of 3/3 and 2/4 metal casement windows with narrow wood trim. A metal louver vent is located under the gable peak. A series of wood fenced corrals (Photograph 14) are located north and northwest of Building 9.
At the west end of the corrals is a medium sized wood frame barn (Building 10). The barn has a rectangular footprint with a dirt foundation. The walls are clad with vertical flush boards and topped with a front gable roof sheathed with corrugated metal. The east and west sides of the barn have open windows and the main entrance to the barn is located on the south end. Double Dutch wood plank doors are located at the southwest corner and a single personnel door opening is just east of the Dutch doors. The single door is currently missing. The east half of the barn features animal stalls with feed storage above while the west half of the barns interior remains an open space. The north side of the barn faces a corral with a sheep loading station shown in Photograph 14.

The drive passes by the sheep loading station and turns west to cross Culvert 2. Culvert 2 carries water that comes down the hills to the valley floor. The culvert features a corrugated metal pipe encased in concrete at the north and south ends. Approximately five-foot long concrete wing walls extend north and south from each end of the culvert, as shown in Photograph 15. The largest barn (Building 11) is located on the west side of the culvert. This large wood frame barn has a rectangular footprint (Photograph 16). The walls are clad with vertical board siding and topped with a front gable roof sheathed with corrugated metal. Under the gable peaks on the north and south sides there are large battened barn doors. The doors on the north side are missing many timbers while the west door on the south side appears to be missing altogether. Shed roofs cover additional cribs on the west and east sides. The cribs have open passage ways at the north and south ends and remain undivided in the interior (Photograph 17).

The drive continues south creating a loop that returns to the main gate. There are two sets of grain silos located on the east and west sides of the drive just north of Culvert 1. The west side features four large metal silos on concrete foundations with a smaller metal silo located at the north end of the line. Three additional smaller silos on concrete rings are located on the east side of the drive. Butler Manufacturing Company manufactured all of the silos. The silos are cylindrical galvanized steel grain bins. Panels of galvanized steel are riveted and crimped together to construct the cylinder, which is topped with a pyramidal roof that also consists of panels of galvanized steel welded and crimped together capped with seamless circular tops that also provide venting. The larger silos stand on a shared board formed concrete foundation and have small rectangular openings on the east side. The smaller silos stand on individual concrete ring foundations with the exception of the smaller silo located on the west side of the drive. This silo has walls constructed of seamless corrugated galvanized steel, is topped with a similar roof and stands on a wood pallet foundation, as seen in Photograph 18. The smaller silos also feature steel doors facing the drives.

B10. Significance (continued):

By 1878, William B. Brown held the land, including not only the parcel in Township 3 North, Range 1 East, section 24, but the entire sections of 24, 13, 14, and 19, as well as half of section 18. Only one building appears on Brown’s extensive holdings in the 1870s. The building, identified as “Brown’s Warehouse,” was located on the flat swamplands just north of the river. William Brown was born in 1825 in Missouri and married his wife Sarah in 1854. They moved to California by the mid 1850s and had four children, three of which survived. Brown had become a very successful farmer in the Montezuma Township of Solano County by 1870. Although Brown still owned his property in the Montezuma Hills in 1890, by the turn of the century he and Sarah had relocated to the Newman Township in Stanislaus County. Ranch Complex 1 first appears on a 1906 USGS map of Sacramento River and at that time was depicted as a single structure. R.D. Robbins Jr. acquired the majority of Brown’s property by 1909. R.D. Robbins Jr. was born in California in 1872 to R.D. Robbins, a bank president in Suisun City, of Solano County and his wife, Saditha. While Robbins owned the property into the mid-1920s, there is no indication that he lived there.

---

1 Bureau of Land Management, “Land Patent Details” Accession/Serial # CACAAA 017871, BLM Serial # CACAAA 017871, available online at http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/PatentSearch, accessed on June 1, 2007; Thompson & West, Historical Atlas Map of Solano County, California (San Francisco: author, 1878), 43 and 67; E.N. Eager, Official Map of the County of Solano California (San Francisco: Britton & Rey, 1890); Kenneth J. Miller, Official Map of the County of Solano California ([Fairfield, CA]: E. N. Eager, DPR 523L (1/95))
By the mid 1930s the complex included two residences, three barns, and a variety of sheds. The debris located southeast of
the main gate appears to be the remains of a large barn that was located south of the debris in 1937. This barn had been the
largest in the complex. A long narrow building appears to have been located in the site now occupied by Building 3. The
third residence (Building 9) was added to the property during the 1950s. The addition to the first residence (Building 4) may
have been constructed at this time. The complex appears in its current configuration by 1962 with the exception of the
modern storage tanks located near the main gate.

Evaluation

Under Criterion 1, the Ranch Complex 1 does not appear significant for association with important events within either an
agricultural or residential context. The property appears to have been continuously used as a ranch since the early 1900s.
This farmstead was part of the agricultural land use that existed in this area throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth
centuries and does not appear to have played an important role in the development of agricultural operations in the
Montezuma Township or Solano County. It does not appear to be associated with events that have made a significant
contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history.

Research on this property did not indicate that the residences or other buildings are associated with the lives of persons
important to our past, as defined by Criterion 2. The property was first developed around the turn of the twentieth century as
an agricultural property. By 1906 the property held only a single building. Farmer William B. Brown held the property
during the late 1800s and R.D. Robbins acquired the land by 1909, the earliest residence dates to this time period. By 1925,
Robbins continued to own the ranch but does not appear to have lived in Solano County at that time. By 1981, Dow
Chemical Company had purchased most of the land originally held by Brown, including the Ranch Complex 1 parcel. A
controversial plan to establish a chemical plant in Solano County was stopped and Dow sold its Montezuma Hills properties.
Although the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) acquired the property in the mid-2000s, the ranch continues to
be occupied. Neither the William B. Brown, R.D. Robbins Jr., nor the subsequent owners of the property were historically
important within a local, state or national historic context.

Under Criterion 3, the houses, barns and outbuildings do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or
method of construction. The earliest residence (Building 8 was constructed in the early 1900s and the majority of the
remaining buildings were constructed between 1900 and 1937, with the third residence (Building 9) and the equipment
shelter (Building 1) being constructed in the 1950s, and the silos being added to the property by 1962. Building 8 is a late
example of the Hall-and-Parlor form of the folk house. A simple form, the Hall-and Parlor design features a small house
two rooms wide and one room deep topped with a side gable roof and commonly feature front porches and rear additions.
This design was especially popular in the Southeast from 1850 to the 1890s but continued to be built in rural areas
throughout the country well into the twentieth century.²

The second house on the property, Building 4 appears to have been constructed in the 1920s in the Bungalow style but has
since been altered with a large addition on the south side that incorporated the porch as part of the house and extended the
east side with an additional room. The Bungalow style was a common style for both urban and rural houses in the Bay Area
and throughout California. Bungalow style houses were an especially popular choice for small house design in California
from the early 1900s through the 1930s. Both builders and architects used the style and companies such as Aladdin Homes,

Footnotes:
Wilson Bungalows, Montgomery Ward, Sears and Roebuck, and Pacific Ready-Cut mass-marketed kit houses in catalogs throughout America, making the Bungalow a common and easily accessible choice for the working class. The simplest versions of the Bungalow are one-story houses are generally of wood frame construction, regular in plan with an attached or engaged porch and simple architectural details. The roof usually features open eaves with exposed rafters, knee braces, lookouts, and a fascia board. The building at Ranch Complex 1 is in disrepair. It is a modest example of the bungalow form and is not architecturally important. The third residence (Building 9) at is a modest building without a particular style. Constructed around the 1950s, this house has the common form of a bungalow or small house without character defining features.

The large barn is a transverse crib barn, a common type in California. Transverse crib barns are multiple crib barns based on designs developed in Tennessee during the nineteenth century. This type of barn contains at least six cribs or pens flanking an open central isle and features overhead storage. This style barn is easily expanded as additional cribs are needed and eventually became the most popular barn type in the United States. William A. Randford, author and publisher of several agricultural building plan books from the early 1900s to 1920, advocated the design in his 1907 and 1917 editions of *Practical Barn Plans*.3

The sheds are constructed in utilitarian designs and do not appear to be architecturally important. All of the buildings on this farmstead, including the residences, agricultural outbuildings, and barns, are modest examples of their style and do not embody the distinctive characteristics necessary to meet Criterion 3. In addition, some of the buildings have suffered a loss of integrity with additions, loss of materials, and replacement of original materials, as discussed in the description. Lacking historical and architectural significance as well as integrity, the Ranch Complex 1 does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the CRHR.

Photographs (continued):

![Photograph 2](image_url)


---


Photograph 12. The second residence (Building 8), camera facing northeast. June 1, 2007.
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Photographs:

Photograph 1: Map Reference 2, camera facing northwest, June 2009.
Photograph 2: Map Reference 2, camera facing southwest, June 2009.

Previous Historic Resources Inventory
(See attached form)
P1. Other Identifier: Map Reference 2

*P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication ☑ Unrestricted
   (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
   *a. County Solano
   *b. U.S.G.S. 7.5' Quad Antioch North Date 1978 T3N: R 1E; SE¼ of Sec 33; MD B.M.
   c. Address 6696 Talbert Lane City n/a Zip n/a
   d. UTM: (give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone ______; _____mE/____mN
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
      APN: 0900-180-070

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
Map Reference 2 sits on a 215.28-acre agricultural parcel against the eastern slope of a hillside. The abandoned complex features eight standing buildings, including three single-family residences, a two-story bunkhouse, a modern camping trailer, two sheds, an animal shelter and a large barn. There is also one collapsed building, which appears to have been a shed. The property is fenced with the main ranch house featuring a concrete walk from the main road. There does not appear to be a formal drive between the buildings. Building 1, the main ranch house is a single-story wood frame building that has been expanded over the years. The walls are sheathed with flush horizontal wood siding and topped with a cross gable roof clad with composition shingles. Fenestration originally consisted of 6/6 lights double hung wood frame windows, however most of the window frames and glazing are now missing. The front entrance is sheltered on the screened porch addition topped with a low-pitched hipped roof supported by six square posts. The screen and doors to both the porch and the house have been removed. An addition on the west side features a shed roof and flush horizontal siding. A metal chimney pipe is located on the west side of the house. A pair of palm trees grow in the front yard, as seen in Photograph 1. (See Continuation Sheet)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) (HP33) Farm/ranch

*P4. Resources Present: ☑ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Photograph 1, main ranch house (Building 1), camera facing west. June 1, 2007

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:
   ☑ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both
   c. 1910 – 1930s, Official County Map & aerial photography

*P7. Owner and Address:
James W. Roberts
PO Box 1172
Manhattan, KS 66505-1172

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, address)
Rand Herbert & Kathleen Kennedy
JRP Historical Consulting, LLC
1490 Drew Ave, Suite 110
Davis, CA 95618

*P9. Date Recorded: June 1, 2007

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive
**B1. Historic Name:** Unknown  
**B2. Common Name:**  
**B3. Original Use:** Ranch  
**B4. Present Use:** None  
**B5. Architectural Style:** National Folk and utilitarian  
**B6. Construction History:** Constructed between c. 1910 and 1930s, alterations unknown  
**B7. Moved?:** No  
**B8. Related Features:**  
**B9. Architect:** Unknown  
**B10. Significance:** Theme n/a  
**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:**  
**B12. References:**  
Solano County Assessor Records (as reported to First American Real Estate Solutions); U.S.G.S., Antioch, Calif., 15’ series, 1908 (surveyed 1906-1908, reprinted 1950), Antioch North, Quadrangle, California, 7.5’ series. 1953 and 1978; aerial photographs from University California, Davis map collection, 1937, 1962, and 1972; Official Map of the County of Solano (1872, 1890, 1909, 1915, and 1925) History of Solano County (San Francisco: Wood, Alley & Company, 1879. See footnotes.  

**B13. Remarks:**  
**B14. Evaluator:** Kathleen Kennedy  
**Date of Evaluation:** June 2007  

(This space reserved for official comments.)
P3a. Description (continued):

Two sheds, Buildings 2 and 3 are located directly west of Building 1. The small wood frame sheds have rectangular footprints. The walls of the sheds are clad with vertical wood siding and topped with front gable roofs. The roofs are in disrepair, missing much of their wood shingle cladding (Photograph 2). Building 4 is located northwest of Building 1 and is a wood frame barn with walls sheathed with vertical wood siding and topped with a medium pitched front gable roof clad with corrugated metal. The entrance faces southeast. The only remnants remain of the central and right crib hinged battened barn door as shown in Photograph 2.

Building 5 is a large wood frame shed with a rectangular footprint located south of Building 1. The walls are clad with wide board siding and topped with a front gable roof. The medium pitched roof features narrow eaves with a simple fascia board and is clad with wood shingles. The east side of the roof is missing both the fascia board at the north end and shingles (Photograph 3). The door and several boards located at the northeast corner are also missing. A fixed six light window on the east side is missing several panes of glass. West of Building 5 is the workman’s cottage (Building 6), also shown in Photograph 3. The cottage is a wood frame, single story building with a rectangular footprint. The walls are sheathed with horizontal wood siding with several feet of siding missing on the northeast corner. The cottage is topped by a front gable roof with narrow eaves, fascia boards and clad with wood shingles. The wood panel entrance door is on the east side and opens to a small concrete stoop. Fenestration consists of 1/1 double hung wood frame windows, which are missing their glass panes and some are missing the wood frames as well.

The final dwelling is a two-story, wood frame bunkhouse (Building 7) that sits west of Building 6. The bunkhouse features walls clad with vertical board siding which is missing in some areas of the east side, a rectangular footprint and a medium pitched side gable roof with narrow eaves and clad with wood shingles. Located centrally on the east side, the wood panel entrance door is intact. Fenestration consists of 6/6 double hung windows with wood frames. Most of the window openings are missing both the wood frames and glass panes. The north end of the building features a shed roof shelter (Photograph 3). Just west of the bunkhouse is the remains of a water tower.

An animal shelter (Building 8) is located south of the bunkhouse. The wood frame shelter is open on the east side and the north half is in a state of collapse. The walls are sheathed with vertical wood siding and topped with a shed roof clad with wood shingles. A central post on the east side supports the roof, as seen in Photograph 4.

B10. Significance (continued):

By 1878, William B. Brown held the land, including not only the parcel in Township 3 North, Range 1 East, section 30, but the entire sections of 24, 13, 14, and 19, as well as half of section 18. Only one building appears on Brown’s extensive holdings in the 1870s. The building, identified as “Brown’s Warehouse,” was located on the flat swamplands just north of the river. William Brown was born in 1825 in Missouri and married his wife Sarah in 1854. They moved to California by the mid 1850s and had four children, three of which survived. Brown had become a very successful farmer in the Montezuma Township of Solano County by 1870. Although Brown still held his lands in the Montezuma Hills in 1890, by the turn of the century he and Sarah had relocated to the Newman Township in Stanislaus County. Map Reference 2 first appears on a 1890 official Solano County map and at that time consisted of a single structure. R.D. Robbins Jr. acquired the majority of Brown’s property by 1909. However, Edward Jenkins, a rancher holding relatively small portions of sections 25 and 30 that equaled 151 acres, expanded his property by adding approximately 64 acres of Brown’s land from sections 24 and 30. Map Reference 2 is located on the eastern edge of this property, which continues to have the boarders and acreage as it did in 1909. Jenkins was born in around 1858 in Canada and settled in Montezuma, California as a general farmer by 1880 with his American born bride Clare. The couple had two children, Edward Jr. and Claire. Jenkins was widowed by...
1910 and his daughter Claire inherited his property by 1915. The ranch was still held by the Jenkins family in 1932. The property was acquired by the One Market Street Property Company by the early 1980s.¹

Evaluation

Under Criterion 1, Map Reference 2 does not appear significant for association with important events within either an agricultural or residential context. The property appears to have been continuously used as a ranch since the early 1900s. This farmstead was part of the agricultural land use that existed in this area throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and does not appear to have played an important role in the development of agricultural operations in the Montezuma Township or Solano County. It does not appear to be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history.

Research on this property did not indicate that the residences or other buildings are associated with the lives of persons important to our past, as defined by Criterion 2. The property was first developed around the turn of the twentieth century as an agricultural property. Farmer William B. Brown held the property during the late 1800s and Edward Jenkins acquired the land by 1909, the earliest residence dates to this time period. By 1930s, the Jenkins family continued to own the ranch. However, it appears to have been abandoned by the time that the One Market Street Company purchased the property. Neither William B. Brown, Edward Jenkins, his daughter Claire Jenkins, nor the subsequent owners of the property were historically important within a local, state or national historic context.

Under Criterion 3, the residences, barns and outbuildings do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. The complex was constructed around the 1910s, with all of the buildings completed by 1937. Building 1 is an example of the Hall-and-Parlor form of the folk house. A simple form, the Hall-and Parlor design features a small house two rooms wide and one room deep topped with a side gable roof and commonly feature front porches and rear additions. This design was especially popular in the Southeast from 1850 to the 1890s but continued to be built in rural areas throughout the country well into the twentieth century.² This particular example has the typical addition to the rear and the porch addition to the front, as well as a further addition on the north side.

The large barn is a transverse crib barn, a common type in California. Transverse crib barns are multiple crib barns based on designs developed in Tennessee during the nineteenth century. This type of barn contains at least six cribs or pens flanking an open central isle and features overhead storage. This style barn is easily expanded as additional cribs are needed and eventually became the most popular barn type in the United States. William A. Randford, author and publisher of several agricultural building plan books from the early 1900s to 1920, advocated the design in his 1907 and 1917 editions of Practical Barn Plans.³

The cottage and bunkhouse (buildings 6 and 7) were constructed with utilitarian designs and do not conform to a particular architectural style. They are modest examples of farm labor housing and are not architecturally important. The sheds and animal shelter are also utilitarian in design and without character defining features. All of the buildings on this farmstead,

including the residences, agricultural outbuildings, and barn, are modest examples of their style and do not embody the distinctive characteristics necessary to meet Criterion 3. Furthermore, all of the buildings have suffered a loss of integrity with additions and loss of materials, as discussed in the description. Lacking historical and architectural significance as well as integrity, Map Reference 2 does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the CRHR.

**Photographs (continued):**

![Photograph 2](image-url)

**Photograph 2.** Building 4 (left), Buildings 2 and 3 (central), and rear of Building 1 (Right), camera facing northwest. June 1, 2007.
Photograph 3. Animal shelter (Building 8, left), shed (Building 5, center), workman’s cottage (center background), and bunkhouse (Building 7, right background), camera facing west. June 1, 2007.
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1. NAME

   COMMON: Hastings Adobe
   AND/OR HISTORIC: Montezuma City or Montezuma Adobe

2. LOCATION

   NE\(\frac{1}{2}\) Sec. 26 T 3 NR 1E M.D.B. & M.
   CITY OR TOWN: Montezuma City or Montezuma Adobe
   STATE: California
   CODE: 06
   COUNTY: Solano
   CODE: 095

3. CLASSIFICATION

   CATEGORY (Check One)
   [ ] District [ ] Building
   [ ] Site [ ] Structure
   [ ] Object

   OWNERSHIP
   [ ] Public [ ] Private
   [ ] Commercial [ ] Industrial
   [ ] Educational [ ] Entertainment
   [ ] Government [ ] Military
   [ ] Private Residence [ ] Museum
   [ ] Religious [ ] Scientific

4. OWNER OF PROPERTY

   OWNER'S NAME: Pacific Gas & Electric Company
   STREET AND NUMBER: 245 Market St.
   CITY OR TOWN: San Francisco
   STATE: California
   CODE: 06

5. LOCATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION

   COURTHOUSE, REGISTRY OF DEEDS, ETC:
   Recorder's Office in Solano County Courthouse
   STREET AND NUMBER: 600 Texas St.
   CITY OR TOWN: Fairfield
   STATE: California
   CODE: 06

6. REPRESENTATION IN EXISTING SURVEYS

   DATE OF SURVEY: 1953
   DEPOSITORY FOR SURVEY RECORDS: U.S.G.S. Federal Center
   STREET AND NUMBER: Denver 25
   STATE: Colorado
   CODE: 06
### DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>(Check One)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Excellent</td>
<td>□ Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Altered</td>
<td>☑ Unaltered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

Originally this adobe erected by Lansford W. Hastings an agent of the Mormon Church, consisted of four rooms and an attic. The sun-dried bricks were made from native clay-adobe and Sacramento river water. The walls were later protected by wooden sheds, which were in time replaced by a complete frame structure over the original adobe. Repairs and additions maintained the occupied ranch dwelling for the next hundred years in good condition (as shown in attached photos), until purchased by the P. G. & E. Co. in 1963. Vandals have since badly harmed the structure, and rain injured an adobe interior wall. It has now a high woven wire fence surrounding the building, with a padlocked gate. If restoration of this historic adobe is to be effected, it should be done at once.

With minor exception the structure retains its basic architectural form. This is expressly noted in the interior. The exterior framework and porch area having been added during recent times.
Ohio lawyer, Lansford W. Hastings reached California by way of Oregon in 1843, and was active in the early settlement of the State. Returning East in 1844 he published an "Emigrant's Guide" to California. (Hasting's Cut-off was followed by the ill-fated Donner party, who attempted the high mountain crossing too late in the year and were snowed in.) Returning West, Hastings was named as Mormon agent to select a strategic site for a Mormon colony in the then Mexican territory of California. This he found at the junction of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers with Suisun Bay, which gave water transportation to the great valleys of California and the Pacific Ocean. Here he planned a city and built an adobe house called Montezuma City, hoping to obtain a large land grant from the Mexican Government. Several colonies of Mormons had already reached California by ship, and the exodus from Illinois "across the plains" had started in February 1846. But on July 7, 1846, the American flag was raised in California and the Mormons lost interest in the Montezuma site. Bayard Taylor in his "Eldorado" (1849) makes mention of it: "City of Montezuma, a solitary house on a sort of headland projecting into Suisun Bay and fronting the three house city "New York of the Pacific" on the Contra Costa side."

Hastings, after about three years, abandoned his adobe, which was occupied early in 1853 by L.P. Marshall and two sons, John and Charles Knox Marshall. They found counterfeiter tools in the house. The Marshalls repaired and improved the dwelling. In a few years Hastings demanded payment for the adobe, to which he had only a squatters claim. He was given two mules and six head of cattle (all valued at $1000.) for the improvements. In time the Marshalls acquired title by pre-emption. A frame structure was placed around the adobe and the Marshall family occupied it until 1908. It was then acquired by the S.O. Stratton family who carefully maintained and further improved the aged dwelling, until sold in 1963 to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. as site of a future atomic power plant. Vandals damaged the ancient structure until the company surrounded it with a high padlocked fence. For perpetuation as a historic monument restoration is needed at once.
9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES


(2) "History of Solano County" by J.P. Munro Fraser, printed by Wood, Alley & Co. in 1879. Pages 311 and 312.

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES DEFINING A RECTANGLE LOCATING THE PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORNER</th>
<th>LATITUDE</th>
<th>LONGITUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Degrees Minutes Seconds</td>
<td>Degrees Minutes Seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE COORDINATES DEFINING THE CENTER POINT OF A PROPERTY OF LESS THAN TEN ACRES

Degrees Minutes Seconds
38° 04' 35" 121° 50' 09"

See USGS map attached.

APPROXIMATE ACREAGE OF NOMINATED PROPERTY: 1/10 of an acre.

LIST ALL STATES AND COUNTIES FOR PROPERTIES OVERLAPPING STATE OR COUNTY BOUNDARIES: No overlap.

STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE

STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE

STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE

STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE

STATE: CODE COUNTY CODE

11. FORM PREPARED BY

NAME AND TITLE: Wood Young

ORGANIZATION: Solano County Historical Society

DATE: Oct. 14 '71

STREET AND NUMBER: Rt. 1 Box 22

CITY OR TOWN: Suisun, Ca. 94585

STATE: California

CODE: 06

12. STATE LIAISON OFFICER CERTIFICATION

As the designated State Liaison Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service. The recommended level of significance of this nomination is:

National [X] State [ ] Local [ ]

Name [Signature]

Title STATE LIAISON OFFICER

Date 1/27/72

NATIONAL REGISTER VERIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register.

Robertson Utley

Chief, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation

Date 6/18/72

ATTEST:

William W. Smith

Keeper of the National Register

Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW</th>
<th>On local significance OK Means 5/13/72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIAN</td>
<td>SAGER 5/13/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHEOLOGIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT</td>
<td>OK 5/9/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST. KEEPER</td>
<td>OK 6/14/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEPER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITER/EDITOR</td>
<td>OK 5/12/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF, OAHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDITORIAN PROCESSING, EDITOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Registry Entry 7/72

Annual Edition Entry

Logged JUN 13 1972 Card JUN 13 1972

COMMENTS: WORKING NUMBER 2.9.72.2110

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT:
Attached USGS map shows exact location of Hastings adobe, placed thereon by the engineers when the map was drawn in 1953. The adobe is slightly west of Bench Mark #39. And is the southerly most building "dot" of the two building "dots" shown. (It is now circled in lead pencil.) The Hastings adobe is in

Latitude 38° 04' 35"
Longitude 121° 50' 09"

(The other dwelling shown by the second "dot" just north of the Hastings adobe, has been removed since this map was drawn.)
## ENTRIES IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER

**State** California

**Date Entered** Jun 13, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taoist Temple</td>
<td>Hanford, Kings County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Fish Traps</td>
<td>Vallecito vicinity, Riverside County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Fermin Lighthouse</td>
<td>San Pedro, Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon School</td>
<td>Brooks vicinity, Yolo County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Adobe</td>
<td>Collinsville vicinity, Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron-Stanford House</td>
<td>Oakland, Alameda County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Also Notified**

| Hon. Alan Cranston         | State Liaison Officer         |
| Hon. John Varick Tunney    | Mr. William Penn Watt, Jr.    |
| Hon. Burt L. Talcott       | Director, Department of Parks & Recreation |
| Hon. Victor Vincent Voysey | State Resources Agency        |
| Hon. Glenn M. Anderson     | Post Office Box 2300          |
| Hon. Robert L. Leggett     | Sacramento, California 95811 |
| Hon. Ronald V. Dallas      |                               |

**Director, Western Region**

HR NRowland:bc 6/6/72
Appendix B

Results of the Northwest Information Center Records Search
**INFO CENTER & IN-HOUSE RECORDS SEARCH**

**Project Name:** Solano 4 Wind Project (60569831, Task 1)

**IC File No. 17-2697** (14 May 2018 by AECOM archaeologist Karin G. Beck)  
**Compliance:** (Section 106/CEQA)

**Address/Location:**  
USGS Quad(s): Antioch North, Birds Landing, Jersey Island, Calif. (Solano County)

**Archaeological Sites within/adjacent to the study area**
- C-56 ("site reported, no description")
- P-48-41/CA-SOL-33 (Hastings Adobe) – approximate location
- P-48-124/CA-SOL-283H
- P-48-125/CA-SOL-284H
- P-48-126/CA-SOL-285H
- P-48-128/CA-SOL-287H
- P-48-139/CA-SOL-298H
- P-48-140/CA-SOL-299H
- P-48-415/CA-SOL-399H
- P-48-416/CA-SOL-400H
- P-48-524 (Historic Ranch Complex)
- P-48-949 (Handstone Isolate)
- P-48-981 (Grizzly Island Rd./Collinsville Rd./Chadbourne Rd.)

**Archaeological Sites within 0.5-mile**
- P-48-142/CA-SOL-301H
- P-48-518
- P-48-519
- P-48-521
- P-48-523 (Sheep Ranch)
- P-48-979 (Suisun Marsh Landings) – approximate location

**Studies within the APE**
- 10481
- 11766
- 11826
- 13263
- 17517
- 22464
- 23674
- 24272
- 34412
- 38991

**Studies within 0.5-mile**
- 38030

**OHP Historic Property Directory [04/05/2012]**
**OHP Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Eligibility Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Adobe, Collinsville (N176; registered 6/13/1972)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suisun Marsh Landings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caltrans Bridge Survey** (Updated 2015)  
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/historic.htm

- [27 Apr 2018]
- N/A

**State Lands Commission Shipwreck Database**
http://shipwrecks.slc.ca.gov/

- [date]
- Did Not Review

**CA Inventory of Historical Resources** (1976)  
http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/listedresources/

- [15 May 2018]
- Hastings Adobe, Collinsville (N176; registered 6/13/1972)

**CA Historical Landmarks**  
http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=21387

- [15 May 2018]
- N/A

**Five Views – An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for CA**  
http://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/Sviews/Sviews.htm

- [15 May 2018]
- N/A

**Historical Atlas of CA** (Beck & Haase 1974)

- p.29 – only 4 ranchos in Solano County; eastern portion of project area is within the Los Ulpinos land grant.

**Historic Spots in CA** (Kyle et al. 2002)

- p.491 - Solano County named for Chief Solano of the Suisuns. It was one of the original 27 counties; first county seat was Benicia, but moved to Fairfield in 1858.

**CA Place Names** (Gudde 1998)

- p.36 – Birds Landing was formerly the shipping point of John Bird who had a storage and commission business. Bird, a native a NY, settled here in 1865.
1907 Antioch, Calif. (USGS); 1910 Jersey, Calif. (USGS); 1910 Rio Vista, Calif. (USGS)

1953 Antioch North, Calif. (USGS); 1953 Birds Landing, Calif. (USGS); 1952 Jersey Island, Calif. (USGS); 1953 Rio Vista, Calif. (USGS)
1978 Antioch North, Calif. (USGS); 1978 Jersey Island, Calif. (USGS); 1978 Birds Landing, Calif. (USGS)
INFO CENTER & IN-HOUSE RECORDS SEARCH

1993 Lodi, Calif. (USGS)
Appendix C
Native American Consultation
Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project: SMUD Solano 4 Wind Project

County: Solano County

USGS Quadrangle Name: Antioch North, Birds Landing, Jersey Island

Township:_________ Range:_________ Section(s):_______

Company/Firm/Agency: AECOM

Street Address: 300 Lakeside Drive, St. 400

City: Oakland Zip: 94612

Phone: 510-874-1787

Fax: ____________________________

Email: karin.beck@aecom.com

Project Description:

Installation/removal of wind turbines, construction of access roads, tie-in with substation for Section 106 permitting
Figure 2
Solano 4 Project Area

Legend
- Solano 4
- Sites, Access Roads, and Collection Lines

N

0 0.5 1 Miles

Solano 4 east

Solano 4 west
May 15, 2018

Karin Beck  
AECOM

Sent by Email: Karen.beck@aecom.com  
Number of Pages: 2

RE: SMUD Solano 4 Wind Project, Solano County

Dear Ms. Beck:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File was completed for the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above with negative results. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in any APE.

I suggest you contact all of those listed, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the NAHC 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 via email: Sharaya.souza@nahc.ca.gov or (916) 573-0168.

Sincerely,

Sharaya Souza  
Staff Services Analyst  
(916) 573-0168
Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians
Charlie Wright, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1630
Williams, CA 95987
(530) 473-3274 Office
(530) 473-3301 Fax

Wintun / Patwin

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson
10720 Indian Hill Road
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 883-2390 Office
(530) 883-2380 Fax

Maidu

Miwok

Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Anthony Roberts, Chairperson
P.O. Box 18
Brooks, CA 95606
aroberts@yochadehe-nsn.gov
(530) 796-3400
(530) 796-2143 Fax

Wintun (Patwin)

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

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 Resource Code, or Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American Tribes for the proposed:
SMUD Solano 4 Wind Project, Solano County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-08-09</td>
<td>5029</td>
<td>Lone Band of Mioch Indians</td>
<td>Crystal Martinez, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plymouth, CA 99629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-04-17</td>
<td>7752</td>
<td>Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation</td>
<td>Leland Kinter, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooks, CA 95606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-04-17</td>
<td>8754</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Rancheria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elk Grove, CA 95624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-04-17</td>
<td>7762</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Ruiz, Jr., Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elk Grove, CA 95624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-04-17</td>
<td>8761</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Rancheria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elk Grove, CA 95624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PS Form 3800, August 2006 See Reverse for Instructions**
April 5, 2018

Cortina Band of Indians
Charlie Wright, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1630
Williams, CA 95987

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (b)(1) California Native American tribe request to the lead agency

Dear Mr. Wright,

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) sent a letter on September 15, 2016 to the Cortina Band of Indians in regards to its proposed Solano Phase 4 Wind Project. SMUD is now proposing a new project, Solano 4 Wind, which is a modification of the earlier Solano Phase 4 project.

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(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.

In order to consult through the AB52 process for SMUD projects in Solano County, including Solano 4 Wind, please submit a request in writing to SMUD to be notified of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Cortina Band of Indians. Upon receipt of the request, SMUD will send a response to initiate the consultation process under AB52 for its Solano 4 Wind project environmental impact report (EIR). A brief description of the project is provided below.

SMUD is proposing to prepare an EIR for the proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed. Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which consists of cables to conduct electricity.
If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ammon Rice  
Environmental Management Specialist III  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201  
Sacramento, CA 95817  
ammon.rice@smud.org  
(916) 732-7466

Cc: Patrick Durham  
    Emily Bacchini  
    Joe Schofield
March 29, 2018

Ione Band of Miwok Indians
Crystal Martinez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 699
Plymouth, CA 95669

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (d) Request for Formal Notification of Proposed Projects

Dear Chairperson Martinez,

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB 52) and the Ione Band of Miwok Indians’ June 27, 2016, letter request for formal notification of and information regarding SMUD-led projects within the Band’s geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation, you are hereby notified that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is proposing to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for its proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). A brief description of the project is provided below.

The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed.

Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which includes cables to conduct electricity. As part of the cultural resources review of the proposed project under CEQA, we are requesting any information that you are willing to share about cultural resources that may be present in the proposed project area. If you would like to consult on this project with SMUD, please notify us in writing within 30 calendar days (May 9, 2018), as detailed in AB 52. If you would like more information about the project to help you determine whether to engage in consultation, please feel free to contact me personally. Please respond to:

Ammon Rice
SMUD
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201
Sacramento, CA 95817
ammon.rice@smud.org
(916) 732-7466
If you decide to consult with us on the project, I will contact you within 30 calendar days to begin the consultation process.

SMUD is committed to working with you to identify, and minimize or avoid impacts to, Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined under California Public Resources Code Section 21074) important to the Ione Band of Miwok Indians. Your assistance in identifying such potential resources will help SMUD avoid and protect them. We understand that the locations of these resources are sensitive; we will have appropriate staff and consultants available to work with you during consultation to ensure confidentiality and awareness. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code 6254.10.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org

Sincerely,

Ammon Rice
Environmental Management Specialist III

Cc: Patrick Durham
Emily Bacchini
Joe Schofield
March 29, 2018

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager
10720 Indian Hill Road
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (d) Request for Formal Notification of Proposed Projects

Dear Mr. Guerrero,

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB 52) and the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria’s November 23, 2015, letter request for formal notification of and information regarding SMUD-led projects within the Rancheria’s geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation, you are hereby notified that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is proposing to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for its proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). A brief description of the project is provided below.

The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed. Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which includes cables to conduct electricity.

As part of the cultural resources review of the proposed project under CEQA, we are requesting any information that you are willing to share about cultural resources that may be present in the proposed project area. If you would like to consult on this project with SMUD, please notify us in writing within 30 calendar days (May 9, 2018), as detailed in AB 52. If you would like more information about the project to help you determine whether to engage in consultation, please feel free to contact me personally.

Please respond to:
Ammon Rice
SMUD
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201
Sacramento, CA 95817
ammon.rice@smud.org
(916) 732-7466
If you decide to consult with us on the project, I will contact you within 30 calendar days to begin the consultation process.

SMUD is committed to working with you to identify, and minimize or avoid impacts to, Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined under California Public Resources Code Section 21074) important to the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. Your assistance in identifying such potential resources will help SMUD avoid and protect them. We understand that the locations of these resources are sensitive; will have appropriate staff and consultants available to work with you during consultation to ensure confidentiality and awareness. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code 6254.10.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org.

Sincerely,

Ammon Rice
Environmental Management Specialist III

Cc: Patrick Durham
    Emily Bacchini
    Joe Schofield
April 24, 2018

Ammon Rice
Environmental Management Specialist
SMUD
6201 S St., Mail Stop H201
Sacramento, CA 95817

RE: AB 52 Consultation Request for the Proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, Solano County, CA

Dear Environmental Management Specialist Ammon Rice,

The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) received a letter from the SMUD dated 4/2/2018, formally notifying us of a proposed project, the Solano 4 Wind Project in Solano County, and an opportunity to consult under AB 52. This letter is notice that UAIC would like to initiate consultation under AB 52.

We would like to discuss the topics listed in Cal. Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2(a), including the type of environmental review to be conducted for the project; project alternatives; the project’s significant effects; and mitigation measures for any direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts the project may cause to tribal cultural resources. As consultation progresses, we may also wish to discuss design options that would avoid impacts to tribal cultural resources; the scope of any environmental document that is prepared for the project; pre-project surveys; and tribal cultural resource identification, significance evaluations and culturally-appropriate treatment.

This letter is also a formal request to allow UAIC tribal representatives to observe and participate in all cultural resource surveys, including initial pedestrian surveys for the project. Please send us all existing cultural resource assessments, as well as requests for, and the results of, any records searches that may have been conducted prior to our first consultation meeting. If tribal cultural resources are identified within the project area, it is UAIC’s policy that tribal monitors must be present for all ground disturbing activities. Finally, please be advised that UAIC’s strong preference is to preserve tribal cultural resources in place and avoid them whenever possible. Subsurface testing and data recovery must not occur without first consulting with UAIC and receiving UAIC’s written consent.

In the letter Environmental Management Specialist Ammon Rice is identified as the lead contact person for consultation on the proposed project. Marcos Guerrero, our Cultural Resources Manager, will be UAIC’s point of contact for this consultation. Please contact Mr. Guerrero by phone at (530) 883-2364 or email at mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com to begin the consultation process.
Thank you for involving UAIC in the planning process at an early stage. We ask that you make this letter a part of the project record and we look forward to working with you to ensure that tribal cultural resources are protected.

Sincerely,

Gene Whitehouse,
Chairman

CC: Matthew Moore, UAIC Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Marcos Guerrero, UAIC Cultural Resources Manager
March 29, 2018

Wilton Rancheria
Antonio Ruiz, Jr., Cultural Resources Officer
9728 Kent Street
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (d) Request for Formal Notification of Proposed Projects

Dear Mr. Ruiz, Jr.,

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB 52) and the Wilton Rancheria’s August 6, 2015, letter request for formal notification of and information regarding SMUD-led projects within the Rancheria’s geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation, you are hereby notified that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is proposing to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for its proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). A brief description of the project is provided below.

The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed. Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which includes cables to conduct electricity.

As part of the cultural resources review of the proposed project under CEQA, we are requesting any information that you are willing to share about cultural resources that may be present in the proposed project area. If you would like to consult on this project with SMUD, please notify us in writing within 30 calendar days (May 9, 2018), as detailed in AB 52. If you would like more information about the project to help you determine whether to engage in consultation, please feel free to contact me personally.

Please respond to:

Ammon Rice
SMUD
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201
Sacramento, CA 95817
ammon.rice@smud.org
(916) 732-7466
If you decide to consult with us on the project, I will contact you within 30 calendar days to begin the consultation process.

SMUD is committed to working with you to identify, and minimize or avoid impacts to, Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined under California Public Resources Code Section 21074) important to the Wilton Rancheria. Your assistance in identifying such potential resources will help SMUD avoid and protect them. We understand that the locations of these resources are sensitive; will have appropriate staff and consultants available to work with you during consultation to ensure confidentiality and awareness. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code 6254.10.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org

Sincerely,

Ammon Rice
Environmental Management Specialist III

Cc: Patrick Durham
    Emily Bacchini
    Joe Schofield
March 29, 2018

Wilton Rancheria
Raymond Hitchcock, Chairperson
9728 Kent Street
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (d) Request for Formal Notification of Proposed Projects

Dear Chairperson Hitchcock,

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (AB 52) and the Wilton Rancheria’s August 6, 2015, letter request for formal notification of and information regarding SMUD-led projects within the Rancheria’s geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation, you are hereby notified that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) is proposing to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for its proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). A brief description of the project is provided below.

The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed. Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which includes cables to conduct electricity.

As part of the cultural resources review of the proposed project under CEQA, we are requesting any information that you are willing to share about cultural resources that may be present in the proposed project area. If you would like to consult on this project with SMUD, please notify us in writing within 30 calendar days (May 9, 2018), as detailed in AB 52. If you would like more information about the project to help you determine whether to engage in consultation, please feel free to contact me personally.

Please respond to:
Ammon Rice
SMUD
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201
Sacramento, CA 95817
ammon.rice@smud.org
(916) 732-7466
If you decide to consult with us on the project, I will contact you within 30 calendar days to begin the consultation process.

SMUD is committed to working with you to identify, and minimize or avoid impacts to, Tribal Cultural Resources (as defined under California Public Resources Code Section 21074) important to the Wilton Rancheria. Your assistance in identifying such potential resources will help SMUD avoid and protect them. We understand that the locations of these resources are sensitive; will have appropriate staff and consultants available to work with you during consultation to ensure confidentiality and awareness. Resource locations will not be disclosed in public documents and will be kept confidential as provided for under California Government Code 6254.10.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ammon Rice
Environmental Management Specialist III

Cc: Patrick Durham
    Emily Bacchini
    Joe Schofield
April 5, 2018

Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Leland Kinter, Chairperson
P.O. Box 18
Brooks, CA 95606

Subject: California Environmental Quality Act Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, subd. (b)(1) California Native American tribe request to the lead agency

Dear Mr. Kinter,

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) sent a letter on September 15, 2016 to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation in regards to its proposed Solano Phase 4 Wind Project, to which you responded (ID YD-09292016-03). SMUD is now proposing a new project, Solano 4 Wind, which is a modification of the earlier Solano Phase 4 project.

In accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(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.

In order to consult through the AB52 process for SMUD projects in Solano County, including Solano 4 Wind, please submit a request in writing to SMUD to be notified of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Upon receipt of the request, SMUD will send a response to initiate the consultation process under AB52 for its Solano 4 Wind project environmental impact report (EIR). A brief description of the project is provided below.

SMUD is proposing to prepare an EIR for the proposed Solano 4 Wind Project, located near the town of Collinsville, Solano County, California (Figure 1 and 2). The Solano 4 Wind project would consist of removing 23 V-47 Vestas wind turbine generators (WTGs) at the Phase 1 site (Solano 4 Wind east) and 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs at the Roberts property. SMUD would then construct approximately 22 new WTGs (10 at the Solano 4 east site [former Phase 1] and 12 on the Solano 4 west [Roberts and Collinsville properties]) that would generate up to 90 megawatts (MW) on approximately 2,237 acres. Solano 4 east is an approximately 881 acre property owned by SMUD and dominated by non-native grasslands used for seasonal livestock grazing, and supports 23 Vestas V-47 WTGs. Solano 4 west is a 1,390 acre SMUD owned property dominated by non-native grasslands, and supporting 62 Kenetech KCS-56 WTGs owned by EDF Renewable Energy. In order to develop the project, additional roads, foundations, and a power collection system to transport power to the SMUD power grid would need to be developed. Given existing Solano County wind project development guidelines, an underground collection system is planned, which consists of cables to transport electricity.
If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by telephone at (916) 732-7466 or e-mail at ammon.rice@smud.org.

Sincerely,

Ammon Rice  
Environmental Management Specialist III  
Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
6201 S Street, Mail Stop H201  
Sacramento, CA 95817  
ammon.rice@smud.org  
(916) 732-7466

Cc: Patrick Durham  
    Emily Bacchini  
    Joe Schofield
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State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Resource Name or #: SMUD-1

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication ☑ Unrestricted

a. County: Solano

b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Antioch North

c. Address: City:
d. UTM: Zone: 10; 608283 mE/ 4219302 mN (G.P.S.) (center of structural remains)
e. Other Locational Data: Elevation: 40 ft. amsl.

From Rio Vista, CA, travel southwest on S. Front Street. Turn right onto St. Gertrudes Avenue; and continue on for 322 ft. turn left on South 2nd Street, and continue for 0.2-mile. South 2nd Street turns right and becomes Montezuma Hills Road; travel for 5.1 miles. Turn left onto Toland Road, and travel for 0.25-miles. The site is located on the north side of Toland Road.

P3a. Description:

SMUD-1 consists of structural remains of an old pump/cistern and a low-density artifact scatter, located on the south bank of an unnamed waterway, on the north side of Toland Road. The structural remains consist of finished lumber, two concrete slabs/foundation fragments, corrugated metal, one red (common) brick and one fire brick, and one fragment of flat, aqua-colored glass. The finished lumber included: two, 4- by 4- by 4-ft. long boards, two, 2- by 10- by 8-ft. long boards, and seven, 2- by 6-ft. long boards of varying lengths. The concrete slabs/foundation fragments measured (respectively): 48- by 14- by 8-in. thick and 28- by 14- by 8-in. thick. A 1-in. diameter threaded pipe was observed among the structural remains. The pipe appeared to be oriented toward the creek and likely acted as part of a water-delivery system. A length of an approximately 6 in. diameter flexible polyvinyl chloride pipe was also observed in close proximity to the metal pipe. Two “Square D,” 60 ampers (amps) breaker boxes were observed within the structural remains, and would have been used to pump water into a tank or cistern. See Continuation sheet page 3.


P4. Resources Present: ☑Site

P5b. Description of Photo:
Overview of structural remains and artifact scatter; Toland Lane in upper right frame. View southeast. May 2018.

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:
Historic

P7. Owner and Address:
Sacramento Municipality Utility District
6201 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95817

P8. Recorded by:
Annamarie Leon Guerrero, Joshua Taylor, Alyssa Loyless
AECOM
300 Lakeside Dr., Ste. 400
Oakland, CA 94612

P9. Date Recorded:
May 22, 2018

P10. Survey Type: Intensive pedestrian survey


*Attachments: ☑Location Map ☑Continuation Sheet

DPR 523A (1/95)
Resource Name or #: SMUD-1

Map Name(s): Antioch North

Scale: 1:24,000

Date of Map: 1978
*Recorded by: A. Leon Guerrero, J. Taylor, A. Loyless

*Date: May 22, 2018

*Required information

**P3a:** Schneider Electric has listed the trademark “Square D” on conduit boxes and switches since 1917, and the trademark is still in use today. The low-density artifacts identified within the vicinity of the structural remains included: three fragments of cobalt-colored glass (<1 in.); 1 fragment of curved aqua-colored glass, and two curved, colorless glass fragments. Two, 21-in. diameter, ferrous metal, concave “discs” with a 6 in. opening in the center were also observed. These are likely the remains of worn out tilling equipment used to disc the fields. In addition to the artifact deposit and structural remains, two 12-in. diameter concrete post foundation fragments were located approximately 15 ft. southeast of the structural remains were identified.

Review of historic-era topographic maps showed one building within the vicinity of SMUD-1 for the years: 1908, 1914, 1936, 1943, 1947, 1951, 1978, 1986, and 1995 (Historicaerials.com). On the 1955 topographic map, two buildings and an ancillary structure are depicted within the vicinity of SMUD-1 (Historicaerials.com 2018). Two buildings are depicted within the vicinity of SMUD-1 on topographic maps for the following years: 1960, 1965, and 1969. No buildings and/or structures are depicted within the vicinity of SMUD-1 on the 2012 topographic map (Historicaerials.com).
Topographic quadrangle maps and historic-era aerials dating to the mid-1950s first depict a building/structure and water tank in the vicinity of SMUD-1 (Historicaerials.com; USGS 1955). These features were razed during the 21st century; the building/structure was removed between 2002 and 2005 (Historicaerials.com 2005), and the water tank was replaced before 2009 (Historicaerials.com 2009) when the lot on which these features were standing appeared to have been stripped and graded, then covered in gravel. Therefore, the integrity of SMUD-1 has been lost, as it appears to be just a secondary deposit of remnant debris from these previous structures, mixed with modern debris. SMUD-1 does not appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion A/1, given its inability to convey its historical association as a ranching feature because of its lack of integrity, nor does it have any research potential as an archaeological resource (Criterion D/4).
**P1. Other Identifier:**

**P2. Location:** [Not for Publication] [Unrestricted]

- **a. County:** Solano
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Antioch North
- **c. Address:**
  - **City:**
  - **Zip:**
- **d. UTM:**
  - Zone: 10
  - N 608219.88 mE / 4220123.5 mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:**
  - **Elevation:** 120 ft. amsl.

From Rio Vista, CA, travel southwest on S. front Street. Turn right onto St. Gertrudes Avenue; and continue on for 322 ft. turn left on South 2nd Street, and continue for 0.2 mile. South 2nd Street turns right and becomes Montezuma Hills Road; travel for approximately 4.6 miles. The resource is located approximately 68 ft. west of Montezuma Hills Road.

**P3a. Description:**

SMUD-3 is a moderately dense historic-period artifact deposit located on a disced, east-facing hillside, approximately 68 ft. upslope of Montezuma Hills Road. The artifact deposit consisted of highly fragmentary: ceramics, glass (vessel) fragments, and metal hardware. Ceramics included 15 fragments of non-diagnostic white improved earthenware, and two fragments of brown glazed earthenware. The glass fragments included: three green-, eight aqua-, and three amethyst-colored sherds. One of the green glass fragments was a partial neck with a crown top finish and one of the amethyst fragments included a partial neck and blob finish. The metal fragments included: two railroad spikes, 10 cast iron brackets/hooks, and several fragments of miscellaneous scrap metal.

Given the disced nature of the field, it is unlikely that the artifacts are in situ; however, the fact that the artifacts were concentrated in one primary location, intermixed and even embedded in the disced dirt—as opposed to just overlaying the dirt—indicates that the artifacts were in this general location when the field was disced. A sparse number of artifacts were identified as far as 145 ft. north of the primary deposit. It is possible that these artifacts were relocated across the landscape during the discing process. See Continuation Sheet page 3.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** AH4. Privies/dumps/trash scatters

**P4. Resources Present:** Site

**P5b. Description of Photo:**


**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:** Historic

**P7. Owner and Address:**

Sacramento Municipality Utility District
6201 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95817

**P8. Recorded by:**

Annamarie Leon Guerrero, Joshua Taylor, Alyssa Loyless
AECOM
300 Lakeside Dr., Ste. 400
Oakland, CA 94612

**P9. Date Recorded:**

May 23, 2018

**P10. Survey Type:**

Intensive pedestrian survey

**P11. Report Citation:**


**Attachments:** Map, Continuation Sheet
Map Name(s): Antioch North
*Scale: 1:24,000
*Date of Map: 1978

*Resource Name or #: SMUD-3

SMUD-3
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Meters
Top photographs: Glass and ceramic fragments.  
Bottom photographs: Miscellaneous metal fragments and railroad spike.

**P3a. Description:**
A review of historic-era maps and aerials does not indicate that a structure was ever recorded in this location; thus, a determination of association is difficult.

The proximity to Montezuma Hills Road and the surficial extent of the scatter suggest that SMUD-3 could have been a roadside dumping spot, and the artifacts were subsequently strewn across a larger area as a result of discing. SMDU-3 does not appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)/California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion A/1, given its lack of an identifiable association; likewise, with no diagnostic artifacts present, it has limited data potential under Criterion D/4. In addition, SMUD-3 does not retain sufficient integrity to be determined eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.
**Resource Name or #:** SMUD-5, Remnant fence

**P1. Other Identifier:**

**P2. Location:** ☐ Not for Publication ☐ Unrestricted

*a. County:* Solano

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad:* Antioch North  
**Date:** 1978 T 2N; R 1E; S ½ and NE ¼ Sec 25; Mount Diablo B.M.

c. **Address:**

d. **UTM:** Zone: 10N; 603991.6 mE/4215265.3 mN (aerial, gate on road)

e. **Other Locational Data:**

From Rio Vista, travel southwest on South 2nd Street/Montezuma Hills Road. After approximately 10 miles, turn left at the T-intersection onto Birds Landing Road. Travel 1.4 miles and turn left onto Collinsville Road. Travel 2.8 miles and turn left onto Stratton Lane. After Stratton Lane turns to the south, the road is behind a locked PG&E gate. Follow this road 0.75 miles generally southeast to the intersection with a gravel access road. Turn left onto the gravel road. The southern edge of the site is 1200 feet northeast of the gate.

**P3a. Description:**

SMUD-5 is an abandoned northeast-southwest trending fenceline situated in a dry swale. The remnants of the fence consist of upright square posts generally 4 feet high; some of the posts have been augmented/stabilized with standard two-by-fours. The barbed wire connecting the posts has mostly been removed. All visible nails are wire cut. A concrete fence pier was found in a dry swale on the east edge of the site where all fence posts had been removed.

The fence, located in the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 25, is likely associated with the ranch property acquired by John Kierce from Lindsay Powell Marshall Sr. in 1880, when Marshall divested some of his lands to Kierce and Edward Jenkins (Gregory 1912; Theodoratus et al. 1980:131). John and his wife Ann (O’Loughlin) Kierce (also Kerce, Kearce), were natives of Ireland, and emigrated to the U.S. sometime in the early 1860s (U.S. Census 1900). John and Ann appear in the 1870 U.S. Census as residents of Denverton, Solano County, northwest of the APE; John is listed as a farmer. See Continuation sheet page 3.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** AH11. Walls/fences

**P4. Resources Present:** ☐ Site

**P5b. Description of Photo:**

Site overview, view south-southwest.

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**

Historic

**P7. Owner and Address:**

SMUD

**P8. Recorded by:**

J. Redmond, J. Taylor, A. Loyless, AECOM
300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 400
Oakland, CA 94612

**P9. Date Recorded:**

June 21, 2018

**P10. Survey Type:** Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** AECOM, 2018. Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Solano 4 Wind Project, Montezuma Hills, California.

*Attachments: Location Map  Continuation Sheet

DPR 523A (1/95)  *Required information*
Scale: 1:24,000  Antioch North, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1978)

Location Vicinity

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN
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DPR 523J (1/95)
At some point, the family moved to San Francisco—likely in the early 1880s when their only son Francis attended St. Mary’s College in San Francisco in an effort to become an attorney (Bates 1912:382)—and the property was eventually sold after John (1893) and Ann’s (1918) death. Research did not indicate when the property was sold, but the Kierce family still retained it in 1915 (Solano County). The property and surrounding ranch lands ultimately became known as the Roberts property. The property maintained (roughly) the same borders and acreage into the twenty-first century when it was consolidated for energy development.

An analysis of historic-era maps depict no fenceline in the area; however, historic-era aerial photographs show a delineation and variations in how the land was plowed (or not) on either side of the fenceline (historicaerials.com 1987; UCSB 1937, 1965). Also visible from the aerial photographs is the presence of a road, which appears to be a connector between Stratton and Talber lanes; the concrete fence pier aligns with the roadway and appears to be part of a gate near Talbert Lane, which is on Jenkins’ (and later Roberts’) property.

Research does not indicate that the Kierce family (or later owners of the property) were important persons to our past (Criterion B/2), nor was SMUD-5 (or the property) associated with important events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history (Criterion A/1). SMUD-5 does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (Criterion C/3), nor does it have any research potential (Criterion D/4). In addition, SMUD-5 does not retain sufficient integrity to be determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)/California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Therefore, SMUD-5 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.

REFERENCES:


**Required information**

Top: Official Map of Solano County depicting John Kierce ownership of portions of Section 25 (Solano County 1890).

Bottom: Official Map of Solano County depicting Mrs. A. Kierce, et al. ownership of portions of Section 25 (Solano County 1915).
SMUD-6 is a broken 9-inch-diameter, white improved earthenware dinner plate. Two pieces were identified. The rim is scalloped and the brim is decorated with a blue floral and geometric decal pattern. The base has a green mark reading “中国唐山 [China Tangshan] / Made in China” surrounding by a green ribbon. Tangshan was a major center of ceramics in China in the 20th century. This mark may date to the 1960s or 1970s. The plate was found in a dry swale just north of the former James W. Roberts’ ranch property line. No other artifacts were found in the vicinity. This isolated find does not appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)/California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion A/1, given its lack of identifiable association; likewise, it has limited data potential (Criterion D/4). Therefore, SMUD-6 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.

SMUD-6 is a broken 9-inch-diameter, white improved earthenware dinner plate. Two pieces were identified. The rim is scalloped and the brim is decorated with a blue floral and geometric decal pattern. The base has a green mark reading “中国唐山 [China Tangshan] / Made in China” surrounding by a green ribbon. Tangshan was a major center of ceramics in China in the 20th century. This mark may date to the 1960s or 1970s. The plate was found in a dry swale just north of the former James W. Roberts’ ranch property line. No other artifacts were found in the vicinity. This isolated find does not appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)/California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion A/1, given its lack of identifiable association; likewise, it has limited data potential (Criterion D/4). Therefore, SMUD-6 does not appear eligible for the NRHP/CRHR.