

THE STATE PLAN: HISTORIC RESOURCES  
AND THE SANTA BARBARA ELEMENT

Julia G. Costello  
P.O. Box 288  
Mokelumne Hill, CA 95245

ABSTRACT

In 1984 the Office of Historic Preservation initiated the development of a statewide historical resources plan and Santa Barbara County was selected as the location for a pilot, interdisciplinary study. Among other problems identified in this first draft, historic archaeological resources were not well developed. To remedy this, a group of people met in Sacramento in 1985 to specify procedures for identifying and evaluating the research potential of historic sites and features. Subsequent work has resulted in a hierarchy of Themes and Study Topics, under which specific resource types are addressed with (1) an identifying list, (2) a narrative descriptive section, (3) specific research questions, and (4) methods for identification, evaluation, and mitigation assessment. As an example of how this method for addressing historic resources works, the Theme of "Transportation Development" is presented.

INTRODUCTION

Comprehensive heritage resource management plans have been required since the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act (80, Stat. 915). In 1984, as a result of recommendations from the California Heritage Task Force, the mandate for the State Historical Resources Commission to pursue development of a state-wide historical resources plan was incorporated into the Public Resources Code [Section 5020.4(d),(e)]. In 1983, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) had already begun the planning process by contracting with Dave Fredrickson, of Sonoma State University, to develop a pilot heritage management plan. One outcome of this study was the selection of Santa Barbara County for a pilot plan development. Los Padres National Forest personnel initiated the effort and Mark Raab ably coordinated the process with financial help from OHP.

In October of 1985, the first draft of the California Comprehensive Heritage Resource Management Plan, the Santa Barbara County Element, was submitted to the OHP (Raab et al. 1985). In June of 1986, 8 months later, the draft was circulated for reviews, which were due in August. A summary of responses was promised for December 1986. Now it is April

of 1987 and there have been no results of the review made available (Note: there was still no response by OHP in November 1987). OHP has instead proposed a plan which would avoid the complexities of improving the Santa Barbara Element by dropping the effort entirely, moving to a different region (San Diego), and developing only a section on prehistoric resources.

I think this is a big mistake [cf. Chace (1986) and Conard (1987)]. Granted, the document is flawed. Much of OHP's unhappiness with the product, however, is a result of their lack of involvement during the process. What has been produced is also a first draft and those who wrote it already have changes and additions they want to incorporate. To date, the Santa Barbara Element is the closest thing to a comprehensive cultural resources management blueprint that we have in California. And, importantly, it is being implemented in Santa Barbara County. The Santa Barbara Element has not disappeared into the one-way file drawer of government studies -- it is being used by the Santa Barbara County for cultural resource management. This is all the more reason to improve it. Not only do we have a workable draft, but we have a testing arena in which to refine it. With a workable model, other regions can also more easily develop their own "Elements."

#### HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

I do not have a solution to all the problems of the Santa Barbara Element, but I would like to report on some progress in addressing historic archaeological resources. Cultural resources in the Santa Barbara Element were divided into two sections: the Historic Element and the Archaeological Element. Historical archaeology was included as the final chapter in the Archaeological Element. The authors had decided that resources should be divided based on distinctive research questions and research methodologies: History and Archaeology. Although this is a traditional division, for cultural resource planning I believe that historic archaeology should be grouped with historic resources.

As this is a controversial technicality, I will defend my viewpoint for this lumping of disciplines. For cultural resource management, the resources must be the organizing principal, not the researchers. The physical remains that historical archaeologists evaluate are part of the human culture of the historic period: specifically, material culture. This is what historic archaeologists study, from an anthropological perspective. Historians can also look at physical remains on sites and use their skills to place them within their historic context. Historical archaeologists and historians often look at the same resources, only with

different viewpoints. The division between "historic resources," and "historic archaeological resources," therefore, does not distinguish resources but, instead, professional orientations (or, perhaps, employment opportunities). For a State Plan, or for the Santa Barbara Element, the goal is responsible management of cultural resources. To accomplish this, I believe that the resources should not be subdivided into academic or professional disciplines, but should be treated as cohesive entities.

#### SACRAMENTO PLANNING GROUP

In response to a request by Dr. Michael Glassow (who by default was author of the original Historical Archaeology section of the Santa Barbara Element), I began to organize some people to assist with revisions. In December of 1985, I arranged for 11 people to meet in Sacramento to review and discuss management of historic resources. Included were seven historical archaeologists, two historians, one cultural geographer, and one ethnohistorian.

The Group noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning (RP3) identify three steps needed for an operable preservation plan (U.S. Department of the Interior 1980:18-20):

1. Establish historic contexts that are based on cultural theme, geographical, and chronological limits;
2. Formulate goals and priorities for identification, evaluation (significance), registration, and treatment of historic properties; and,
3. Integrate these formulations into land planning processes of governmental and other entities.

The Group agreed that in the draft Santa Barbara Element, Step 1 had largely been accomplished. Historians who worked on the Element developed a useful matrix for identifying the historic context of resources. Although fine tuning is needed, this is a workable method of locating resources in relation to time, cultural activity, and demographics. Step 3, integration into planning processes, had also been achieved thanks to the enthusiasm and vision of the Santa Barbara County Planning Department. What was missing was Step 2, methods for:

1. identifying resources,
2. evaluating significance, and
3. determining mitigation measures.

Determining significance was discussed by the Sacramento Study Group as a critical step in the management of resources. A list of significance criteria developed by

the group looked much like that used the by the National Register. A significant resource should: be rare (or representative); have integrity; be connected with important persons or processes; have emotional value, folklore aspects, or a concerned constituency present; have research potential; or, have potential for education and/or interpretation. Among these criteria, "research potential" was the area that was identified as most needing clarification. In response, the Group developed a series of general research questions, or domains. Some of the participants agreed, as a start, to write one specific question for each domain.

As with many ad-hoc, volunteer efforts, we missed all our self-imposed deadlines and fell far short of our goals. However, five of the historic archaeologists met last year at the 1986 SCA meetings in Santa Rosa to try and make progress. Here we formally agreed to work with the Santa Barbara Element and to develop a method for determining research potential for historic archaeological resources.

#### A PLAN FOR IDENTIFYING THE RESEARCH POTENTIAL OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

In drafting up a research plan, we needed to have a specific audience in mind. We decided that since the goal of our effort was to enhance management of historic cultural resources, the product should be designed for planners and other general cultural resource practitioners. Although we hoped the guidelines we developed would also be helpful to our colleagues (and, in fact, we have fruitfully used each other's contributions since that time), we organized our material for use by informed non-archaeologists. To this end, we started not with research questions, but with the resources themselves.

We developed a list of Study Topics, under which various Themes would be identified. Included were: Hispanic Missions, Pueblos, and Ranchos; Urban Development; Rural Development; Architecture; Industrial Sites; and, Underwater Sites. General Themes were identified under these Study Topics. For example, under Industrial Sites, identified Themes included Mining, Water Development, Transportation Development, and Agricultural Development.

For each Theme, or for more specific Sub-Themes, the following outline would be completed:

1. The types of resources included under the theme would be identified;
2. A narrative section introducing the theme would be written;
3. Specific research questions would be proposed; and,

4. Methods for identification, evaluation, and mitigation of identified resources would be recommended.

It was readily recognized that development of a comprehensive set of Themes would be a monumental undertaking. If a format could be agreed upon, however, and an outline of Study Topics and Themes identified, sections could be developed and added gradually, as to a loose leaf notebook. Different individuals could contribute sections in areas for which they are particularly knowledgeable.

For example, Jim Rock (1987) could summarize his research design for tin cans as a Theme under the Study Topic, Rural Development. Other papers presented at the SCA Annual Meetings (1) could also be easily incorporated: Steve Mikesell's bridge study could be presented as a Sub-Theme under Transportation Development and railroad logging under Sub-Theme, Railroads. Overlapping categories would be cross-referenced to different Study Topics and Themes. References could guide the reader to more in-depth discussions in other sources.

Each of the five of us at the 1986 meeting agreed to outline one or more Themes to be circulated to each other for review. Thus far topics on transportation, ditches, urban sites, and mining sites have been drafted. Transportation Development, one of the topics I authored, is presented below as an example of how the proposed outline works.

#### STUDY TOPIC: INDUSTRIAL SITES

##### Theme: Transportation Development

##### 1. Resource Types:

- a. trails
- b. roads
- c. bridges
- d. ferrys
- e. railroads (Also see Study Topic: Architecture)
- f. airports (Also see Study Topic: Architecture)

##### 2. Narrative

Individual transportation-related resources are parts of larger systems; these larger systems need to be identified in order to successfully evaluate their constituent parts. Information on the development of transportation systems in any given area is instrumental to understanding related economic development. Studies of exchange systems, commodity flows, market access, and urban

growth are dependent on knowledge of routes and means of transport. Social and cultural exchanges usually also follow economic paths and knowledge of these interactions will therefore be dependent on accurate reconstructions of economic and transportation networks. Changes in routes, or in the importance of a transportation system, can often be linked to shifts in population centers, development of new economic ventures, and/or changes in social or cultural ties.

### 3. Specific Questions:

a. What information does this resource contain on the economic development of the region?

b. What does the location and nature of this resource tell us about the development of historic population centers?

c. What will knowledge about this resource also reveal about the location and nature of undocumented or poorly documented cultural resources?

d. What does the resource reveal about the technological evolution of transportation systems in the area?

### 4. Identification and Evaluation of Resources

Introduction. If any of the above resource types are present, the following historical and physical attributes should be identified (where relevant) for the resource and for the transportation system of which the resource is a part:

a. What are the physical attributes of the resource?

b. When was the system constructed? By whom? Who maintained the system?

c. Was the resource part of a major, secondary, or tertiary transportation system? What population centers or activity areas did the system connect?

d. What commodities or persons was the facility constructed to benefit?

e. Were there changes in the route over time? If so, why?

f. When was the system abandoned? Why? What new system replaced it?

Research and Recordation. Primary and secondary roads are usually recorded on historic maps, and documents often contain pertinent information on construction and users. Roads that continued in use for long periods of time are typically altered with route improvements; abandoned segments of roads need to be identified, and their abandonments dated, in order to reconstruct the cultural landscape. Tertiary roads are not always depicted on maps

and roads to short-lived ventures such as mines, ranches, or logging areas may not have been documented at all.

The route of the system, and location of important features, should minimally be placed on a 7.5' USGS Quadrangle Map. Documentary research and oral histories can usually provide historical information on primary and secondary transportation systems. Smaller systems, however, may have to be interpreted based on archaeological evidence alone.

#### Evaluation of Significance and Mitigation Recommendations.

All transportation systems are potentially significant for their information or research potential. This potential, however, is usually limited to the road's: (1) historic associations and development; (2) physical location; and (3) construction techniques. Mitigation of the last two items is usually accomplished by physical survey, description, and recordation (mapping and photographs) of the system. Unless a particular transportation resource: (1) has remarkable integrity, (2) can be associated with a specific economic venture, and (3) was of unusual importance in the development of the region, or uniquely represents an important regional development, it likely does not require additional mitigation measures such as project avoidance or preservation.

Transportation related resources that are determined to be significant should be protected from physical alterations to the resource itself and to its setting. If this is not possible, than mitigation measures may include any combination of the following: extensive, professional level photographic recordation of the resource and its setting; Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standard drawings of the resource; an oral history program on the resource; intensive historical research; and, an academic and/or popular publication on the resource incorporating data from the mitigation measures.

#### CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This is the first time we have presented our plan for review. We are an unsponsored, unofficial group although we have the support of those who initially authored the Historic and the Historic Archaeology sections of the Santa Barbara Element. We are also notably unorganized and slow on production. However, we believe that the method we have chosen is workable and that the cause of clarifying research on historic sites is critical. We will appreciate any comments and welcome any contributions to our efforts.

## NOTES

1. Papers presented in the symposium "Managing the Past: Planning for the Future III". Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Twenty-First Annual Meeting, Fresno, 1987).

## REFERENCES CITED

- Chace, Paul G.  
1986 California's State Heritage Plan, What is the Next Step? Society for California Archaeology Newsletter 20(7):5-6.
- Conard, Rebecca  
1987 History Action 5(1):6-9. California Committee for the Promotion of History. Cupertino, California.
- Raab, L. Mark and Santa Barbara County Heritage Planning Group  
1985 California Comprehensive Heritage Resource Management Plan: Santa Barbara County Element; Draft 1. Manuscript on file, California State Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento.
- Rock, James T  
1987 Tin Canister PMOA: Draft. U.S. Forest Service, Klamath National Forest.
- U.S. Department of the Interior  
1980 Preservation Planning Series: Resource Protection Planning Process. Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Division of State Plans and Grants, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.