

1 Council on Historic Preservation (36 CFR Part 800); and

2
3 WHEREAS, the Park has consulted with the California State Historic Preservation
4 Officer (SHPO) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800; and

5
6 WHEREAS, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has chosen to
7 participate in this consultation and agreement; and

8
9 WHEREAS, the purpose of this Programmatic Agreement (PA) is to establish a parkwide
10 program for compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and set forth a streamlined process when
11 agreed upon criteria are met and procedures are followed. The PA will be used to supplement the
12 existing *Programmatic Agreement Among the National Park Service (U.S. Department of the*
13 *Interior), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of State*
14 *Historic Preservation Officers for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic*
15 *Preservation Act* (hereafter referred to as the NPS Servicewide PA); and

16
17 WHEREAS, this Park PA will apply to all undertakings in the park and will be guided by
18 planning and management documents listed in Appendix A; and

19
20 WHEREAS, the park has a staff of specialists who meet the Secretary of the Interior's
21 Historic Preservation Professional Qualifications Standards appropriate to the historic properties
22 in the park to carry out the Park's programs; and

23
24 WHEREAS, the Park has determined that the implementation of this program may affect
25 properties within the park or that are included in, or eligible for listing in the National Register of
26 Historic Places to which Indian tribes may attach religious and cultural significance.

27
28 WHEREAS, the Park has consulted with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
29 (FIGR), with Ohlone groups seeking federal recognition, and with Ohlone individuals who
30 participate in the stewardship of Ohlone heritage, and has invited the FIGR Tribe, and Ohlone
31 tribes and affiliated descendants to sign this Programmatic Agreement (PA) as concurring
32 parties; and

33
34 WHEREAS, the park has invited interested parties to be consulting parties; and

35
36 NOW, THEREFORE, the Park, ACHP and SHPO agree that the PA shall be
37 implemented in accordance with the following stipulations and undertakings in order to take into
38 account the effect of this program on historic properties.

39
40 **I. CONSULTATION**

41
42 The Park Superintendent will consult with outside parties interested in the park's cultural
43 resources or in proposed NPS actions that might affect those resources, and provide them with
44 the opportunities to learn about and comment on those resources and planned actions.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
- a. The Park works with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), a federally recognized Indian tribe composed of park affiliated Coast Miwok and Southern Pomo. Park lands in Marin County are the aboriginal homelands of the Coast Miwoks. The park will notify FIGR in writing on a quarterly basis regarding undertakings that may affect tribal resources on park lands, and allow them a two week opportunity to provide comments.
 - b. The park works with Ohlone Indian groups seeking federal recognition, and with Ohlone Indian organizations, and individuals who participate in the stewardship of Ohlone heritage. Park lands in San Francisco and San Mateo counties are part of the aboriginal homeland of the Ohlone. The park will notify Ohlone representatives in writing on a quarterly basis regarding undertakings that may affect tribal resources on park lands, and allow them a two week opportunity to provide comments.

17 Park staff will continue to work and consult with FIGR and the Ohlone in areas of cultural
18 stewardship, traditional ecological knowledge, education, and revitalization of community
19 and tradition.
20

- 21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
- B. The Park will use the Standard Review Process in 36 CFR 800.3-800.6 for undertakings that do not meet the criteria or the specific project type mentioned in Section II of this document, or in the NPS Servicewide PA, section III.
 - C. The Park will make its interests and constraints clear at the beginning of a planning effort, and shall make clear, any rules, processes, or schedules applicable to the consultation known. The park shall actively seek the views and comments of local governments and certified local governments when an undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties, and seek to acknowledge and understand others interest. Those seeking Federal assistance, licenses, permits or other approvals are entitled to participate as a consulting party as defined in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(4) and will be consulted as applicable early in the planning process.
 - D. The Park will notify the Presidio Trust in writing when reviewing undertakings located adjacent to, or in Area A of the Presidio of San Francisco, and will allow them a two week opportunity to comment.
 - E. The park will coordinate its Section 106 review with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process under 36 CFR 800.8 to meet its obligation for public input for undertakings not covered under this PA. The Park will consult with interested parties and members of the public through regular public meetings, informational mailings, and use of the Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website for undertakings that are not covered by this PA in cases where they are not coordinated with NEPA.

1 **II. STREAMLINED REVIEW PROCESS**

2
3 A. Criteria for Using the Streamlined Review Process

4
5 All work pursuant to this PA regarding historic properties will be reviewed by the Park’s Section
6 106 Coordinator, and the Park’s Cultural Resource (CR) Team who meet the professional
7 qualifications for Historian, Historic Architect, Historic Landscape Architect, Archeologist, or
8 Curator, included in The Secretary of the Interior’s Historic Preservation Professional
9 Qualification Standards, and/or NPS 28 Cultural Resources Guidelines. In the absence of these
10 specialists, the Park will seek professional assistance from the NPS San Francisco Bay Area
11 Network Parks, or the Pacific West Regional Office CR Team.

12
13 The Park’s Section 106 Coordinator and the CR Team will review the project and certify that the
14 results of the proposed undertaking on historic properties on or eligible for the National Register,
15 will not be adverse based on criteria in 36 CFR 800.5, including consideration of direct, indirect,
16 and cumulative effects. The Effect Finding must be “No Historic Property Affected,” or “No
17 Adverse Effect.”

18
19 The park shall manage and preserve the integrity of its National Historic Landmark properties
20 through a more stringent level of evaluation than National Register properties in the park. This
21 will be accomplished through planning, research, and specific undertakings consistent with
22 effective historic preservation management and stewardship, the goals of the NHPA and related
23 regulations, standards, and guidelines.

24
25 The Park Section 106 Coordinator in consultation with appropriate members of the CR Team
26 will:

- 27
28 1. Evaluate and determine whether the proposed undertaking is an activity listed as an
29 undertaking eligible for streamlined review in Section II.B of this PA. If not, compliance
30 for the undertaking must be accomplished through the Standard Review Process;
31
32 2. Identify the undertaking’s area of potential effect (APE) taking into account direct,
33 indirect, and cumulative effects;
34
35 3. Identify historic properties within the APE including the location, number, and
36 significance of historic properties. Proposed undertakings involving ground disturbing
37 activities will be identified early enough in the planning process to allow an
38 Archeological Management Assessment (AMA) to be prepared and implemented.
39
40 4. Evaluate the effect of the undertaking in addition to any cumulative effects on historic
41 properties in the APE applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect set forth in 36 CFR
42 800.5(a)(1). All evaluations will conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for
43 the Treatment of Historic Properties, baseline documentation and treatment
44 recommendations cited in cultural resources publications in Appendix A.

- 1
2 5. Document the Streamlined Review Process using the PEPC database, including its
3 Preservation Assessment Form. Documentation will include the comments of each
4 member of the CR Team involved in the review process and the signature of the
5 Superintendent. Documentation will be permanently retained by the Section 106
6 Coordinator for review by consulting parties and to facilitate the preparation of the
7 annual report.
8

9 B. Undertakings Eligible for Streamlined Review.

10 The following undertakings are eligible for streamlined review under this PA. These
11 undertakings supplement but are not included in the list of eligible undertakings included in the
12 NPS Servicewide PA.
13

- 14
- 15 1. Preservation Maintenance (cleaning, routine maintenance, cyclic maintenance,
16 stabilization, and building monitoring) including:
17
 - 18 a. When repairs are not feasible, replacement of roofing in-kind, or restoration of
19 roofing material from the period of significance. Chimney repair that includes flue
20 liner replacement and chimney capping;
21
 - 22 b. Re-grading of terrain adjacent to a building to achieve positive water run-off provided
23 that previous cultural resource studies indicate that no national register eligible
24 archeological property would be adversely effected;
25
 - 26 c. Maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and restoration of historic vegetation, vistas, and
27 small scale features. Addition of non-historic features must be reversible and
28 compatible with the historic landscape;
29
 - 30 2. Rehabilitation of historic buildings, structures, and landscapes consistent with the
31 Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties when informed by
32 historic structures reports and cultural landscape reports;
33
 - 34 3. All projects to be assessed under Streamlined Review will have Archeological
35 Management Assessments (AMA) conducted for them to determine the scope of work
36 required to identify significant properties and avoid adverse effects. An AMA will
37 reference existing park studies and records (see Appendix A), will follow 36 CFR 800
38 regulations, meet the standards established in NPS Director's Order 28 (Cultural
39 Resources), and the Secretary of Interiors Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and
40 Historic Preservation.
41
 - 42 4. Military Fortifications Preservation and Management, including the following activities:
43

- 1 a. Maintenance and preservation work limited to retaining, protecting, and/or
2 replacing in-kind deteriorated materials and features that contribute to the
3 National Register significance of the fortification including its associated
4 landscape and archeological properties;
5
- 6 b. Earthworks maintenance to prevent erosion and ensure preservation of an existing
7 profile will be based on current and accepted practices as defined in *Seacoast*
8 *Fortification Preservation Manual* (1999); and *NPS Guide to Sustainable Military*
9 *Earthworks Management* (1998);
10
- 11 c. Removal of hazard trees as directed by certified arborist or professional landscape
12 architect with use of stump grinding provided the grinding is limited to the
13 diameter of the stump and a depth of no greater than 6 inches in order to avoid
14 ground disturbance;
15
- 16 d. Repairing eroded or damaged sections of earthworks using imported soil to re-
17 establish historic contours, following archeological review and documentation in
18 appropriate NPS inventory and management databases;
19
- 20 e. Maintaining a healthy and sustainable vegetation cover for fortification
21 landscapes based on recommendations made by historic landscape architects and
22 research defined in cultural landscape reports;
23

24 Removal of non-contributing buildings, structures, pavement, and additions as described in the
25 Park's General Management Plan (2014).
26

- 27 5. Construction of new compatibly designed restroom facilities in keeping with the
28 recommendations in approved cultural landscape reports;
29
- 30 6. Removal of both natural and man-made surface debris following a major weather or
31 geologic event such as a tsunami or an earthquake, provided archeological review has
32 been obtained prior to any ground disturbing activity;
33
- 34 7. Sustainable energy improvements made according to the *Secretary of the Interior's*
35 *Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating*
36 *Historic Buildings* (2013) when informed by historic structures reports, cultural
37 landscape reports, and archeological review;
38
- 39 8. Maintenance or replacement of non-historic utility lines, transmission lines and fences on
40 historic properties if performed in a manner that does not adversely affect above or below
41 ground historic properties;
42
- 43 9. Replacement of above ground infrastructure or wireless telecommunications facilities
44 provided the undertaking is performed in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's

1 Standards;

2
3 10. Installation of new signs that meet the *Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Signage &*
4 *Graphics Guide Guidelines, Hunt Design* (2009) provided that care is taken to avoid
5 effects to historic properties.
6

7 11. Projects to provide accessibility for buildings and landscapes if proposed in a sensitive
8 way that protect historic properties, and follow guidance from NPS Preservation Brief 32,
9 *Making Historic Properties Accessible*, and recommendations from cultural landscape
10 reports and historic structures reports. Projects should be compliant with standards
11 outlined in the *Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards* (ABAAS),
12 *Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Recreation Areas* (AGODA) published by the U.S.
13 Access Board, and *Americans with Disabilities Act and Architectural Barriers Act*
14 *Accessibility Guidelines* (ADAABAAG).
15

16 12. Rehabilitation of HVAC systems including replacement of furnaces provided it is done in
17 conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards;
18

19 Undertakings that affect a historic property, regardless of their temporary or reversible nature,
20 must avoid adverse effects to the design, materials, location, feeling, setting, association and
21 workmanship of historic fabric.
22

23 **III. INADVERTENT DISCOVERIES**

24
25 If historic properties are discovered or unanticipated effects on historic properties are found after
26 the Park's approval of the undertaking and after construction has commenced, the Park shall
27 implement any post review discovery plan developed pursuant to this PA, or if such plan is not in
28 effect shall take reasonable efforts to avoid or minimize, document adverse effects to such
29 properties; determine reasonable actions that can be taken to resolve any adverse effects, and
30 notify the SHPO and any Indian tribe or group that might attach religious and cultural
31 significance to the affected properties within 48 hours of the discovery.
32

33 1. The notification shall describe the Park's assessment of the National Register
34 eligibility of the property, describe the effects, and propose actions to resolve adverse
35 effects. The SHPO and Indian tribe(s), or groups that have been notified shall respond
36 within 2 business days of the notification. The agency official/superintendent shall take
37 into account their recommendations regarding National Register eligibility and the
38 proposed actions, and then carry out appropriate actions. The agency
39 official/superintendent shall provide the SHPO and Indian tribes or groups with a report
40 of the actions when they are complete.
41

42 2. The Park, in consultation with the SHPO, may assume a newly-discovered property to
43 be eligible for the National Register for purposes of Section 106, and shall specify the
44 National Register criteria used to assume the property's eligibility.

1
2 **IV. EMERGENCY ACTIONS**
3

4 A. Immediate rescue and salvage operations conducted to preserve life or property temporarily
5 supersedes the provisions of Section 106 and this PA. Examples include earthquake, tsunami,
6 and/or fire.
7

8 B. In the event the Park Superintendent deems an action necessary as an essential and immediate
9 response to a disaster or emergency declared by the President, a tribal government, or the
10 Governor of a State or another immediate threat to life or property, the park shall:
11

12 1. Notify, within 24 hours of declared emergency or as soon as conditions permit, the
13 appropriate SHPO and any Indian tribe or group that may attach religious and cultural
14 significance to historic properties likely to be affected prior to the undertaking and afford
15 them an opportunity to comment within 24 hours of notifications. If the Park determines
16 that circumstances do not permit 24 hours for comment, the agency
17 official/superintendent shall notify the SHPO and the Indian tribe or group and invite
18 comments within the time available. The Park shall take into account any comments
19 received in reaching decisions on how to proceed with the emergency undertaking.
20

21 2. These emergency procedures apply only to undertakings that will be implemented
22 within 30 days after the disaster or emergency has been formally declared by the
23 appropriate authority. The park may request an extension of the period of applicability
24 from the SHPO prior to the expiration of the 30 days.
25

26 **V. DISPUTE RESOLUTION**
27

28 A. Should any party to this agreement object at any time to any actions proposed, or the manner
29 in which the terms of this PA are implemented, the Park, SHPO and ACHP shall consult with the
30 objecting party(s) to resolve the objection. If the Park determines that such objection(s) cannot
31 be resolved through this consultation, the Park will:
32

33 1. Forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the ACHP and the other parties
34 of the dispute in accordance with 36 CFR Section 800.2(b)(2). Upon receipt of adequate
35 documentation, the ACHP shall review and advise the Park on the resolution of the
36 objection within 30 days. Any comment provided by the ACHP, and all comments from
37 the parties to the PA, will be taken into account by the Park in reaching a final decision
38 regarding the dispute.
39

40 2. If the ACHP does not provide comments regarding the dispute within 30 days after
41 receipt of adequate documentation, the Park may render a decision regarding the dispute.
42 In reaching its decision, the Park will take into account all comments regarding the
43 dispute from the parties to the PA.
44

1 3. The Park’s responsibility to carry out all other actions subject to the terms of this PA
2 that are not the subject of the dispute remain unchanged. The Park will notify all parties
3 of its decision in writing before implementing that portion of the undertaking subject to
4 dispute under this stipulation. The Park’s decision will be final.
5

6 **VI. DURATION**
7

8 This agreement will terminate 12 years from the date of its execution. Prior to such time, the
9 Park may consult with the other signatories to reconsider the terms of the agreement and revise
10 or amend the document, and provide opportunities for periodic review.
11

12 Execution of this Programmatic Agreement by the Park, the SHPO, ACHP, and Tribal
13 representatives, and implementation of its terms evidence that the National Park Service has
14 taken into account the effects of this undertaking on historic properties and afforded the ACHP
15 an opportunity to comment.
16

17 **SIGNATORIES:**
18

19 **National Park Service**
20

21 _____

Date

22
23 **Frank Dean, General Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area**
24
25

26 **California State Historic Preservation Officer**
27

28 _____

Date

29
30 **Carol Roland-Nawi, State Historic Preservation Officer**
31
32

33 **Advisory Council on Historic Preservation**
34

35 _____

Date

36
37 **Reid Nelson, Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation**
38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CONCURRING PARTIES]:

[insert consulting party tribe/organization name]

_____ Date

[insert name and title]

[insert consulting party tribe/organization name]

_____ Date

[insert name and title]

[insert consulting party tribe/organization name]


_____ Date

[insert name and title]

[insert consulting party tribe/organization name]

_____ Date

[insert name and title]



1 Appendix A
2 Golden Gate National Recreation Area
3 Cultural Resources Publications
4 Baseline Documentation and Treatment Recommendations
5

6 Parkwide
7

8 General Management Plan (2014)
9

10 The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on
11 Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (2013)
12

13 Golden Gate National Recreation Area Trail Management Plan: Cultural Resources Protocols
14 Agreement (2013)
15

16 Preservation Guidelines for Residential Leased Properties, Golden Gate National Recreation
17 Area (Draft 2013)
18

19 Archeological Sensitivity Models Revisions (Gavette 2012-present)
20

21 Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Signage & Graphics Guide Guidelines, Hunt Design
22 (2009)
23

24 Site Furnishing Standards, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (2009)
25

26 Ethnohistory and Ethnogeography of the Coast Miwok and Their Neighbors, 1783-1840
27 (Milliken 2009)
28

29 Ohlone/Costanoan Indians of the San Francisco Peninsula and Their Neighbors, Yesterday and
30 Today (Milliken, Shoup, and Ortiz 2009)
31

32 Archeological Sensitivity Model of San Francisco and San Mateo Lands of Golden Gate NRA
33 (Barnaal 2004)
34

35 Historic Fortification Preservation Handbook, Washington State Parks and Recreation
36 Commission (2003)
37

38 Golden Gate and Point Reyes Archeological Research Issues (Praetzellis, Stewart, Meyer,
39 Waghorn, and Douglass 2003)
40

41
42 Archeological Sensitivity Model of Marin Lands of Golden Gate NRA (Barnaal and Barker
43 2003)
44

1 Seacoast Fortifications Preservation Manual (1999)
2
3 Point Reyes National Seashore Affiliation Study (Emberson 1999)
4
5 NPS Guide to Sustainable Military Earthworks Management (1998)
6
7 Submerged Cultural Resources Assessment of Golden Gate and Point Reyes (Delgado and Haller
8 1989)
9
10 The Prehistory of San Francisco (Rudo 1982)
11
12 Golden Gate National Recreation Area Archeological Overview and Assessment (Kelly 1976)
13
14 Marin Archeological Settlement Patterns (Van Dyke 1972)
15
16 Archeological Sites Management Information System Records
17
18 California Historic Resource Information System Records
19
20 Alcatraz Island
21
22 Remote Sensing in the Alcatraz Recreation Yard (Everett and Desmet 2012)
23
24 Alcatraz Recreation Yard Preservation Plan (Sitten, Chapman, and Rice 2012)
25
26 Preliminary Citadel ASR Documentation (Hagin, Gavette, Barker 2011)
27
28 Alcatraz Island National Historic Landmark Cultural Landscape Report (2010)
29
30 Cultural Landscape Inventory, Alcatraz Island, National Park Service, Golden Gate National
31 Recreation Area (2005)
32
33 Historic Furnishing Report: Alcatraz Island-Main Prison Building (2005)
34
35 Alcatraz Barracks Building 64 Historic Structures Report (2003)
36
37 Alcatraz Powerhouse Building Abbreviated Historic Structures Report {Partial Draft} (2002)
38
39 Alcatraz Model Industries Building Abbreviated Historic Structures Report {Partial Draft}
40 (2002)
41
42 Alcatraz Island Historic Preservation and Safety Construction Program, Final Environmental
43 Impact Statement (2001)
44

1 Alcatraz Guardhouse Complex Historic Structures Report (2001)
2
3 Alcatraz New Industries Building Abbreviated Historic Structures Report (2001)
4
5 Alcatraz Post Exchange Abbreviated Historic Structures Report (2001)
6
7 Alcatraz Quartermaster Warehouse Building Abbreviated Historic Structures Report (2001)
8
9 Alcatraz Indian Occupation Graffiti (Noxon and Noxon 1971, Scolari and Salisbury 1997)
10
11 Warden Residence Rehabilitation: Archeological Monitoring (Fox 1995)
12
13 Alcatraz Development Concept Plan and Environmental Assessment (1993)
14
15 Alcatraz Cell House Historic Structures Report, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (1992)
16
17 National Register Nomination (1976); and National Historic Landmark Nomination (1986)
18
19 Fort Mason
20
21 Fort Mason Cultural Landscape Report, Treatment (2012)
22
23 Marina Boulevard Track Removal Archaeological Report (Pastron 2012)
24
25 Franklin Street Rehabilitations: Archeological Monitoring Reports (Spillane 2011)
26
27 Franklin Street Rehabilitations: The Ossuary Pit at Point San Jose Hospital (Barker 2010,
28 Spillane 2013)
29
30 Franklin Street Rehabilitations: Archeological Assessment (Holman and Psota 2010a, 2010b)
31
32 F-Line Archeological Report (Psota 2010)
33
34 Fort Mason Cultural Landscape Report, Part II: Treatment Fort Mason Center (2009)
35
36 Fort Mason Historic Assessment Report for Buildings 235, 238, 239, 240 and 241 (2007)
37
38 Fort Mason Officers' Club Historic Structure Report (2005)
39
40 Fort Mason Cultural Landscape Report (2004)
41
42 Cultural Landscape Inventory, Fort Mason (2004)
43
44 San Francisco Port of Embarkation Historic Structure Report (1991)

1 Black Point Battery Archeological Research Design (Delgado 1983)
2
3 Black Point Battery Archeological Excavations (draft) (Mayer et al. 1982-1989)
4
5 Fort Mason Osteological Remains (Eschmeyer and Schonewald 1981)
6
7 Civil War Barrack, Building 240, Fort Mason, Historic Structure Report (1980)
8
9 Fort Mason National Register Form (1979)
10
11 Fort Mason Building 201 Historic Structure Report (1978)
12
13 Fort Mason Archeological Test Excavations (Baker, 1978a, 1978b)
14
15 Fort Point
16
17 Fort Point Exterior Drainage Archeological Assessment (Meyer and Massey 2012)
18
19 Golden Gate Bridge, Fort Point Bluffs, and Waterfront Cultural Landscape Report (2012)
20
21 Fort Point Barbette Tier Archeological Study (Massey and Meyer 2011)
22
23 Fort Point U.S. Coast Guard Station Historic Structure Report (2008)
24
25 Fort Point Coast Guard Station Cultural Landscape Report (2007)
26
27 Fort Point Coast Guard Station Cultural Landscape Inventory (2006)
28
29 Fort Point Updated and Abbreviated Historic Structure report (2006)
30
31 Presidio
32
33 Archaeological Identification and Monitoring Plan: Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1 (Hauer and
34 Haessler 2013)
35
36 East Battery Remediation Archeological Monitoring (Meyer 2012)
37
38 Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark Update (2012)
39
40 Presidio Coastal Trail Special History (2010)
41
42 Baker Beach Disturbed Area Archeological Monitoring (Stoyka 2010)
43
44 California Coastal Trail in Fort Winfield Scott: A Cultural Resource Report (Martini 2009)

1 Presidio Coastal Batteries Drainage Systems (Martini 2007)
2
3 Presidio Building 1648 Determination of Eligibility (2006)
4
5 Baker Beach Disturbed Area Test Excavations (URS 2005)
6
7 Protocols for Contaminated Archeological Artifacts found on Presidio Park Lands (Praetzellis
8 2005)
9
10 West Battery & Fort Scott Endicott Batteries – Construction, Evolution, and Modifications
11 (Martini 2005)
12
13 Presidio Quartermaster Dump Data Recovery (Clark and Ambro 2002)
14
15 Doyle Drive Archeological Survey and Evaluation (Jones & Stokes, Albion Environmental, and
16 PastForward , 2002)
17
18 Crissy Field Prehistoric Site CA-SFR-129 (Clark 2001)
19
20 Crissy Field Archeological Inventory Trenching (Clark 2000)
21
22 Crissy Field Archeological Research Design (Ambro 1999)
23
24 Presidio Quartermaster Dump Data Recovery Proposal (Clark and Ambro 1999)
25
26 Presidio Archeological Management Plan (draft) (Adams 1995)
27
28 Presidio of San Francisco Cultural Landscape Report (1993)
29
30 Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark Nomination (1993)
31
32 Fort Miley
33
34 Fort Miley and the Marine Exchange Lookout Cultural Landscape Report (2013)
35
36 Point Lobos Lookout Station (Octagon House) Physical History Report (2010)
37
38 San Francisco Veterans Association Medical Center Determination of Eligibility (2008)
39
40 Golden Gate Cemetery Excavations (Buzon et al. 2005)
41
42 Point Lobos Fort Miley Determination of Eligibility (1980)
43
44 Lands End , Sutro District

1 Merrie Way Stands Public Stewardship and Reporting (Spillane 2012)
2
3 Ocean Beach Seawall and Esplanade Determination of Eligibility (2011)
4
5 Merrie Way Stands Site (CA-SFR-174H) Data Recovery (Praetzellis 2010)
6
7 China Beach Bath House Determination of Eligibility (2009)
8
9 Historic Assessment of Sutro Baths (ARG 2009)
10
11 Merrie Way (CA-SFR-174H) Research Design (Meyer 2008)
12
13 Grounds for Pleasure: Merrie Way Stands Archeological Management Assessment (Barker
14 2007)
15
16 Lands End – Ocean Terrace (CA-SFR-164H) Archeological Test Excavations (Meyer 2007)
17
18 Lands End – Ocean Terrace 1890-1920: Historic Context (Martini 2006)
19
20 Site Stabilization in a Public Place: CA-SFR-5 at the Point Lobos Archeological Sites (Barker
21 2005)
22
23 Sutro Historic District Cultural Landscape Inventory (2005)
24
25 Abbreviated Cultural Landscape Report for Lands End (2005)
26
27 Sutro District Archeological Management Assessment (Barker 2001)
28
29 Sutro Historic District, Vol 2, Cultural Landscape Report (1993)
30
31 Sutro Heights Park, Cultural Landscape Analysis (1992)
32
33 Cliff House Historic Structures Report (1987)
34
35 North Annex Cliff House Historic Structures Report (1987)
36
37 Sutro Baths Preliminary Archeological Investigation (Holman 1977)
38
39 Fort Funston and Ocean Beach
40
41 Sloat Boulevard Buried Ship Documentation (1992)
42
43 Lake Merced Cultural Resource Overview (Shoup and Baker 1981)
44

1 King Philip/Reporter Shipwreck NRHP Documentation
2
3 Forts Baker, Barry and Cronkhite—Marin Headlands
4
5 Rodeo Valley Stables (Balloon Hangar, Motor Vehicle Shed and Rifle Range Camp are of Fort
6 Barry) Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatment: Cultural Landscape Report, Historic
7 Structure Reports, Archeological Assessment and Treatment Report (2013)
8
9 Cultural Landscape Report, Forts Baker, Barry Cronkhite, Vol II (Draft 2013)
10
11 Cultural Landscape Report, Forts Baker, Barry Cronkhite, Vol I (Draft 2012)
12
13 Fort Barry Firing Range CLR (Rurik 2010)
14
15 Battery Construction 129 Hawk Hill Historic Structure Report (2008)
16
17 Fort Baker Archeological Landscape Features (Barnaal and Barker 2007)
18
19 Records Research Report: Fort Barry (TetraTech 2007)
20
21 Wolf Ridge Archeological Survey (Koenig 2007)
22
23 Fort Baker Lateral Fire Archeological Survey (Liu 2006)
24
25 Fort Barry Balloon Hangar and Motor Vehicle Sheds, Abbreviated Historic Structures Report
26 (2005)
27
28 Cultural Landscape Inventory, Point Bonita Historic District (2005)
29
30 Cultural Landscape Report for Fort Baker, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (2005)
31
32 Gerbode Valley Archeological Survey: Bobcat Burn (Barnaal 2005)
33
34 Road Work Ahead: Road Rehabilitation in the Marin Headlands (Barker and Barnaal 2005)
35
36 Cultural Landscape Inventory for Fort Baker, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (2004)
37
38 Rodeo Lagoon Environmental History (Striplen et al. 2004)
39
40 Historic Road Character Study: Marin Headlands (Feierabend 2004)
41
42 Fort Baker Geoarcheological Exploration (Dalldorf and Meyer 2004)
43
44 Fort Baker Historic Building Reports (2002)

1 Fort Baker Archeological Archeological Survey (Stewart, Meyer, Newland 2001)
2
3 “What We Have, We Shall Defend;” An Interim History and Preservation Plan for Nike Site SF-
4 88L, Fort Barry (1998)
5
6 Point Bonita Archeological Report (Pastron 1998)
7
8 Fort Baker Archeological Overview and Assessment (Barker and Mayer 1997)
9
10 Forts Baker, Barry, Cronkhite National Register Nomination Form (1973)
11
12 Muir Woods
13
14 Muir Woods Cultural Landscape Report (started 2013)
15
16 Dipsea Trail Determination of Eligibility (2010)
17
18 Muir Woods Cultural Landscape Inventory (2007)
19
20 Camino del Canyon Determination of Eligibility (2007)
21
22 Historic Resources Study for Muir Woods National Monument (2006)
23
24 Muir Woods Sewer Archeological Survey (Duncan 1989)
25
26 Redwood Creek
27
28 Golden Gate Dairy (Lopes Brothers Dairy or Ranch M) Cultural Resource Reports and Site
29 Treatment: Cultural Landscape Report, Cultural Landscape Inventory, Historic Structure
30 Reports, Archeological Assessment and Treatment Report (2013)
31
32 Ranch M (Golden Gate Dairy) National Register Nomination (2008)
33
34 Redwood Creek and Big Lagoon Geoarcheological Study (2002, 2005)
35
36 Golden Gate Dairy Preservation Plan (2003)
37
38 Golden Gate Dairy Physical History Report (2001)
39
40 Slide Ranch to Bolinas Lagoon
41
42 Bolinas Lagoon Gulches Archeological Survey (Loyd, Origer, and Thompson 2004, Thompson
43 2009)
44

1 Slide Ranch Historic Assessment (Clark 2004)
2
3 McKennan Gulch ARPA Violation Damage Report (Barker 2003)
4
5 Slide Ranch Prehistoric Site Assessments (CA-MRN-199 and CA-MRN-572/H)(Clark 2001)
6
7 Slide Ranch Archeological Survey (Duncan 1989)
8
9 Hill 640 Military Reservation National Register Form (1980)
10
11 Tennessee Valley
12
13 Tennessee Valley Stabled (Cunha/Repozo Ranch or Ranch A/B) Cultural Resource Reports and
14 Site Treatment: Cultural Landscape Report, Cultural Landscape Inventory, Historic Structure
15 Reports, Archeological Assessment and Treatment Report (2013)
16
17 Ranch AB (Miwok Stables) National Register Determination of Eligibility (2008)
18
19 Tennessee and Oakwood Valley Archeological Surveys (King and Fredrickson 1979)
20
21 San Mateo Lands
22
23 Rancho Corral de Tierra Determination of Eligibility (2011)
24
25 San Mateo Parklands Historic Resource Study (Postel 2011)
26
27 West Union Creek Archeological Survey (Spillane 2009)
28
29 Archeological Management Assessment for San Mateo Trails (Barker 2006)
30
31 Mori Point Archeological Survey (Barker 2005)
32
33 Native American Adaptations Along the San Mateo and Santa Cruz Coast (Hylkema 1991)
34
35 Top of the Peninsula: A History of Sweeney Ridge (Babal 1990)
36
37 San Mateo County National Register Nomination (1973)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44