

U.S. Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
Interagency Resources Division

**"FUNDING NEEDS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
ON INDIAN LANDS"**

December 20, 1989

**INTRODUCTION:** This year, Congress has provided the National Park Service with the opportunity to report on funding needs for the **management, research, interpretation, protection, and development of sites of historical significance on Indian lands.**

Several weeks ago you were invited to attend informational meetings to develop that report and to ensure that the historic preservation needs of your tribe are heard. The invitation, also enclosed with this mailing, noted that worksheets would be mailed to all tribes to provide the opportunity for all to give information concerning their funding needs, regardless of whether or not a tribal representative could attend one of the meetings.

**Please help us to ensure that your tribe is represented in this Congressional report by answering the questions on the enclosed worksheet and by sending us any additional information that might be used to document your needs in the report to Congress.** This can be done by mail or at one of the meetings described in the enclosed invitation. Additional information can be provided by telephone to Patricia Parker, Coordinator, Tribal Historic Preservation Programs at (202) 343-9505. Information must be received no later than February 2, 1990, in order to be included in the report to Congress.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The terms "management," "research," "interpretation," "protection," and "development" mean different things to different people, and in practice, often overlap. For the purpose of this report on the funding needs for historic preservation on tribal lands:

- o "Management" includes such activities as preparing and implementing preservation plans and

administering historic preservation programs in its broadest sense.

- o "Research" means systematic studies to survey, identify, record, and evaluate historic properties (buildings, structures, ceremonial and sacred areas, objects, etc.) and the traditions through which they are understood. It also includes nominating or determining the eligibility of historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places.
- o "Interpretation" refers to presenting information about tribal history to tribal members and/or the public.
- o "Protection" includes such activities as implementing a tribal preservation ordinance, implementing a system that ensures that historic preservation is considered in the planning of economic and infrastructure development projects, and conserving and curating museum collections (including historical and natural materials) archival collections (including written records, photographs, videotapes, audio tapes), and archeological collections.
- o "Development" means restoring tribal historic properties and preparing them for use by the tribe and/or the public.

In practice, tribal historic preservation "management," "research," "interpretation," "protection," and "development" tend to be carried out by cultural committees, tribal museums, cultural heritage centers, historic preservation programs, tribal archives, and tribal language programs.

You can assist us to understand the historic preservation funding needs of your tribe by answering the questions in the attached worksheet. For your information, a longer list of examples of the kinds of activities included in historic preservation "management," "research," "interpretation," "protection," and "development" is attached as an appendix to this information sheet.



U.S. Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
Interagency Resources Division

"FUNDING NEEDS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION ON INDIAN LANDS"

APPENDIX TO INFORMATION SHEET

December 20, 1989

The following list expands on National Park Service definitions of historic preservation "management," "research," "interpretation," "protection," and "development". We recognize that these terms may be used differently in your tribe. However, the list shows how the National Park Service will use the terms in its report to Congress. The list is for your information only and may assist you to prepare for the informational meetings and/or to answer the questions in the enclosed worksheet. You are not being asked to report on all of these preservation-related activities.

"Management" includes such activities as:

- 1) planning for the preservation of historic properties and traditions;
- 2) creating an inventory, or list of historic properties and traditions significant to the tribe;
- 3) planning for the protection and enhancement of historic properties and traditions while allowing for economic development and other changes on tribal lands;
- 4) implementing a system to protect tribal historic properties and the traditions through which they are understood;
- 5) providing for the storage and care of museum, archival, and archeological collections, photographs, documents, tape recordings, music, and so forth; and,
- 6) administering historic preservation and cultural heritage programs, tribal museums, tribal archives, tribal language preservation programs, and so forth.

"Research" includes such activities as:

- 1) surveying, or identifying historic properties and traditions;
- 2) recording and/or documenting historic properties and traditions;
- 3) recording oral history, oral tradition, and the tribal language itself;

- 4) documenting traditional arts, crafts, skills, and lifeways through documents, photographs, videotape, ethnographic studies, and so forth, for use in schools, by the tribe in general, or by tourists and other non-tribal members;
- 5) documenting where collections of tribal objects are located;
- 6) conducting archeological excavations;
- 7) nominating historic properties to the National Register, or determining their eligibility for the National Register; and
- 8) learning about the traditional uses of plants, animals, natural landmarks, and other natural resources.

"Interpretation" includes such activities as:

- 1) preparing and caring for exhibits on tribal history;
- 2) creating and caring for signs and markers that tell about tribal history; and,
- 3) performing traditional tribal arts, crafts, skills and lifeways to enhance and continue traditional tribal arts and knowledge.

"Protection" includes such activities as:

- 1) preparing and implementing tribal preservation ordinance(s);
- 2) implementing a system to review the potential effects of development projects on historic properties and traditions;
- 3) establishing and implementing a system to prohibit the destruction and removal of historic properties from tribal lands; and,
- 4) establishing and implementing a system to conserve and curate museum, archival, and archeological collections.

"Development" includes such activities as:

- 1) stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating historic properties;
- 2) establishing programs and facilities that allow adequate management, research, interpretation, and protection of historic properties and traditions;
- 3) establishing and implementing a cultural tourism program; and,
- 4) establishing cultural parks.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION INITIATIVE  
MEETING SUMMARY  
June 9, 1992

CREATING A PROGRESSIVE MODEL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**Attendees:**

Roberto Barragan, Executive Director, MEDA  
Rosemary Cambra, Chair, Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe  
Faye Campbell, Glide Memorial Church  
Ann Cochran, Acting Director, San Francisco Conservation Corps  
Joe Compton, Consultant, Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe  
James Head, Executive Director, NED&LC  
Hinano, Consultant, Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe  
Ntombi Howell, Glide Memorial Church  
Espanola Jackson, Liaison, Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe  
Ray Jones, Director, Urban Economic Development Corp.  
Frank La Pena, Professor, Native American Studies, Cal State Sacramento  
Jamal Leach, Glide Memorial Church  
Lynette Lee, Executive Director, East Bay Asian Local Development Corp.  
Deni Leonard, Aboriginal Public Policy Institute  
Thomas Mills, Director, Local Initiatives Support Corp.  
Sam Murray, President, The New Bayview Committee  
Al Repato, Director, Asian American Information Institute  
Norma Sanchez, Administrator, Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe  
Golden Venters, YouthBuild  
Anthony Williams, National Economic Development & Law Center

National Park Service

Brian O'Neill, Superintendent  
Howard Levitt, Chief of Interpretation and Public Affairs  
Marti Leicester, Fort Point and Presidio District Ranger  
Armando Quintero, Bay District Ranger  
Fermin Salas, Park Ranger  
Alison Kendall, Presidio Coordinator, City and County of San Francisco

GGNPA/Presidio Council

Ed Blakely, Council member; Dept. of City/Regional Planning, UC Berkeley  
Greg Moore, Executive Director, GGNPA  
Nan Stockholm, Director, Presidio Council  
Gus Newport, Consultant  
Martha Matsuoka, Assistant in Planning  
Anne Seymour, Office Manager  
Dwayne Marsh, Project Intern

## Purpose of Meeting

To initiate dialogue among leaders of community based organizations to explore program development and tenant opportunities for communities of color at the Presidio. The focus of the meeting was to generate program ideas in response to the *Call for Interest*.

## Summary of Meeting

National Park Service and Presidio Council staff provided background on the conversion process and opportunities for program development and tenancy at the Presidio. Staff outlined economic and programmatic challenges facing the NPS and future Presidio tenants in the conversion process:

- The Presidio consists of nearly 1500 acres of open and developed space
- Over 800 structures on the Presidio comprise 6.2 million feet of usable space
- The current annual operating cost of the Presidio is roughly \$45 million
- Capital costs for critical infrastructure repairs and building renovations may exceed \$100 million.

Following a tour of the Presidio, meeting participants discussed their interests in the Presidio as well as ideas for future programs. Representatives from the Muwekma-Ohlone tribe presented the claims of the Ohlone people as original inhabitants of the Presidio site.

There was a strong sentiment among the community groups present that it was necessary to acknowledge the claims of indigenous peoples in the Bay Area before proceeding with the community planning initiative. To this effect, a statement was read by a representative of the Muwekma-Ohlone tribe for informal acceptance by the community representatives present. The community participants expressed their support of the following: *We acknowledge that the Presidio immemorial is Ohlone-Muwekma land and that the moral obligation is to recognize the right of the Ohlone to this land and its use.*

The participants stressed that the statement reflects the underlying goal of equitable treatment of all people in the planning process. It was recognized that a collaborative effort would significantly enhance organizational capacity and support for funding. A number of possible approaches and potential programs were suggested:

- Investigate research opportunities for new community development activities
- Institute projects and programs such as a community hospital, art center, and conference facilities that address the needs of California Native Americans
- Establish a progressive public policy/research institute
- Expand recreational opportunities for inner-city youth

- Create nursing and health care facilities for the disadvantaged
- Initiate youth and leadership training programs
- Develop conferencing centers serving low income or nonprofit groups
- Establish recreation and arts activities
- Integrate transitional housing and social service programs
- Develop a women's resource center serving low-income women
- Connect transportation upgrades to needs of communities of color
- Expand cultural centers and activities
- Increase access to the environment for disadvantaged youth
- Capitalize on opportunities for economic development for communities of color
- Apply employment and training programs to reintegrate disenfranchised youth
- Enhance successful existing community programs
- Conduct multicultural events (e.g. Festival at the Lake) at the post
- Generate opportunities for elders (e.g. programs that allow elders to pass on skills to youth)

### Community Concerns

The group agreed that the Presidio conversion must reflect the agendas of communities of color. Specific community concerns were discussed:

- Programs should reflect cooperation and interdependence amongst community groups
- The *Call for Interest* and selection process must be clarified; specifically the role of the community in developing the Presidio programs
- Dependence on federal funding for programs should be replaced with collaborative interdependence between community groups
- Activities should reflect relevant linkages between urban and environmental issues
- Programs should address current and future needs of the community

- Minority hiring procedures and equal opportunity guidelines must be enforced
- To create effective community development programs, improved finance mechanisms must be devised
- Develop an RFP process that is inclusive of community organizations and ideas
- Programs should emphasize the transitory nature of the Presidio to allow the inclusion of all interested participants
- The financial realities of operating community development programs with limited resources must be considered

### Next Steps

The group determined that a second meeting should occur before the July 15 deadline to refine ideas and initiate collaborative planning. At that meeting, the participants will articulate their program ideas for submittal.



# INTERNATIONAL INDIAN TREATY COUNCIL

INFORMATION OFFICE

710 CLAYTON STREET #1 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

TELEPHONE: (415) 566-0251

FAX: (415) 566-0442

EMAIL PEACE NET: IITC



April 6, 1992

To all concerned local, state and federal officials,

The International Indian Treaty Council, a Non-governmental Organization (NGO) advocating for the rights of Indigenous Peoples at the United Nations, supports the inherent land rights of all Indigenous Peoples. This "right to territory" is recognized under international law.

The IITC recognizes that the Muwekma Ohlone People of the San Francisco Bay Area have survived a bitter history which has disenfranchised them from their ancestral lands and denied them recognition as a distinct and independent People. This history includes enslavement in Mission communities in the early 1800's, forced removals and stealing of traditional lands, cultural destruction, and ongoing desecration of burial grounds and sacred sites.

As a critical aspect of their struggle to implement their basic right to self-determination, the Muwekma Ohlone People are currently seeking federal tribal recognition, along with more than 30 other California Indian Nations who have been relegated to the tragic and genocidal status of "landless Indians".

The Muwekma Ohlone have also initiated the process of regaining a portion of their traditional land base. Currently their priority is the return of the area in San Francisco known as the Presidio, soon to become unused federal land when the military pulls out. Under federal law, this land must be returned to the original "owners", the Muwekma Ohlone. This act of simple and straightforward justice, carried out at the earliest possible date, will be a significant step in reversing the policy of genocide through which many California Indian Peoples have been pushed to the brink of extinction, and California Indian Nations have become homeless in their own homelands.

The IITC strongly encourages all city, state and federal officials who have a part in the decision-making regarding the future of the Presidio to take immediate action towards its return to the Muwekma Ohlone.

The IITC also supports federal recognition for the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe as a critical step in their ability to engage in government-to-government relations, and to exercise self-determination as a Sovereign People.

The IITC will continue to support the efforts of the Muwekma Ohlone People to reclaim their traditional lands, including the Presidio in San Francisco. 1992 is the year

for healing the wounds that have been inflicted upon  
Indigenous Peoples, but this healing will not begin until  
justice is done.

Respectfully,

  
William A. Means,  
IITC Executive Director

cc: Muwekma Ohlone Tribal Council  
President George Bush  
Manuel Lujan, Secretary of the Interior  
Senator Daniel Inouye, Chairman, Senate Select Committee  
On Indian Affairs  
Congressman George Miller and Tad Johnson, House  
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs  
Mayor Jordan, City of San Francisco  
Supervisor Willy Kennedy, San Francisco Board of  
Supervisors  
United Nations Office of Human Rights  
file

## RESOLUTION HONORING

**MUWEKMA OHLONE TRIBE**

WHEREAS, the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe is the aboriginal Native American Tribe of San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Muwekma Ohlone people, who were taken away from their aboriginal land and were one thought extinct, have retained their cultural and social identity for the past five hundred years; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors strongly supports all Native American aboriginal groups, especially in this Year of the Quincentennial Celebration, in their attempts to be self-sufficient and to be recognized and acknowledged;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors does hereby commend and support the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe and other California tribes and bands in their efforts to obtain recognition at the Federal level and by the United States Congress.



SUPERVISORS GONZALEZ, ACHTENBERG, ALIOTO, BRITT,  
CONROY, HALLINAN, HSIEH, KENNEDY, MIGDEN, SHELLEY

07/20/92

*Human Rights Commission*

# *Resolution*

## MUWEKMA OHLONE TRIBE

- WHEREAS,** the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe is the aboriginal Native American Tribe of San Francisco; and
- WHEREAS,** the Muwekma Ohlone people, who were taken away from their aboriginal land and were once thought extinct, have retained their cultural and social identity for the past five hundred years; and
- WHEREAS,** the Muwekma Ohlone people have suffered several hundred years of dislocation, dispossession of the lands, and relocation to harsh environments; and
- WHEREAS,** the Human Rights Commission strongly supports all Native American aboriginal groups, especially in this Year of the Quincentennial Celebration, in their attempts at self-determination, and to be self-sufficient, officially recognized, acknowledged, and justly treated by the Federal government; and
- WHEREAS,** the Human Rights Commission is mandated to identify and publicize all conditions of human injustice, discrimination, prejudice, and inequality;
- THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Human Rights Commission does hereby commend and support the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe and other California tribes and bands in their efforts to obtain recognition and assistance at the Federal level and by the U.S. Congress.



Chair

*Margaret J. Gaher*

Date

*September 10, 1992*



# United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
DENVER SERVICE CENTER  
12795 W. ALAMEDA PARKWAY  
P.O. BOX 25287  
DENVER, COLORADO 80225-0287

TAKE  
PRIDE IN  
AMERICA

IN REPLY REFER TO:

October 26, 1993

Ms. Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson  
Muwekma Tribe  
1845 The Alameda  
San Jose, CA 95126

Dear Ms. Cambra:

Thank you for meeting with us on the Presidio planning project. The other two National Park Service ethnographic interviewers -- Roger Kelly and Fermin Salas -- and I appreciate the time and attention you gave us.

A copy is enclosed of Report on American Indian Consultations, April 26 to May 7, 1993, Presidio of San Francisco, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Our report has been conveyed to Team Captain Don Neubacher, to Public Affairs Specialist Kate Nichol, and to others of the Presidio Project Office. Their addresses and telephone numbers are in the report along with mine and those of Roger Kelly and Fermin Salas.

Also enclosed is a copy of a draft memorandum of agreement. Roger Kelly is developing it to promote better working relationships among California Indian peoples and the National Park Service concerning the Presidio of San Francisco and Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We recognize that all groups have not been contacted and intend to do so.

There have been some delays in bringing the draft Presidio plan to the public for review. However, you should be invited to comment on the draft plan when it comes out. If you have any questions or wish to make any comments at this time, please contact Roger Kelly (415-744-3979) or Kate Nichol (415-556-3097-x214).

Yours sincerely,

*Larry Van Horn*

Lawrence F. Van Horn  
Cultural Anthropologist  
Branch of Planning, Western Team  
Denver Service Center  
National Park Service

**DRAFT**

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
AND  
CERTAIN BAY AREA NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITY GROUPS

ARTICLE I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

WHEREAS, Public Law 92-589, 86 Stat. 1299, 16 U.S.C. 460bb, established the Golden Gate National Recreation Area "[i]n order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco Counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic and recreational values...";

WHEREAS, subsequent legislation expanded the boundaries of the Recreation Area to include additional areas of San Mateo and Marin Counties (Public Laws 93-544, 95-625, 96-199, 96-344, 96-607, and 102-299);

WHEREAS, Public Law 92-589, 16 U.S.C. 460bb-2, also provides for the administration of the Presidio of San Francisco by the Secretary of the Interior when the Presidio is no longer needed by the Department of Defense;

WHEREAS, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior have signed an agreement (1990) providing for the future transfer of the Presidio to the administration of the National Park Service;

WHEREAS, historical and prehistorical studies indicate a substantial presence of Native Americans upon lands now included within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and within the Presidio of San Francisco in particular;

WHEREAS, several contemporary Native American tribes and communities can demonstrate a continuity of historical association and cultural affiliation to such lands;

WHEREAS, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Public Law 101-601, 104 Stat. 3048, 25 U.S.C. 3001, establishes the ownership of Native American human remains, objects, and burial items located on public lands, requires the National Park Service to consult with Native communities or tribes concerning excavation, removal, and repatriation of Native American remains and culturally associated objects located on federal lands, and provides for the identification, inventory and repatriation of such objects and remains in consultation with Native American tribes;

WHEREAS, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, Public Law 96-95, 93 Stat. 721, 16 U.S.C. 470aa (as amended), provides for surveys and other programs to increase public

awareness concerning archaeological resources located on public lands, is designed to foster increased cooperation and exchange of information about such resources, and is aimed at securing the protection of archaeological resources on federal lands;

WHEREAS, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Public Law 95-341, 92 Stat. 469, 42 U.S.C. 1996, establishes a national policy encouraging recognition of the rights of Native Americans to the use and possession of sacred objects, and to access to sites of traditional religious significance;

WHEREAS, the National Historic Preservation Act, Public Law 89-665, 80 Stat. 915, 16 U.S.C. 470 (as amended), provides that the National Park Service shall carry out a program for the excavation and protection of historic sites and objects in consultation with Native American groups, and will provide for the disposition of Native American cultural items consistent with other provisions of law;

WHEREAS, interpretation of Native American culture is identified as a management objective in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Statement for Management (April 1992);

WHEREAS, the Native American organizations that are parties to this Memorandum wish to perpetuate their cultural traditions and interpret for and educate the community at large about those traditions which exist or once existed in connection with the lands of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area;

WHEREAS, the National Park Service's Native American Relationships Management Policy (September 1987) requires that the National Park Service develop and execute programs in a manner that reflects awareness, sensitivity, and serious concern for the traditions, cultural values and religious beliefs of Native Americans who have ancestral ties to park lands, including considering the concerns of and maintaining effective consultation relationships with potentially affected Native American groups with regard to planning, management, operations, and interpretive programs; and

WHEREAS, Public Law 91-383, 84 Stat. 826, 16 U.S.C. 1a-2, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish advisory committees with regard to the functions of the National Park Service and to enter into agreements with respect to interpretive demonstrations and park programs;

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of August 25, 1916, 39 Stat. 535, 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4, and laws supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof; in Public Law 91-383, 84 Stat. 826, 16 U.S.C. 1a-2; and in Public Law 92-589, 86 Stat. 1299, 16 U.S.C. 460bb, the signatories to this Memorandum of Understanding agree as follows:

## ARTICLE II. STATEMENT OF WORK

### Section 1. Service Responsibilities

(a) The National Park Service (hereinafter "the Service") will solicit comment from the Native American signatories pursuant to relevant laws and policies as set out more fully below.

(b) The Service will seek review and comment by the Native American signatories with respect to research design, scopes of work, and requests for proposals relating to archaeological projects in areas with known or potential sensitivity for Native American remains, artifacts, or other significance, and will provide opportunity for members of Native American communities that are signatories to this memorandum to participate in archaeological projects as appropriate.

(c) The Service will provide timely opportunity for Native American signatories to comment on proposed actions or undertakings which may have an effect on historic or prehistoric properties associated with Native American culture.

(d) The Service will undertake a detailed ethnographic overview of the entire Recreation Area, which will serve to describe Native American and other groups that have been historically associated with such terrain, and the Service will seek input from appropriate Native American signatories regarding research design.

(e) The Service will also undertake an assessment of ethnic community interests relating to the Presidio lands in particular, including basic data on Native American presence in this portion of the Recreation Area.

(f) The Service will seek comments and suggestions from the Native American signatories regarding the development of interpretive exhibits and signage relating to Native American themes.

(g) The Service will provide timely review of special use permit requests from the Native American signatories for traditional events occurring on Recreation Area lands.

### Section 2. Native American Signatories' Responsibilities

(a) The Native American signatories will provide a timely response to Park Service requests for assistance, comments and suggestions as detailed more fully below.

(b) The Native American signatories will participate with the Park Service in the studies mentioned above, including providing data for researchers working on projects mentioned in this memorandum.

(c) The Native American signatories will provide input to the Service regarding research and archaeological projects, and will provide comments on other projects or undertakings that may have an effect on historic or prehistoric properties associated with Native American culture.

(d) The Native American signatories will provide the Service with timely comments on other issues of concern to the Native American community.

(e) The Native American signatories will assist the Service in the interpretation of sites within the Recreation Area.

### ARTICLE III. TERM OF MEMORANDUM; AMENDMENT

(a) This Memorandum of Understanding shall remain in effect for a term of two years from the date of the last signature, and may be amended only with the written consent of all parties to the Memorandum.

(b) The signatories to this Memorandum agree to meet not less than ninety (90) days prior to its expiration to discuss the need for its renewal or expiration. Any such renewal may be accomplished only in writing, and only with the concurrence of all the signatories thereto.

### ARTICLE IV. KEY OFFICIALS

(a) The key official for the Service shall be the General Superintendent of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area or his/her designee.

(b) The key officials for the Native American signatories shall be the tribal or community leaders of each signatory, or their designees.

### ARTICLE V. REPORTS

A "Record of Meeting" shall be made by the Service for each formal meeting of the signatories, within ten working days of such meeting; shall be submitted in draft form to each of the meeting participants for approval within ten additional working days; and shall be distributed to each signatory within five further working days.

### ARTICLE VI. TERMINATION

Any signatory to this Memorandum may terminate its participation

upon thirty (30) days written notice to each of the other signatories.

#### ARTICLE VII. REQUIRED CLAUSES

(a) In the execution of this Memorandum the parties agree to comply with the requirements of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title V, Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of September 26, 1973, Public Law 93-112, which requires affirmative action to employ and to advance in employment qualified handicapped individuals; and with regulations heretofore or hereafter promulgated relating to nondiscrimination in employment and in providing facilities and services to the public. The signatories agree that they will not discriminate against any person because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin, and that they will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin.

(b) No member of or delegate to Congress, or resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this Memorandum, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, but this provisions shall not be construed to extend to this Memorandum if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

#### ARTICLE VIII. MULTIPLE COUNTERPARTS

This Memorandum may be executed in multiple counterparts, and when taken together, shall be deemed as one instrument.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, the parties hereto have signed their names and executed this agreement as set out below.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### NATIVE AMERICAN SIGNATORIES

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Report on  
American Indian Consultations  
April 26 to May 7, 1993

Presidio of San Francisco  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
General Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement  
Package 859A, Project Type 02B

Lawrence F. Van Horn, Ph.D.  
Cultural Anthropologist  
Branch of Planning  
Western Team  
Denver Service Center  
National Park Service

August 1993

## PURPOSE

Consultations were conducted in the greater San Francisco area with American Indian groups who may have traditional and/or contemporary interests in the lands or grounds occupied by the Presidio of San Francisco; who may have been influenced historically by the Presidio; or who may have planning suggestions for its future uses. This work was requested by the Western Regional Office as part of the Presidio General Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement.

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

California before European contact was inhabited by many indigenous peoples whose languages and other cultural traits were diverse but well adapted to the bay environment. The San Francisco Bay area illustrates this variety. Within what is now Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) -- as it includes portions of Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties -- much archaeological and historical evidence attests to continuous indigenous occupation from prehistoric times to the present period.

More than two centuries of social control through the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods has drastically changed many aspects of the indigenous cultures, but much remains in the form of continuing rituals and beliefs maintained through linguistic traditions (Kelly 1993a). Much is being learned through ethnohistorical and genealogical research about genetic ties, family histories, group identities, and cultural continuities (Field, Leventhal, Sanchez, and Cambra 1992a, 1992b). Also discoveries of prehistory through archeology have been and will continue to be important to contemporary groups descended from Bay Area indigenous populations. Prehistoric archeological sites have been found within the boundaries of the Presidio (Kelly 1993a).

Contemporary residents known as Coast and Bay Miwok, Ohlone, Pomo, and other descendant peoples continue to live within or near their historic areas (Kelly 1993a). In addition, federal government incentive programs several decades ago encouraged American Indians from other parts of the country to relocate to urban areas like San Francisco for intended economic betterment. Many families and individuals did come to the Bay Area this way. The parents of one of our anthropological team members, Fermin Salas (Apache), are examples.

The 1990 United States Census for Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Sonoma counties indicates that 32,141 persons identified themselves as American Indian or other Native American. However, those descended from California indigenous peoples living in the seven Bay Area counties are not further identified from others in this Native American category (Larry Myers 1993). But with 242,164 such persons, California contains more American Indians and other Native Americans than any other state except Oklahoma, which has a population of 252,420 in that category. Two-thirds of California's Native American population represent descendants from indigenous peoples of what is now California; the other one-third is from different parts of the United States.

The communities of indigenous descendants who are neighbors to Golden Gate National Recreation Area make up tribes officially recognized as such by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), groups applying for federal acknowledgment

(Roth 1989-1990), or groups whose status once recognized but "terminated" has been recently reinstated by the BIA. Regardless of their status of BIA federal recognition, recent federal law (for example, Public Law 102-416) and NPS policy support contacting and consulting with all Native American groups as an integral part of the planning process. They have a unique legal status not shared by other cultural groups in our nation (Kelly 1993a). There are 30-40 federally unrecognized tribes in California.

#### PRIOR AND ONGOING CONSULTATIONS

Scoping meetings held by the planning team began May 15, 1990. As part of scoping an American Indian meeting was held August 4, 1992 (National Park Service 1993:110-111). Several groups attended, including the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe.

An American Indian meeting was held at the Presidio on June 10, 1993. Dick Trudell (Dakota), executive director of the American Indian Resources Institute and a member of the Presidio Council, told us on May 7, 1993, that he saw a need for such a meeting and would set it up. It was sponsored by Joe Myers (Pomo), executive director of the National Indian Justice Center, and 40 to 50 people attended (Salas 1993a), including Roger Kelly, Marti Leicester, and Fermin Salas of the NPS and Martha Matsuoka of the Presidio Council staff (Kelly 1993b, 1993c; Salas 1993a).

#### ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

I worked with Regional Archeologist Roger E. Kelly and Interpretive Ranger Fermin Salas of Alcatraz, The Bay District, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I participated in all of the ethnographic interviews. Both Roger and Fermin were usually present. The following roles and responsibilities were either decided upon ahead of time or evolved during the consultations.

Roger's roles and responsibilities were to set up the trip, provide leads as to what persons and groups to contact, suggest references for background information on California Indians in the anthropological and historical literature, and serve as an ongoing liaison for American Indian contact for such things as the pending memorandum of understanding being put forth by the National Park Service (NPS) and various American Indian groups in the area. Fermin knew ahead of time a few representatives of the groups we contacted. However, his main roles and responsibilities were to communicate the desire of the National Park Service to employ American Indians, to make employment information more readily available, and to promote American Indian interpretation through the possibility of cultural events at various National Park Service units in the greater San Francisco area. He is an American Indian employee of the National Park Service of Apache heritage. His roles were defined by Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the Western Regional Office. My roles and responsibilities were to initiate appointments for interviews upon arrival in San Francisco, listen and ask questions along with Roger and Fermin as to American Indian concerns, record responses by taking notes, and write up our findings in an extended trip report.

We interviewed 12 American Indian individuals representing eight different groups. We also interviewed 14 non-Indians who are either

interested in certain American Indian groups as friends or who have worked with many of the American Indian groups in the Bay Area as professionals on various types of anthropological, archeological, or historical projects. In the course of our interviews and travels, we contacted 31 other persons who wish to be placed on the mailing list for later public comment on the draft Presidio plan. In orienting ourselves to the Presidio and providing feedback on our work, we talked with 13 staffers of the National Park Service including one from the Golden Gate National Park Association's Presidio Council.

## METHODOLOGY

In introducing ourselves, we explained our respective National Park Service affiliations and expressed the desire of the Service to establish and maintain ongoing relations with American Indian groups in the Bay Area who may have interests in the Presidio. We asked about any possible traditional or historical interests in the Presidio area, about any cultural details that might be shared, and about any suggestions for future uses of the Presidio. We routinely used the cultural-landscape maps prepared under the auspices of the planning team (Land and Community Associates and Architectural Resources Group 1993) as "talking papers" as well as Nancy Morita's "Wild in the City" twofold, cultural-landscapes comparison map. She compares the Ohlone cultural landscape -- what is now San Francisco under Ohlone Indian habitation before European contact -- with the cityscape of today (Morita 1992).

The interviews were unhurried, and we did a lot of listening. We are most grateful for the courtesy and hospitality shown us. Many gave unsparingly of their time and spent anywhere from two to four hours with us at a sitting.

## GENERAL FINDINGS

The people with whom we talked make a polite but clear-cut distinction between California Indians -- descendants of peoples indigenous to what is now California -- and those American Indians indigenous to other states who have moved to California. The implication is that the First Americans should be given first consideration for facilities and interpretation. The California Indians should be first in California, especially those native to the Bay Area regarding the Presidio. One person expressed dismay that Mikhail Gorbachev has already been given priority consideration in the establishment of the Gorbachev Foundation at the Presidio (Arceneaux 1993); he is not even an American citizen, let alone a California First American, so it is not fair according to this person's thinking. That person represents a group, the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, that claims the Presidio under what they say is a Native American right of first refusal (Cambra 1992).

The myth of the general extinction of California Indians should be dispelled, especially in the Bay Area, where virtually all of the indigenous groups have living representatives. Links between traditional peoples and contemporary groups should be emphasized through effective interpretation so that the average American does not perceive Indians as only part of the past. This sentiment was widely expressed by our interviewees, both Indian and non-Indian.

The non-Indians we interviewed were very supportive of our work and freely shared information, identifying various Indian groups and leaders. We were told that some Indian groups oppose one another and play politics having to do with differential self-expressed cultural identities. It is something to be aware of, with the best approach being to talk neutrally with as many groups as possible.

Although some of this political competition came out in the interviews, the Indian interviewees showed great respect towards the traditional territories of other groups and for one another as individuals if not their positions. We were impressed with their knowledge and courtesy.

The Indian interviewees were genuinely very appreciative that one member of our three-person anthropological team is an American Indian NPS employee. Fermin Salas (Apache) is terribly concerned about networking, sharing employment information, and promoting the interpretation of Indian peoples at Bay Area NPS cultural events. He feels and particularly wishes to say that "often the Park Service is willing to take from the Indian communities without offering anything in return....[and] that many of the jobs that could benefit by hiring a qualified Native American are often given to non-Native Americans." His goal "is to let the Indian people know that with the Presidio becoming part of GGNRA...that perhaps [the] NPS would consider Indian people for some of the interpretive-ranger jobs in the future." Fermin believes that there would be "benefit from the continuation of any type of outreach with Bay Area Indians" (Salas 1993b). By including Fermin, I think the NPS gave something in return on the spot -- a better and more comprehensive dialogue than would have otherwise occurred.

In using the Presidio cultural-landscape maps mentioned earlier (Land and Community Associates and Architectural Resources Group 1993), the omission of an Indian cultural landscape before European contact was immediately noticed by all of the Indian interviewees. The draft plan is devoid of an Indian landscape in its succession of Presidio landscapes over time (National Park Service 1993:10-11). Perhaps a map like Nancy Morita's "Wild in the City" twofold, cultural-landscapes comparison map could be used. As indicated earlier, she compares the Ohlone cultural landscape -- what is now San Francisco under Ohlone Indian habitation before European contact -- with the cityscape of today (Morita 1992). Roger Kelly has a copy.

We missed some groups, north and south, in our consultations because of their unavailability or our limited time. And we did not receive any specific, detailed information about possible sacred sites or traditional-use areas at the Presidio. However, we did consult with leading individuals affiliated with the indigenous groups whose traditional territories immediately surrounded San Francisco Bay. "These consultations included discussions of historical links, natural and cultural resources on the lands, and ideas about future Native American programs" (Kelly 1993a).

#### AMERICAN INDIAN CONSULTATIONS ON THE PRESIDIO PROJECT LIST OF SPECIFIC IDEAS

*At the Presidio, establish:*

1. A nursery for plants native to California and demonstrate how they were/are used by its first peoples.

2. An international clearing house for American Indian organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area with data on cultural, educational, employment, health, and training services of, by, and for Indians.
3. A California Indian Museum, emphasizing the peoples of the Bay Area.
4. A museum featuring the Bay peoples alone, such as the Miwok, the Ohlone, and Pomo.
5. Interpretation at any museum, above, linking the peoples of the past with their descendants in contemporary groups; bridge the gap and show linkages between the arts and crafts of the past with those of California Indians of today; dispel the myth of extinct Ohlone Indians and tell about their modern revitalization movement and the cultural survival of other Bay Area groups such as the Miwok and Pomo peoples.
6. An expanded exhibit on Ishi (the last California Yahi Indian, who was befriended by anthropologist Alfred Louis Kroeber; see Theodora Kroeber 1962) and incorporate in it the current display in the museum at the University of California at Berkeley; Ishi it seems spent much more of his later urban time in San Francisco than in Berkeley.
7. An Indian law, policy, and research center to be known as the Golden Gate Institute for Indigenous Cultures; it would be a place of resources and assistance for the future of tribal peoples, offering to the world environmental and other adaptations from native cultures (Joseph Myers 1993).
8. A national annual competition and exhibition of traditional games, sports, and skills hosted by California Indians and featuring American Indian and other Native American peoples.
9. An umbrella cultural organization that would help small Indian organizations like the California Indian Basketweavers Association display and sell their wares along with those of other arts-and-crafts groups.
10. A centralized genealogical computer database from mission documents and other records that would help individuals find their ancestors and generally assist in California Indian genealogical research.
11. An informational clearing house for regional recreation areas, parks, and museums that interpret California Indian peoples and cultures.
12. A regional reburial site for human remains found during various types of ground-disturbing activities or being repatriated from museum collections; groups claiming cultural affiliation under the Repatriation Act of 1990 or through archeological monitoring could elect to use a reburial site in an appropriate natural setting at the Presidio.
13. Interpretation programs that describe the human suffering and cultural dissolution borne by California Indians as subjugated peoples during the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods. On the positive side, tell about the different types of cultural survival of California Indians, especially the modern revitalization movement of the Muwekma Ohlones.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the momentum gained from our consultations be maintained, and I would like to be involved. Our consultation team should meet with the planning team to discuss these ideas further. Additional consultations should be arranged during the public involvement period to contact groups we missed and to follow through with the ones with whom we talked. If not feasible for me to make another trip, certainly Roger Kelly and Fermin Salas should be supported for further contact on a regular, ongoing basis.

## AMERICAN INDIAN CONSULTATIONS

*American Indian Persons Interviewed, April 26 through May 7, 1993*

1. EUGENE C BUVELOT (COAST MIWOK) TREASURER 415-241-3942 (o)/415-883-9215(h)  
FEDERATED COAST MIWOK 1025 SUSAN WAY  
NOVATO CA 94947
2. ROSEMARY CAMBRA (OHLONE) CHAIRPERSON 408-293-9956  
MUWEKMA TRIBE  
1845 THE ALAMEDA  
SAN JOSE CA 95126
3. EDWARD D CASTILLO (CAHUILLA/LUISEND) HISTORIAN & COORDINATOR  
707-664-2458/2486 (o) or 707-585-8411 (h)  
NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES 120 NICHOLS HALL  
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY 1801 EAST COTATI AVENUE  
ROHNERT PARK CA 94928
4. ANDREW GALVAN (OHLONE) INTERPRETIVE VOLUNTEER 510-656-0777  
COYOTE HILLS REGIONAL PARK  
POST OFFICE BOX 3152  
FREMONT CA 94539
5. JAKKI KEHL (OHLONE) 209-832-7403  
1675 NORTH CORRAL HOLLOW ROAD  
TRACY CA 95376
6. VANA LAWSON (POMO) NURSERY ASSISTANT 707-887-1586  
YA-KA-AMA INDIAN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER  
6215 EASTSIDE ROAD  
FORESTVILLE CA 95436
7. OTIS PARRISH (POMO) EMPLOYMENT SPECIALIST 510-763-3410  
UNITED INDIAN NATIONS  
1320 WEBSTER STREET  
OAKLAND CA 94612
8. LANNY PINOLA (MIWOK/POMO) 415-663-1092 (o) 415-868-9317 (h)  
POST OFFICE BOX 173  
OLEMA CA 94950 (Please cross-reference this LANNY PINOLA listing with that  
below under National Park Service staffers.)

9. GREG BARRIS (MIWOK) CHAIRPERSON 310-827-4174 (a) 213-851-2025 (h)  
FEDERATED COAST MIWOK C/O DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES  
405 HILGARD AVENUE  
LOS ANGELES CA 90024

10. KATHLEEN R SMITH (MIWOK/POMO) 510-938-6323  
YAMHUUT & ASSOCIATES ARTISTS  
1778 SUNNYVALE AVENUE  
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-1810

11. RICHARD TRUDELL (DAKOTA) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 510-834-9333  
AMERICAN INDIAN RESOURCES INSTITUTE  
319 MAC-ARTHUR BOULEVARD  
OAKLAND CA 94610

12. IRENE ZWIERLEIN (OHLONE) CHAIRPERSON 415-851-7747 or 415-364-1130  
AMAH TRIBAL BAND  
OHLONE/COSTANOAN INDIANS  
789 CANADA ROAD  
WOODSIDE CA 94062

*Non-Indian Persons Interviewed, April 26 through May 7, 1993*

1. LEE DAVIS CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST 510-527-4652  
663 SAN GABRIEL AVENUE  
ALBANY CA 94706

2. LINDA FRIES CALIFORNIA INDIAN ENTHUSIAST 415-387-8679  
14 SHOREVIEW AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121

3. CAROL M GERRANS CHAIRPERSON 707-576-7445  
RESTORATION COMMITTEE  
OLOMPALI STATE HISTORIC PARK  
POST OFFICE BOX 328  
NOVATO CA 94948

4. MILEY HOLMAN ARCHEOLOGIST 415-338-2046/1642  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94132

5. LUIS S KEMNITZER CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST 415-338-2046  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94132

6. FRED LEW RANGER/MANGER 415-892-3383  
OLOMPALI STATE HISTORIC PARK  
POST OFFICE BOX 328  
NOVATO CA 94948

7. DAVE LIBCHITZ PHOTOGRAPHER 707-763-6196  
POST OFFICE BOX 955  
PETALUMA CA 94953

8. ALAN LEVENTHAL INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNICIAN 408-924-5722/5300  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES 1 WASHINGTON SQUARE  
SAN JOSE CA 95192-0107

9. BEV ORTIZ GRADUATE STUDENT IN ANTHROPOLOGY 510-938-6323  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY  
1778 SUNNYVALE AVENUE  
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-1810

10. SYLVIA BARKER THALMAN FORMER PRESIDENT 415-479-3281  
MIWOK ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVE OF MARIN  
9 MOUNT TENAYA COURT  
SAN RAPHAEL CA 94903

11. DON THIELER FORMER PRESIDENT 415-883-4310  
MIWOK ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVE OF MARIN  
6 ARLINGTON COURT  
NOVATO CA 94947

12. ELAINE THORNBURGH PRESIDENT 415-387-8780 (o) 415-387-6890 (h)  
HUMANITIES WEST  
580 FUNSTON AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118

13. BERNARD WONG CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST/CHAIRPERSON 415-338-7518/2046  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94132

14. YOSHIKO MIKO YAMAMOTO CURATOR/DIRECTOR 415-338-1642  
TREGANZA MUSEUM DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94132

*Persons Contacted Who Want to be on the Mailing List for Public Comment  
(American Indians and non-Indians)*

1. JENNIFER BATES CHAIRPERSON 916-292-0141  
CALIFORNIA INDIAN BASKETWEAVERS ASSOCIATION  
16894 CHINA FLATS ROAD  
NEVADA CITY CA 95959

2. HELEN BROWN (COAST MIWOK) 415-892-1826/415-883-4787  
90 EL NOVATO TRAILER COURT  
NOVATO CA 94945

3. RICK CALLANAN DAY MANAGER PACIFIC HEIGHTS INN 415-776-3310  
1555 UNION STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

4. VIOLET CHAPPELL 707-785-2971  
POST OFFICE BOX 13  
STEWARTS POINT CA 95480

5. DIANE EINSTEIN PRESIDENT 707-762-9715  
THE OLOMPALI PEOPLE, FRIENDS OF OLOMPALI STATE HISTORIC PARK  
POST OFFICE BOX 1400  
NOVATO CA 94948

6. MARILYN ENGLANDER PRESIDENT 415-897-4064  
MARIN MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN  
POST OFFICE BOX 864 2200 SOUTH NOVATO BOULEVARD  
NOVATO CA 94948

7. GEORGE FRANK (POMO) 707-882-2156  
POST OFFICE BOX 465  
POINT ARENA CA 95468

8. JERRY GARDNER (CHEROKEE) ATTORNEY AT LAW 415-647-3472  
NATIONAL INDIAN JUSTICE CENTER  
MC-NEAR BUILDING #7 FOURTH STREET SUITE 46  
PETALUMA CA 94952

9. JAMES A HIRABAYASHI CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST 415-333-2373/415-338-2046  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
125 CAMBON DRIVE #8F  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94132

10. ANA JIMENEZ MANAGER 415-441-2240  
CURRIE'S CHEVRON SERVICE STATION  
2465 VAN NESS AVENUE AT UNION STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94109

11. NORM KIDDER MANAGER 510-795-9385  
COYOTE HILLS REGIONAL PARK  
8000 PATTERSON RANCH ROAD  
FREMONT CA 94536

12. GENE LADRECH OWNER 415-776-3310  
PACIFIC HEIGHTS INN  
1555 UNION STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

13. SAGE LA-PENA NURSERY ASSISTANT 707-887-1586  
YA-KA-AMA INDIAN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER  
6215 EASTSIDE ROAD  
FORESTVILLE CA 95436

14. DENI LEONARD DIRECTOR 415-921-8769  
ABORIGINAL PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE  
2881 VALLEJO STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123-4616

15. MALCOLM MARGOLIN PUBLISHER 510-549-3564  
NEWS FROM NATIVE CALIFORNIA  
POST OFFICE BOX 9145  
BERKELEY CA 94704

16. CINDY MARKS 707-546-3476  
1799 COOPER DRIVE  
SANTA ROSA CA 95404

17. YOLANDA MC-CARTHY (POMO) 707-462-3682  
GUIDIVILLE RANCHERIA OF POMO INDIANS  
POST OFFICE BOX 339  
TALMAGE CA 95481

18. JOSEPH A MYERS (POMO) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 707-762-8113  
NATIONAL INDIAN JUSTICE CENTER  
MC-NEAR BUILDING #7 FOURTH STREET SUITE 46  
PETALUMA CA 94952

19. LARRY MYERS (POMO) EXECUTIVE SECRETARY 916-653-4082  
CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION  
915 CAPITOL MALL ROOM 288  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

20. RICK PARRISH YA-KA-AMA NURSERY ASSISTANT 707-887-1586  
POST OFFICE BOX 13  
STEWARTS POINT 95480

21. DAVID WAYLE PERI CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGIST 707-664-3166/2312  
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY 1801 EAST COTATI AVENUE  
ROHNERT PARK CA 94928

22. JIM QUILLEN ALCATRAZ INTERPRETIVE VOLUNTEER 707-451-0963  
432 BRADLEY DRIVE  
VACAVILLE CA 95687

23. NORMA E SANCHEZ (OHLONE) TRIBAL ADMINISTRATOR 408-293-9956  
MUWEKMA TRIBE  
1845 THE ALAMEDA  
SAN JOSE CA 95126

24. JAMES W SCHUL ENGINEER 415-871-7176  
REIMER ASSOCIATES CIVIL ENGINEERS LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS URBAN PLANNERS  
601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD #600  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080

25. ANITA SILVA 707-785-2971  
POST OFFICE BOX 13  
STEWARTS POINT CA 95480

26. ALLOGAN SLAGLE ATTORNEY AT LAW 415-798-7683  
ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS  
1776 LAGUNA STREET #301  
CONCORD CA 94520

27. SUSAN STOMPE 415-397-1610  
110 SAN MATEO WAY  
NOVATO CA 94945

28. SHIRLEY TURNER (COAST MIWOK) 415-897-4705  
819 DIABLO AVENUE #10  
NOVATO CA 94947

29. MARGARET WALKER STAFF MEMBER & OFFICE MANAGER 707-887-1586  
YA-KA-AMA INDIAN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER  
6215 EASTSIDE ROAD  
FORESTVILLE CA 95436

30. LINDA YAMANE ARTIST/NEWSLETTER EDITOR 408-394-5915/916-292-0141  
CALIFORNIA INDIAN BASKETWEAVERS ASSOCIATION  
16894 CHINA FLATS ROAD  
NEVADA CITY CA 95959

31. RIA YOUNG NURSERY MANAGER 707-887-1586  
YA-KA-AMA INDIAN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER  
6215 EASTSIDE ROAD  
FORESTVILLE CA 95436

*Staffers Contacted of the National Park Service or the Presidio Council*

1. BRETT BANKIE INTERPRETIVE RANGER PRESIDIO DISTRICT 415-556-1874/0865  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
POST OFFICE BOX 29333  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

2. CURT EDLUND MAINTENANCE CHIEF 415-556-3004  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

3. CAREY FEIERABEND HISTORICAL ARCHITECT 415-556-1400-x332  
PRESIDIO PROJECT OFFICE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
P O BOX 29022  
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

4. STEPHEN A HALLER HISTORIAN 415-556-3124  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

5. MARTI LEICESTER PROGRAM DEVELOPER PRESIDIO DISTRICT 415-556-  
1874/0865  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
POST OFFICE BOX 29333  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

6. MARTHA M MATSUOKA ASSISTANT FOR PLANNING & ANALYSIS 415-556-5944  
PRESIDIO COUNCIL GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL PARK ASSOCIATION  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

7. MARTIN T MA'ER ARCHEOLOGIST 415-556-9505  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

8. CINDY MILESTONE MAINTENANCE BUDGET ASSISTANT 415-556-3004  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

9. DON NEUBACHER TEAM CAPTAIN 415-556-1400-x333  
PRESIDIO PROJECT OFFICE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
P O BOX 29022  
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

10. KATE NICHOL PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SPECIALIST 415-556-3097-x214  
PRESIDIO PROJECT OFFICE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
P O BOX 29022 PRESIDIO BUILDING 102  
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

11. LANNY PINOLA INTERPRETIVE SPECIALIST 415-663-1092 (o) 415-868-9317 (h)  
POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE  
POINT REYES CA 94956 (Please cross-reference this LANNY PINOLA listing with  
that above under American Indian persons interviewed.)

12. ARMANDO QUINTERO BAY DISTRICT CHIEF RANGER 415-556-1070  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

13. NAOMI L TORRES BAY DISTRICT SUPERVISORY RANGER 415-705-1044  
GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA  
BUILDING 201 FORT MASON  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123

#### *Ethnographic Interviewers*

Roger E. Kelly, Ph.D., Regional Archeologist/Acting Regional Anthropologist  
Park Historic Preservation, Western Region  
National Park Service  
600 Harrison Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco CA 94107-1372  
415-744-3979 (o)  
415-744-3932 (fax)

Fermin Salas, Alcatraz Interpretive Ranger, Bay District  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201 Fort Mason  
San Francisco CA 94123  
415-556-1070 (o Fort Mason)  
415-705-1044 (o Alcatraz)  
415-705-1050 (fax Alcatraz)  
415-885-2858 (h)

Lawrence F. Van Horn, Ph.D., Cultural Anthropologist  
Branch of Planning  
Western Team  
Denver Service Center  
National Park Service  
Post Office Box 25287  
12795 West Alameda Parkway  
Denver, CO 80225-0287  
303-969-2255 (o)  
303-969-2226 (fax)

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arceneaux, Wanda

- 1993 The Gorbachev Foundation: Presidio Hails New Tenant. The [Presidio of San Francisco, California] Star Predidian 38(15, April 23, 1993):1.

Bean, Lowell John, Ann M. Curria, and Michael R. Amrine

- 1992 Interpretive Text for The Ohlone [People]: An Exhibit Presented by the C. E. Smith Museum of Anthropology, April 10 - November 13, 1992. Typescript. Hayward: California State University at Hayward.

Bean, Lowell John and Dorothea Theodoratus

- 1978 Western Pomo and Northeastern Pomo. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 289-305. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Bibby, Brian

- 1992-1993 A Purpose for Everything. News [Berkeley, California] from Native California 7(1, Winter):8.

Callaghan, Catherine A.

- 1978 Lake Miwok. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 264-273. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Cambra, Rosemary

- 1991 Restoring Life to the Dead: About the Stanford [University, 1990] Reburial. Chapter 5. In Native American Testimony: A Chronicle of Indian-White Relations from Prophecy to the Present, 1492-1992. Edited by Peter Nabokov. Pages 424-459. New York: Viking Penguin Company, A Division of Penguin Books. Second, expanded edition. First published in 1978.
- 1992 Muwekma Indian Tribe -- Costanoan/Ohlone Indian Families of the San Francisco Bay. Media Advisory: Muwekma Ohlone Tribe Makes Its Public Claim Statement at the Presidio Council Call-To-Interest Meeting. The Presidio Is Located on Ohlone Land. June 9, 1992. San Jose, California: Muwekma Indian Tribe.

Castillo, Edward D.

1978 The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 99-127. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

1992 The Other Side of the "Christian Curtain:" California Indians and the Missionaries. The Californias 10(2, September-October 1992):8-17.

Collier, Mary E. T. and Sylvia Barker Thalman, editors

1991 Interviews with Tom Smith and Maria Copa: Isabel Kelly's Ethnographic Notes on the Coast Miwok Indians of Marin and Southern Sonoma Counties, California. San Rafael, California: Miwok Archeological Preserve of Marin (MAPOM), MAPOM Occasional Papers Number 6.

Cook, Sherburne F.

1978 Historical Demography. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 91-98. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Dietz, Stephan

1976 Echa-tamal [Prehistoric-historic Archeological Site]: A Study of Coast Miwok Acculturation. San Francisco: San Francisco State University, Department of Anthropology, M.A. thesis.

Elsasser, Albert B.

1978 Historical Demography. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 91-98. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Field, Les, Alan Leventhal, Dolores Sanchez, and Rosemary Cambra

1992a A Contemporary Ohlone Tribal Revitalization Movement: A Perspective from the Muwekma Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area. California History (Fall 1992):412-431.

1992b A Contemporary Ohlone Tribal Revitalization Movement: A Perspective from the Muwekma Costanoan/Ohlone Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area. San Jose, California: Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribal Press.

Goodrich, Jennie, Claudia Lawson, and Vana Parrish Lawson

1980 Kashaya Pomo Plants. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, American Indian Studies Center, American Indian Monograph Series Number 2.

Hallstone, Viven

1992-1993 The Past Is But the Beginning. News [Berkeley, California] from Native California 7(1, Winter):4-5.

Haller, Stephen A.

- 1992 The Ohlone Indians of the Bay Area: A Continuing Tradition. Notes of the National Park Service historian, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California, taken at a conference at California State University at Hayward, The C. E. Smith Museum of Anthropology, November 14, 1992.

Heizer, Robert F. and M. A. Whipple, editors

- 1971 The California Indians: A Source Book. Second edition. Berkeley: University of California Press. First published in 1951, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kehoe, Alice Beck

- 1992 North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account. Chapter 7: The Intermontane West and California. Pages 360-428. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Incorporated, A Simon and Schuster Company.

Kelly, Isabel

- 1978 Coast Miwok. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 414-425. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Kelly, Roger E.

- 1976 Archeological Resources of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California. San Francisco: National Park Service, Western Regional Office, Division of Cultural Resources Management.
- 1993a Suggested Background Text: Native American Indian Topics. American Indian Consultations for the Presidio Planning Project. Typescript sent from Regional Archeologist Roger E. Kelly, Western Regional Office (San Francisco), National Park Service, to Cultural Anthropologist Lawrence F. Van Horn, Branch of Planning, Western Team, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, May 26, 1993.
- 1993b Briefing Regarding the Presidio Council Meeting on June 10, 1993, and the Proposal for the Golden Gate Institute for Indigenous Cultures of the National Indian Justice Center. Memorandum from Regional Archeologist Roger E. Kelly, Western Regional Office (San Francisco), National Park Service, to Park Historic Preservation Chief Thomas D. Mulhern, Western Regional Office (San Francisco), National Park Service, June 11, 1993.
- 1993c Telephone conversation of Regional Archeologist Roger E. Kelly, Western Regional Office (San Francisco), National Park Service, with Cultural Anthropologist Lawrence F. Van Horn, Branch of Planning, Western Team, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, June 11, 1993.

King, Chester

- 1978 Protohistoric and Historic Archeology. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 58-68. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Kroeber, Alfred Louis

- 1976 Handbook of the Indians of California. New York: Dover Publications. First published in 1925, Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78.

Kroeber, Theodora

- 1962 Ishi in Two Worlds: The Life and Death of a California Indian Tribe [The Yahi] and the Story of Ishi, Its Last Survivor, Who Emerged from the Stone Age in the Modern World in 1911. Berkeley: University of California Press. First published in 1961, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Land and Community Associates and Architectural Resources Group

- 1993 Presidio of San Francisco Overview, Cultural Landscape Report. Prepared for the National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Presidio Planning Team. Eugene, Oregon and San Francisco, California: Land and Community Associates and Architectural Resources Group, respectively, Post Office Box 3185, Eugene, Oregon 97403 and Pier 9, The Embarcadero, San Francisco, California 94111.

Lang, Kathryn M.

- 1979 Golden Gate National Recreation Area: The Indian and Hispanic Heritage of a Modern Urban Park. San Francisco: National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Langellier, John Phillip and Daniel Bernard Rosen

- 1992 Historic Resource Study of El Presidio de San Francisco: A History under Spain and Mexico, 1776-1846. Denver, Colorado: National Park Service, Denver Service Center, for Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California.

Levy, Richard

- 1978a Eastern Miwok. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 398-413. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.
- 1978b Costanoan. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 485-495. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Margolin, Malcolm

- 1978 The Ohlone Way: Indian Life in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books.

McLendon, Sally and Michael J. Lewy

- 1978 Eastern Pomo and Southeastern Pomo. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 306-323. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

McLendon, Sally and Robert L. Oswalt

- 1978 Pomo: Introduction. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 274-288. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Milliken, Randall T.

- 1991 An Ethnohistory of the Indian People of the San Francisco Bay Area from 1770 to 1810. Berkeley, California: University of California at Berkeley, Department of Anthropology, Ph.D. dissertation, August 8, 1991.

Morita, Nancy

- 1992 Wild in the City [San Francisco, California]: Cultural Landscapes Comparison Map, Ohlone Indian Days and Today. San Anselmo, California: Wild in the City, 5 Cypress Road, 94960.

Myers, Joseph A.

- 1993 Golden Gate Institute for Indigenous Cultures: The National Indian Justice Center's Proposal for a Future Native American Use of the Presidio. June 10, 1993. Petaluma, California: National Indian Justice Center.

Myers, Larry

- 1993 California Native American Heritage Commission. Packet of information sent from Executive Secretary Larry Myers to Cultural Anthropologist Lawrence F. Van Horn, Branch of Planning, Western Team, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, April 29, 1993.

National Park Service

- 1993 Creating a 21st Century National Park: From Military Post to National Park. Draft General Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Assessment, Presidio of San Francisco, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (San Francisco, California). Denver: National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Presidio Planning Team, March 1993.

Ordano, Jo-Ann

- 1993 Changing of the Guard: Shaping the Future of San Francisco's Presidio Will Require the Most Massive Planning Effort in National Park Service History. National Parks 67(3-4, March-April 1993):31-36.

Ortiz, Bev

- 1990-1991 Beyond the Stereotypes. News [Berkeley, California] from Native California 5(1, November-January):32-33.

Peterson, Bonnie J., editor

1993 Dawn of the World: Stories Told By the Coast Miwok Indians. Fourth edition. First published in 1976. San Rafael, California: Miwok Archeological Preserve of Marin.

Roth, George E.

1989-1990 Interdisciplinary Research in the Federal Acknowledgment Process. High Plains Applied Anthropologist 9 & 10:156-164.

Salas, Fermin

1993a Telephone conversation of Interpretive Ranger Fermin Salas, Alcatraz, The Bay District, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (San Francisco), National Park Service, with Cultural Anthropologist Lawrence F. Van Horn, Branch of Planning, Western Team, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, June 11, 1993.

1993b Evaluation of Involvement as an American Indian Employee of the National Park Service, American Indian Consultations, April 26-May 7, 1993, Presidio Planning Project. Typescript sent from Interpretive Ranger Fermin Salas, Alcatraz, The Bay District, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (San Francisco), National Park Service, to Cultural Anthropologist Lawrence F. Van Horn, Branch of Planning, Western Team, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, June 23, 1993.

Schuyler, Robert L.

1978 Indian-Euro-American Interaction: Archeological Evidence from Non-Indian Sites. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 69-79. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Shipley, William F.

1978 Native Languages of California. In Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 8: California. Robert F. Heizer, volume editor. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Pages 80-90. Washington, District of Columbia: Smithsonian Institution.

Thalman, Sylvia Barker

1993 The Coast Miwok Indians of the Point Reyes Area. Point Reyes, California: The Point Reyes National Seashore Association.

Thompson, Erwin N. and Sally B. Woodbridge

1992 Special History Study of the Presidio of San Francisco: An Outline of Its Evolution as a U.S. Army Post, 1847-1990. Denver, Colorado: National Park Service, Denver Service Center, for Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California.

Trafzer, Clifford E.

1990-1991 Beyond the Stereotypes. News [Berkeley, California] from Native California 5(1, November-January):40-41.

United Indian Nations

- 1991 Bay Area American Indian Representatives Resource Directory: A Guide to San Francisco Bay Area American Indian Organizations. Oakland, California: United Indian Nations. Approximately 40 organizations are listed that provide various services to American Indians from cultural centers to employment centers to health centers.

February 23, 1998

Rosemary:

I really regret what appears to be misunderstandings about previous communications. I'm personally dedicated to do whatever I can to establish greater trust and a sustained positive relationships between the Muwekma Ohlone people and the National Park Service.

Please call me directly on arrangements for the suggested next meeting if this would be preferable to you. My direct number is 415-561-4620. I sincerely hope that we can build a strong positive partnership in the years ahead.

Thanks

Brian O'Neil

|                   |          |         |          |            |   |
|-------------------|----------|---------|----------|------------|---|
| Post-it® Fax Note | 7671     | Date    | 3-2-98   | # of pages | 2 |
| To                | Alan     | From    | Rosemary |            |   |
| Co./Dept.         |          | Co.     |          |            |   |
| Phone #           |          | Phone # |          |            |   |
| Fax #             | 424-5303 | Fax #   |          |            |   |

# DRAFT

## Summary of Meeting between the Muwekma Indian Tribe and the National Park Service (Golden Gate National Recreation Area) 5 May 1998

\*\*\*\*\*

**Location:** Presidio of San Francisco, Building 102, 2nd Floor Conference Room.

**Attendees:** *Representing the Muwekma Indian Tribe* -- Rosemary Cambra (Tribal Chairperson), Monica Arellano (Tribal Council Member), Francisco Da Costa (Tribal Liaison), Espanola Jackson (Tribal Liaison), Alan Leventhal (Tribal Ethnohistorian), Melissa Nelson (Tribal Liaison, *The Cultural Conservancy*), Norma Sanchez (Tribal Administrator), Allogan Slagle (*Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.*).

*Representing the California Indian Museum and Cultural Center* -- Otis Parrish.

*Representing the National Park Service* -- B.J. Griffin (General Manager, Presidio of San Francisco), Brian O'Neill (General Superintendent, Golden Gate NRA), Dr. Patricia Parker (American Indian Liaison Office, Washington, D.C.), Leo Barker (Park Historical Archeologist, Golden Gate NRA), Paul Scolari (Historian, Golden Gate NRA).

**Notetaker:** Paul Scolari

(The Muwekma Indian Tribe also tape-recorded the meeting)

**Attachments to this Summary:** Attendance list, correspondence leading up to the meeting (letters dated 26 February 1998, 23 March 1998, 22 April 1998, and 29 April 1998); preliminary list of local tribes which will be invited into discussions with the park.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Introduction

The National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, invited the Muwekma Indian Tribe to this meeting so that the tribe could discuss, face-to-face with park officials, concerns it has had over several years about its role in, and relation to, National Park Service activities in the Presidio of San Francisco. There was no formal agenda for the meeting. In a letter to the park dated 23 March 1998, the tribe indicated a number of issues it wished to discuss. These issues provided the basis for the discussion which is summarized below.

### Discussion: Assessment of Past Relations Between the Muwekma and the Park

After introductions, Chairperson Cambra led the group into a discussion of the first substantive issue. She stated that there is an urgent need for the park to begin

working with the Muwekma Indian Tribe. She and other Muwekma representatives referred to meetings and correspondence between the park and the Muwekma dating from the early 1990s. These meetings and supporting correspondence took place in the context of planning for the future of the Presidio. At that time, the park expressed an interest in formalizing relations with the Muwekma and other local tribes for the purpose of jointly stewarding, in a manner conforming with federal law and policy, archeological sites that are integral to the ancestral heritage of local native peoples.

Muwekma representatives at the meeting were critical of the park for not having followed through in this effort to formalize relations. The urgency of the present situation, according to Chairperson Cambra, derives from the fact that planning/development activities have been progressing in the Presidio without relations between the park and tribes having been formalized and without any other effort to involve the Muwekma or other local tribes. NPS representatives at the meeting recognized that the effort to enter into formal relations with the Muwekma and other local tribes through some form of agreement needs to be revived, explaining to the Muwekma representatives that the present meeting was initiated by the park with the purpose of getting this effort underway.

#### *Discussion: The NPS Archeological Program at the Presidio*

Next, as a means of demonstrating to Muwekma representatives that identification, protection and preservation of resources which form part of their ancestral heritage has been fully integrated with National Park Service activities in the Presidio, and that these activities have been conducted in a manner conforming with federal preservation law, Leo Barker provided a detailed briefing on the archeological program that has been conducted at the Presidio since the National Park Service has become owner of the property. He explained that as part of the process of updating the Presidio National Historic Landmark study in 1990-91, the National Park Service developed an archeological sensitivity map for the Presidio which mapped known "prehistoric" and "historic" archeological sites, as well as zones which had the potential to yield such sites. Since 1993, this map has provided the basis for an archeological monitoring program which has been carried out in satisfaction of resource preservation laws triggered by federal activity in the Presidio by the Army, the Corps of Engineers and the National Park Service.

The remainder of the archeological briefing focused on activities in the Crissy Field area of the Presidio. Mr. Barker first described activities which have occurred in the vicinity of the one known "prehistoric" site in the Presidio which is still located at Crissy Field (the site is referred to as Ca-SFr-6 in the scientific literature). None of the activities in the area have disturbed or encountered the site. Mr. Barker also explained that in 1972, the Army unearthed the burial of a California Indian female whose remains dated to around 700 A.D. near the mapped site of Ca-SFr-6 (the burial site is referred to as Ca-SFr-26). In 1986, the Army turned over the remains to the California Native American Heritage Commission for proper disposition.

Mr. Barker next described the testing program that the Army conducted at Crissy Field in preparation for its current remediation effort, explaining that based on the level of impact of remediation work, and upon historic, archeological and ethnographic records, National Park Service resource managers determined that Army activities would not encounter any known or predicted "prehistoric" archeological sites. Muwekma

representatives were assured that any inadvertent discovery at Crissy Field, or anywhere else in the park, would lead to a work stoppage and situation assessment to determine how to proceed respectfully and in conformance with federal law, particularly the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Finally, the archeological component of the National Park Service's upcoming Crissy Field Restoration Plan was described. It is the park's goal to consult on this Plan with the Muwekma and other local tribes that are culturally affiliated with Presidio lands due to the extent of ground disturbance that will take place and because the National Park Service would like to incorporate local tribes in efforts to identify the precise location of Ca-SFr-6 and to develop interpretive programs concerning native peoples of the area. Alan Leventhal added that in an effort to identify a site such as Ca-SFr-6, the tribe might be interested in formulating and answering research questions in order to learn from the site and thus add to the knowledge about its ancestral heritage. Mr. Barker stated that if gathered, such information could be used to support a potential National Register of Historic Places nomination of the site.

#### Discussion: Working Together to Formalize Relations

Chairperson Cambra, General Manager Griffin, and General Superintendent O'Neill all expressed the desire for the park and the tribe to begin working immediately toward formalizing relations. The group discussed how a general agreement such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) could be used to broadly define the goals and parameters of a working relationship between the park and the Muwekma. All agreed that they also wished to begin working immediately on developing a protocol for adhering with NAGPRA on park lands (Muwekma and park representatives both recognized that NAGPRA implementation nation-wide has been vexed by questions about the "standing" of unacknowledged tribes under the law, and that this circumstance would apply to the effort to implement NAGPRA on Golden Gate National Recreation Area lands as well).

Because there are unanswered questions about which local Indian tribes are culturally affiliated with park lands, Chairperson Cambra suggested that the park invite all of the tribes within a 50-mile radius of the park to a meeting at the end of June (1998). Park officials concurred with this idea. General Superintendent O'Neill stated that the park would welcome Chairperson Cambra's personal leadership in the effort to bring local tribes together for this meeting. The purpose of the meeting would be to announce that the park is embarking on an effort to reestablish relations with local tribes and to find out which among these would be interested in entering into formal relations with the park (i.e., through an MOU, a NAGPRA protocol, etc.). The meeting would also provide the park the opportunity to begin consultation on its Crissy Field Restoration Plan with the full spectrum of local tribes that may be culturally affiliated with Presidio lands. Attached to this meeting summary is a preliminary list of tribes which will be invited to the June meeting.

#### Discussion: California Indian Museum and Cultural Center

The California Indian Museum and Cultural Center (CIM) was invited to the meeting by Chairperson Cambra, and was represented by Otis Parrish. Mr. Parrish was critical of the National Park Service for its inability, over several years, to furnish a

building for lease to CIM for the purpose of housing its proposed museum. He explained that CIM is in an awkward position because it received a \$2,000,000 State of California grant for the purpose of founding its museum in the Presidio, and has made little progress in this effort. General Manager Griffin explained that at present CIM will have to negotiate a lease in the Presidio with the Presidio Trust because administrative jurisdiction of most of the Presidio will be turned over to the Trust on 1 July 1998. She and General Superintendent O'Neill went on to say that the National Park Service is doing, and will continue to do, all it can to encourage the Trust to negotiate with CIM, because it believes CIM would play an important role in fulfilling the General Management Plan Amendment vision of the Presidio as a meeting ground for a diversity of cultures. General Manager Griffin indicated that she has met with Joseph Myers (Chairman, CIM Board of Directors) a number of times, and that at present she was attempting to meet with Mr. Myers and with James Meadows (Executive Director, Presidio Trust). General Manager Griffin indicated that since 1995, the National Park Service has been prohibited from negotiating long-term leases in the Presidio due to the creation and passage by the U.S. Congress of the legislation establishing the Presidio Trust (copies of this legislation were handed out to meeting participants). General Superintendent O'Neill concluded this discussion by stating that if CIM is unable to obtain a Presidio lease, an effort would be made to locate the museum on park lands over which the National Park Service does have administrative jurisdiction, if this would be amenable to CIM.

#### Discussion: Presidio Trust

Muwekma and park representatives both recognized that in the future the Presidio Trust, as the federal agency which will take over administrative jurisdiction of much of the Presidio, must play a role in Indian tribal issues as they relate to the Presidio. Chairperson Cambra stated that as she understood it, any Muwekma claim to lands in the Presidio would have to be taken up with the Presidio Trust.

#### Conclusion: Next Steps

It was agreed that park staff members Paul Scolari and Leo Barker would take the initiative in arranging for the meeting of local Indian tribes at the end of June that was discussed in the present meeting. They will begin working anew with the MOU that was developed by the park during American Indian consultations that took place during the Presidio planning process, revising it as necessary and sending it out along with the June meeting announcement, with the intention that it will be an item of focus at the June meeting. Looking beyond the June meeting, the intention of the park at present is to conduct additional meetings as necessary to address specific issues (i.e., development of a NAGPRA protocol, consultation meetings related to Crissy Field Restoration Plan activities).



# United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123

IN REPLY REFER TO:

H4217 (GOGA-RMPCR)

JUN - 9 1996

Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson  
Muwekma Indian Tribe  
503-A Vandell Way  
Campbell, CA 95008

Dear Chairperson Cambra:

In 1993, the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area (NPS), began an effort to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with a number of American Indian tribes indigenous to the Bay Area, for the purpose of facilitating formal tribal participation in activities affecting or concerning the ancestral heritage of the tribes. Unfortunately, this effort was never brought to fruition.

Establishing working relations with local tribes continues to be an important goal of the park. For this reason, we are restarting the effort begun in 1993. As a first step in this renewed effort, we are inviting you, and all of the other Ohlone/Costanoan and Coast Miwok tribes who may trace their ancestry to park lands, to an initial meeting here in the park on Friday, July 31, from 1:00 - 4:00 P.M. The precise location for this meeting will be announced in a subsequent letter.

In addition to establishing a dialogue between park and tribal leaders, this meeting will address a number of specific issues including: discussion of ancestral heritage sites and archeological activities in the park; development of MOUs between the park and tribes; and discussion of an inadvertent discovery protocol and "cultural affiliation" with park lands for the purpose of compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

We hope that you will be able to attend this meeting, and we invite your input as we develop the agenda further. To confirm your attendance please contact park staff

member Leo Barker at (415) 561-4832 through July 3, or Paul Scolari at (415) 561-4813 beginning July 6.

Sincerely,



*for* Brian O'Neill  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate NRA



B.J. Griffin (Ms.)  
General Manager  
Presidio of San Francisco

Enclosure

cc:

Enclosed list

Dr. Patricia Parker, American Indian Liaison Office, NPS

The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe of the San Francisco Bay and  
Alcatraz and Angel Islands

October 1998

by

Alan Leventhal (Tribal Ethnohistorian), Hank Alvarez (Tribal Councilman), Monica Arellano (Tribal Councilwoman), Carolyn M. Sullivan (Tribal Councilwoman),  
Concha Rodriguez (Tribal Councilwoman), and Rosemary Cambra (Tribal Chair)

**Introduction: Cultural and Geographical Landscape of the Muwekma Territory -  
10,000 Years Ago to European Contact in 1769**

Over ten thousand years ago, before the waters of the Pacific Ocean passed through the gap now spanned by the Golden Gate Bridge and filled the interior valley-basins, Alcatraz and Angel Islands were small mountain peaks which were later isolated by the encroaching sea water, the ancestors of the Muwekma Ohlone and the neighboring tribal groups had established their homes within this changing landscape. The people comprising these early tribal groups gave birth, hunted, fished, harvested a great diversity of seeds, fruits and vegetables, managed large tracts of land through selected burning, married, grew old and died within the greater San Francisco Bay region. Over these millennia the Muwekma Ohlone tribal groups along with their neighboring linguistic cousins, inter-married and developed complex societies which anthropologists call **ranked chiefdoms**. Many of the complex aspects of their social, cultural, religious and ceremonial institutions have been traced back through the archaeological record to over 4500 years ago within the greater Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta and Bay Area regions, thus culturally and biologically linking this larger geographic area. Based upon this archaeological record, it appears that sometime around 4000 years ago, these ancestral California tribal cultures developed a system of social ranking (meaning hereditary noble lineages and elites who controlled wealth, production, distribution and power) and there also evolved institutionalized religions. This complex system of social distinction was reflected in the elaborate mortuary (burial) treatment of the dead as expressed within the larger geographical area. Many of the social elites (nobility) were buried with grave wealth in the form of social and religious markers of distinction. Furthermore, many these high lineage people during the early and middle periods of time, were buried in extended positions, oriented toward the west, and placed in cemeteries that developed into large earth mounds.

Such was the case within the greater San Francisco Bay region, beginning approximately 4000 years ago, when people were interred in what has become commonly known as the "**shellmounds**". Historically, these "shellmounds" have been misinterpreted by scholars over the past 100 years as remnant "villages", "kitchen middens", "garbage dumps" and "habitation sites", however archaeological evidence suggests to the contrary, that these mounds formally served as the final resting places for the elite and distinguished members (e.g. fallen warriors) of the many ancestral Muwekma Ohlone tribal societies living around the San Francisco Bay.

In 1769, the evolution of these complex Ohlone societies, were adversely impacted and became another casualty within the international arena of European colonialism. In that year, the Bourbon Monarchy of the Hispanic Empire decided to expand its presence into Alta California. Thus began the first of a series of contacts between the Spanish colonial empire and the aboriginal Costanoan/Ohlone people (whom the Spaniards referred to as *Costeños* or Coastal People) living within the Monterey/San Francisco Bay regions. Although the term Muwekma is used as an identifier of the modern survivors of the aboriginal people of the greater San Francisco Bay region and whose direct ancestors were missionized into Missions Dolores, San

Jose and Santa Clara, Muwekma also means "The People" in the Tamien and Chochenyo Ohlone languages spoken around the San Francisco Bay [note: collectively the Ohlone languages spoken in southern Napa, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Mateo and San Francisco Counties have been classified as either Northern Costanoan or Muwekma by anthropologists and linguists].

**Late Eighteenth Century Land and Sea Explorations:**  
**Impressions of the Muwekma Ohlone People, Alcatraz and Angel Islands**  
**and the San Francisco Bay**

During the early Spanish expeditions from Monterey into the San Francisco Bay region (1769 - 1776), the Spaniards encountered an number of Muwekma Ohlonean tribes and villages (rancherias) along the way. Accounts of these first hand encounters were kept by the priests and the military leaders of the expeditions and they provide important information in our understanding of the nature and complexity of 18th century Ohlone societies and their world-view. In simplistic terms, it appears that the Ohlone treatment towards the presence of strangers within their territories was divided into two general considerations: strangers were considered as either enemies (and/or other powerful forces that could cause harm) or as distinguished guests. Apparently, during this formative, contact/pre-mission period, the Spaniards were not viewed as enemies by the Ohlone they encountered, but in most cases they were invited to their villages and treated as distinguished guests. An example of one such encounter occurred on April 2, 1776, near the Carquinez Straits (East Bay), when Father Font wrote the following account:

We set out from the little arroyo at seven o'clock in the morning, and passed through a village to which we were invited by some ten Indians, who came to the camp very early in the morning singing. We were welcomed by the Indians of the village, whom I estimated at some four hundred persons, with singular demonstrations of joy, singing and dancing.

A year earlier in 1775, the first Spanish ship, the San Carlos, circum-navigated the San Francisco Bay. On board was Captain Juan Manuel de Ayala, First Sailing Master and Map Maker, Jose de Canizares, and Father Vincente Santa Maria, who after having some preliminary contact with the **Karkin** (northern Ohlones), decided to go ashore and visit a village located some distance inland. Father Santa Maria left us with the following account:

There was in authority over all of these Indians one whose kingly presence marked his eminence above the rest. Our men made a landing, and when they had done so the Indian chief addressed a long speech to them...

After the feast, and while they were having a pleasant time with the Indians, our men saw a large number of heathen approaching, all armed with bows and arrows.

...This fear obliged the sailing master to make known by signs to the Indian chieftain the misgivings they had in the presence of so many armed tribesmen. The *themí* (chief), understanding what was meant, at once directed the Indians to loosen their bows and put up all of their arrows, and they were prompt to obey. The number of Indians who had

gathered together was itself alarming enough. There were more than four hundred of them, and all, or most of them, were of good height and well built.

Alcatraz apparently was used as a fishing station, while Angel Island was more permanently occupied by Muwekma people at the time of European contact. Both islands were mapped by the Jose de Canizares of the San Carlos. On August 12, 1775, Captain Ayala noted in his log:

The longboat was lowered and I set out in it to find a better anchoring ground for the ship. I was looking over the island that I called Angels' Island, the largest one in this harbor, and making close search for an anchoring place that handily provided water and firewood. Although I found some good ones, I was inclined to go further and look over another island, and found it quite barren and rugged and with no shelter for a ship's boats. I named it Pelican Island because of the large number of pelicans that were there.

Alcatraz was so named Ysla de Alcatrazes (Pelicans) by Captain Ayala (although some believe this is actually Yerba Buena Island). On August 14, 1775, the **San Carlos** casts her anchor opposite a large island which they named Santa Maria de los Angeles (Angel Island) in honor of the Blessed Virgin as Queen of the Angels. On this island they found two Ohlone rancherias and also evidence of religious activities. Father Vincente Santa Maria described some of these shrines:

These were slim round shafts about a yard and a half high, ornamented at the top with bunches of white feathers, and ending, to finish them off, in an arrangement of black and red-dyed feathers imitating the appearance of the sun.

... This last exhibit gave me the unhappy suspicion that those bunches of feathers representing the image of the sun (which in their language they call *gismen* [the Ohlone word for sun] must be objects of the Indian's heathen veneration; ...

**The Post-Contact Muwekma Ohlone and their ties to the Yelamu Ohlone of San Francisco, Missions Dolores, San Jose and Santa Clara and the East Bay Rancherias:  
A Brief Historic Overview 1777 to 1906**

The region comprising the City and County of San Francisco was controlled by the **Yelamu** tribal group of Ohlone Indians. According to the comprehensive mission record and ethnogeographic studies conducted by anthropologist Randall Milliken, it appears that the first four people from Yelamu were baptized by Father Cambon and the others were baptized by Fathers Palou and Santa Maria between 1777 - 1779. Apparently the first converts from the "*rancheria de Yalam*:" into Mission Dolores also had relations who lived in the neighboring rancherias (villages) of Sitlintac (located about 2.6 miles northeast of Mission Dolores), Chutchui, Amuctac, Tubsinte, and Petlenuc all located within the present boundaries of San Francisco. Sitlintac and Chutchui were located in the valley of Mission Creek. Amuctac and Tubsinte were established in the Visitation Valley area to the south. The village of Petlenuc may have been near the location of the Presidio. The Ohlone people from these as well as other villages to the south, and across the East Bay, were missionized into Mission Dolores between 1777 to 1787. According to Fathers Palou and Cambon the **Ssalsones** (the Ohlone tribal group located on the San Mateo Peninsula to the south) were intermarried with the Yelamu and called them **Aguazios** which means "Northerners".

Based upon genealogical information derived from the Mission Dolores records, the Yelamu Ohlone people of San Francisco were intermarried with Ohlone groups to the south and across the East Bay, prior to contact with the Spaniards. For example, Fathers Palou, Cambon and Noriega over a period of time baptized the family of a Yelamu chief named Xigmacse (a.k.a. Guimas) who was identified by Palou as the "Captain of the village of this place of the Mission". Two of Xigmacse's wives, Huitanac and Uittanaca (who were sisters) were recorded by Cambon as coming "from the other shore to the east at the place known as Cosopo". Recently some scholars have suggested that the ending "-cse" on a man's name was served as an appellation of distinction or preeminence, thus identifying that person as a chief or one of distinguished status and lineage. In another case of cross-Bay intermarriage between tribal groups involved a Yelamu woman named Tociom. Tociom had a daughter named Jojcote who according to Father Cambon was "born in the mountains to the east on the other side of the bay in the place called by the natives Halchis". The place called "Halchis" is the land of the **Jalquin** Ohlone Tribe.

It was into this complex and rapidly changing world that a young Jalquin Ohlone man named Liberato Culpecse at the age of 14 years old (born 1787) was baptized at Mission Dolores along with other members of his tribe on November 18, 1801. Seven years later in 1808 Liberato Culpecse married his first wife and she died before 1818. Presumably, after the death of his wife, Liberato was allowed to move to the Mission San Jose region, where he met his second wife, Efrena Quennatole. Efrena who was **Napian/Karquin** Ohlone was baptized at Mission San Jose on January 1, 1815. She and Liberato were married on July 13, 1818 by Father Fortuny. Liberato Culpecse and Efrena Quennatole had a son named Dionisio (Nonessa) Liberato and a daughter, Maria Efrena. Both Dionisio and Maria Efrena married other Mission San Jose Indians and they had children who later became the Elders (including the **Guzmans** and **Marine** lineages) of the historic Federally Recognized Verona Band (Muwekma) community residing at the following East Bay rancherias: San Lorenzo, Alisal, Del Mocho, Niles, Sunol, and Newark. These Elders also enrolled along with their families with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the 1928 California Indian Jurisdictional Act.

The world of all of the Ohlone tribes was drastically changed within the first 25 years after contact due to the establishment of Missions San Carlos, Soledad, Santa Cruz, San Juan Bautista, Santa Clara, San Jose and Dolores (San Francisco), and with the military Presidios at Monterey and San Francisco. Of the approximately over twenty thousand Ohlonean speaking people who inhabited the San Francisco/Monterey Bay regions in 1769, less than 2000 were left by 1810. Their numbers continually declined throughout the remaining Spanish/Mexican/Californio regimes, and the surviving Muwekma families eventually sought refuge, especially after the American conquest of California (1846-1848), on some formal land grants and especially the six East Bay rancherias located within their ancestral homelands. During the mid-19th century, as the rest of the central California Indians were displaced and, at times, hunted down, Alisal (located near Pleasanton) as well as the other rancherias, became safe-havens for the Muwekma Ohlone Indians and members from the interior tribes who had intermarried with them at the missions. The Alisal rancheria was established on a 1839 land grant belonging to a *Californio* named Agustin Bernal.

Years later, in the 1880s, the Hearst family purchased part of the rancho containing the rancheria and they permitted the 125 Muwekmas living at Alisal to remain on the land. During the early part of this century, the Muwekma Ohlone Indians (later known as the Verona Band) became Federally Recognized as a result of the Special Indian census conducted by Agent C. E. Kelsey

in 1905-1906 and the ensuing Congressional appropriation bills of 1906 and 1908 addressing the purchase of homesites for landless California Indians. Also, independently, during this period of time, Mrs. Phoebe Hearst was responsible for funding the fledgling Department of Anthropology at U.C. Berkeley. Concurrently, A. L. Kroeber, one of the early pioneering anthropologists, helped develop the Anthropology Department at Berkeley and later became known as "the Father of California Anthropology". During the early part of this century, there were approximately 20,000 Indians left in California, a devastating decline from the estimated population of 1.5 million people at the time of Hispano-European contact in 1769. Realizing such a state of devastation, Kroeber and his students embarked upon the task to try to "salvage" as much memory culture from the surviving communities and elders, in order to record detailed aspects about their culture before their passing. This effort culminated in the monumental publication by Kroeber in 1925, entitled **The Handbook of California Indians**. In this Bureau of American Ethnology's (Smithsonian Institution) publication, Kroeber wrote of the Costanoans (Ohlones):

The Costanoan group is **extinct** so far as all practical purposes are concerned. A few scattered individuals survive, whose parents were attached to the missions San Jose, San Juan Bautista and San Carlos; but they are of mixed tribal ancestry and live almost lost among other Indians or obscure Mexicans.

For the surviving Costanoan/Ohlone people of the 1920s, they never read of this sentence of "extinction", nor did they embrace it. Instead, the Muwekma Ohlone continued maintain their Indian culture, although by this time completely landless, they like the other Ohlone/Costanoan tribal communities (the Amah-Mutsun from Mission San Juan Bautista) and the Esselen/Costanoans from Mission San Carlos/Carmel/ Monterey region), continued to survive as distinct Indian communities and speak their respective languages as late as the 1930s. It is from the work of linguist-cultural anthropologist J. P. Harrington from the Bureau of American Ethnology, who worked in the Ohlone region from 1921-1939 with the last fluent elderly speakers of the Ohlone languages that we know much about the culture and changing world of the Costanoan/Ohlone people. Presently, the grandchildren of Harrington's linguistic and cultural consultants, comprise the Elders and leadership of the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay.

On the Government side, in 1927, although landless, the Muwekma were administratively dropped or "no longer dealt with" (along with approximately 135 other Acknowledged California Indian communities) from their Federally Recognized status by L.A. Dorrington, Superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Sacramento. This unilateral administrative termination was enacted contrary to BIA policy and without any notification or due process for the tribe. Although, the Muwekma Ohlone families had enrolled with the Bureau of Indian Affairs since the 1928 California Jurisdictional Act and have organized themselves according to the Bureau's directives, they still have no right to be recognized as an Indian Tribe under federal law without first being federally reaffirmed and formally Acknowledged by the Secretary of the Interior.

### **Indians of All Tribes: Alcatraz 1969**

In the early morning hours on November 20, 1969, exactly two hundred years after the Portola/Crespi Expedition of 1769, representatives from different Indian tribes throughout the U.S. calling themselves **Indians of All Tribes** crossed the San Francisco Bay and claimed Alcatraz Island for the Native People of the Americas. This major event, ignited by both the indignities inflicted upon Native Americans for almost 500 years and further fanned by

America's consciousness during the Viet-Nam War and Civil Rights movements of the 1960s, served notice to the dominant society that, although rendered **invisible** to most of America, that something was still wrong, very wrong in Indian Country. The Alcatraz takeover was a major wake up call to America, to its government and to its citizens. In a publication entitled Alcatraz Is Not An Island (1972), Native American anthropologist/historian Dr. Jack Forbes from UC Davis penned the following:

In the 1870's Natchez Winnemucca, respected chief of the Pyramid Lake Paiutes, was arrested and sent as a prisoner to Alcatraz. His crime: Attempting to resist and expose the corruption of the government's agents on his reservation. Natchez did not stay on "The Rock" very long, but other Indians, guilty of the "crime" of resisting white conquest, were frequent visitors to the prison. Now in 1969 modern-day Native Americans are attempting to claim Alcatraz Island in order to both obtain facilities for educational programs and to publicize the desperate circumstances under which Indian people live.

... There is little question but that the Muwekma Indian people of San Francisco and the Hulueko [Coast Miwok people] of Marin County were, in the old days, frequent visitors to all of the islands in the San Francisco Bay. ...

...The Native Americans on Alcatraz are saying that they want to have a place where they can control programs which will benefit both Indians and non-Indians. Those who can see into the future will agree, I think that an Indian museum, memorial, and educational center on Alcatraz will be of great benefit and value to all California, regardless of race.

### **The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe of the San Francisco Bay: Shattering the Myth that the Ohlones were Never Federally Recognized**

Ironically, sometime either before or after the closure of Alcatraz, one of the Muwekma elders, Ernest George Thompson, Jr., became a security guard on Alcatraz. Ernest Thompson, Jr., as with his Muwekma ancestors, was baptized at Mission San Jose in 1912. His lineal ancestry has been directly traced to the Chupcan Tribe (southern Carquinez Straits to Mt. Diablo region), the Alson Ohlone Tribe of the Fremont/Alviso coastal plain, and the Seunen Ohlone Tribe of the Livermore Valley/Dublin region. When Ernest Thompson, Jr. passed away on September 17, 1984, his death certificate identified him as a **Security Guard** for the **Alcatraz Federal Prison**.

The Ohlone people have left a record of approximately 13,000 of human history, and today they are still trying to overcome the onus of their sentence of "extinction" placed upon them by scholars and politicians by continuing to educate the general public, academic institutions and the Federal Government. After eight years of being in the petitioning process, and after the submittal of several thousand pages of documentation, on May 24, 1996 the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Branch of Acknowledgment and Research (BAR) made a positive determination, but reluctantly acknowledged that:

Based upon the documentation provided, and the BIA's background study on Federal acknowledgment in California between 1887 and 1933, **we have concluded on a preliminary basis that the Pleasanton or Verona Band of Alameda County was previous acknowledged between 1914 and 1927.** The band was among the groups, identified as bands, under the jurisdiction of the Indian agency at Sacramento, California. The agency dealt with the Verona Band as a group and identified it as a distinct social and political entity.

Over the past 18 years, the Muwekma have politically, spiritually and culturally revitalized themselves and formed a formal tribal government in compliance with Congressional and the Department of the Interior's criteria. Presently, the Muwekma Tribe is seeking reinstatement and reaffirmation as a Federally Acknowledged Indian Tribe. The Muwekmas have spent these past 18 years conducting research and submitted to the Branch of Acknowledgment (BAR) over several thousand pages of historical and anthropological documentation as part of the petitioning process.

As Muwekma Elders are passing, the Muwekma Tribe has yet to advance through the "Recognition Process" for complete reaffirmation of its Acknowledged status. For other tribes it has been a long and difficult ordeal as well. For example, it took the Cowlitz Tribe of Washington 22 years to go through the Recognition Process and the Samish Tribe of Washington waited 25 years, including litigation in Federal Court for 8 years, before they won their Federal Recognition. As a result of their litigation, the Federal Courts decided that the Samish Tribe were denied "Due Process" by the Department of the Interior, BIA and BAR. Presently, there are approximately over 200 tribes in the United States petitioning for recognition. After coming "back from extinction", the Muwekmas now face, along with approximately 40 other California Indian Tribes, BIA bureaucratic inaction and obstruction. The Muwekmas, who have never left their ancestral homelands, have been waiting for a response from the United States Government since 1906. In 1972, as a result of the 1928 California Indian Jurisdictional Act, the U.S. Government made a token payment of \$668.51 (this is with interest back to 1852) as just compensation for the illegal acquisition (theft) of California land, minerals and resources. This payment was issued to help California Indians build their future upon.

More recently, another major decision was made by the Interior Department, on March 26, 1998, Deborah Maddox, Director of the Office of Tribal Operations issued the following decision on behalf of the Department of the Interior:

A review of the Muwekma submissions shows that there is sufficient evidence to review the petition on all seven mandatory criteria. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is placing the Muwekma petition on the ready for active consideration list on March 26, 1998.

Now the Muwekma will wait perhaps another 20 years or so in a bureaucratic limbo and holding cell, before the Branch of Acknowledgment and Research decides to review and process their petition. As a result, it is fitting that the tribal representative of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe of the San Francisco Bay, stand this day on Alcatraz Island along with their Native American cousins, on this rock - a bleak beacon to the world - to bring attention once again to the injustices confronting not only the Muwekma, but all of the other tribes in the Western Hemisphere who hope and pray that one day they will attain some semblance of justice and obtain their due recognition once again as a Federally Acknowledged Tribe.



# United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, San Francisco, California 94123

IN REPLY REFER TO:

H4217 (GOGA-CRMM)

APR - 4 2006

Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson  
Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe  
P.O. Box 360791  
Milpitas, CA 95036

Dear Chairperson Cambra:

The National Park Service proposes to develop and subsequently implement a general management plan (GMP) for Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Although we are just beginning our data gathering efforts for this plan, its eventual implementation may affect properties included in, or that may be eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, in accordance with 36 CFR 800.2 (c) (6), we are inviting your participation in the Section 106 process for the general management plan to ensure that cultural resources are adequately considered during the preparation of this GMP.

Areas within Golden Gate National Recreation Area were important in the history of Ohlone peoples. Your special knowledge of the area's history and culture is important to the accuracy and adequacy of our planning effort. We are contacting you to be sure any concerns you may have regarding this planning project are adequately addressed during the study.

We will seek your input during the various stages of the general management planning process, and you will have a number of opportunities to share your ideas and concerns with us. Should you have any questions or desire additional information, please contact Paul Scolari of the park staff at (415) 561-4813.

Sincerely,

Brian O'Neill  
General Superintendent

cc:

Ray Murray, Pacific West Region, Pacific Great Basin Support Office

Keith Dunbar, Pacific West Region, Columbia Cascades Support Office

Stephanie Toothman, Pacific West Region, Columbia Cascades Support Office

Fred York, Pacific West Region, Columbia Cascades Support Office

Harlan Unrau, Denver Service Center

Craig Kenkel, Golden Gate

Diane Nicholson, Golden Gate

Nancy Hornor, Golden Gate