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ABSTRACT

This research design and treatment plan addresses archaeological resources located within three proposed project areas in Stockton’s waterfront area:

**Site 1**: A theatre and retail complex at the head of the Stockton Channel which involves two blocks and a portion of a third and incorporates several historic buildings including the Hotel Stockton;

**Site 2 South**: An area encompassing about 8 city blocks in a former residential area just south of the Channel, and;

**Site 2 North**: A present industrial area on the north side of Stockton Channel, once known as Banner Island (and home to the Mudville 9 baseball team), which includes 6 city blocks and 2 blocks of potential development.

This study has been prepared for InSite Environmental to achieve compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the California Register of Historic Places with regard to archaeological resources. It also satisfies requirements for Federal Section 106 historic properties evaluations. Other cultural resource concerns such as historic buildings, landscapes, and viewsheds are being addressed by other studies.

In urban settings, it is frequently infeasible to determine the presence of archaeological remains prior to project construction. This document details a program that can be used to identify, evaluate and treat important archaeological resources during demolition and excavation phases of construction work. In order to accomplish this, extensive documentary research was conducted on each of the Site areas, and historic resources once present were identified. These resources were evaluated in light of the types of questions currently being addressed on similar urban, historic-period archaeological sites. For potentially important resources - specified as artifact-filled features associated with domestic and commercial occupations during the 1860s-1880s – excavation and recovery methods are described.

Potentially important archaeological remains likely to have survived under the modern landscape were identified within defined Test Areas for **Site 1** (Block 70 2/3), and **Site 2 South** (Blocks H, I, and M). For **Site 2 North**, adjacent potential development Blocks 20 and 26 may contain important remains associated with the prehistoric “Channel Mound” Yokut village. A research design and testing program for this resource is not included here and should be developed prior to any activities in this vicinity.
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PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Two projects involving three site locations have been proposed for the waterfront area of Stockton (Figure 1):

**Site 1**  Civic Partners proposes to develop a multi-screen theatre and retail/restaurant commercial project at the head of the Stockton Channel. The project will include renovation of the Hotel Stockton, and possible closure of Channel Street between Hunter and Center for a public pedestrian area. This area includes the heart of the historic commercial area of Stockton from the early Gold Rush years (Figure 2).

The Stockton Ports propose a new 5,000-seat stadium at one of two sites.

**Site 2 South**  Involving about eight city blocks south of the channel, the area is vacant, having been cleared during earlier downtown redevelopment. Bordering the industrial area of the port, most this site was a residential area from the early years through modern times (Figure 3).

**Site 2 North**  Involving six city blocks north of the channel, this site is largely vacant with remnants of 20th-century industrial use. The site includes former Banner Island and the location of the ball field for the league-winning Mudville 9 of “Casey at the Bat.” Two blocks immediately west of Site 2 North have been identified for potential development and are included in this study (Figure 4).

Evaluation of historic buildings and structures, and potential historic settings and viewsheds affected by these projects have been undertaken by other environmental studies.

CONSOLIDATED APPROACH TO CEQA COMPLIANCE

The phasing of the archaeological work in this document departs somewhat from the standard approach of CEQA cultural resources compliance studies. This “Consolidated Approach”, designed to minimize construction delays and reduce costs, will, nonetheless, fully comply with CEQA and federal guidelines. This section describes the Consolidated Approach, explains departures from standard compliance procedures, and offers rationale for the proposed departures.

The Consolidated Approach to Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) and CEQA compliance was first developed and formalized in 1991 by Mary and Adrian Praetzelis for the Caltrans Highway 480 Reconstruction Project in San Francisco (Praetzelis and Praetzelis 1993). Their approach was refined and implemented on the Caltrans Cypress 1880 Reconstruction Project in Oakland (Praetzelis 1994) and further developed on the Metropolitan Water District Headquarters Project in Los Angeles (Costello et al, 1996, Costello 1999). The approach has also recently been successfully implemented on Caltrans’ Guadalupe Parkway Upgrade in San Jose (Allen et al. 1999).
This treatment plan is a further application of the Praetzellis’ Consolidated Approach. The remainder of this section, and major portions of Chapters 3 and 4, are drawn directly from the research design developed by Mary and Adrian and Praetzellis and Julia Costello for the Los Angeles project (Costello et al, 1996).

Compliance with CEQA generally entails three phases of field work: (Phase 1) discovery/identification of potentially important resources; (Phase 2) evaluation of the importance of the resources and assessment of impacts of the proposed project on the important elements of the resource; and (Phase 3) treatment to mitigate significant impacts (in the case of archaeological resources, treatment usually involves data-recovery excavations). For the Site 1 project area, because any potentially important resources are currently buried beneath parking lots and standing structures, the discovery and evaluation studies (Phases 1 and 2) are infeasible until the demolition phase of construction work has commenced.

Under the standard procedures of CEQA, following identification of a potentially important resource (Phase 1), an evaluation plan is prepared and implemented (Phase 2), then documented in a report filed with and reviewed by those parties/agencies who received the Project EIR. That report documents the findings of the studies (in this case, test excavations), evaluates the importance of the resources, assesses the significance of impacts, and formulates a plan of treatment to mitigate impacts (Phase 3). Generally, preparation of a testing plan, completion of field work, compilation of a report, and agency review and concurrence of the evaluation and treatment plan takes at least four to six months, and often longer. Once approved, site treatment would then require further construction delays.

Because a construction delay of many months between demolition and construction in order to conduct archaeological investigations is unacceptable, only two alternatives are available. The first would require that Phase 2 studies be conducted prior to demolition, excavating through paved surfaces, structures, and perhaps many feet of fill dirt. Even if such an endeavor were successful at identifying important archaeological deposits, it would be extremely costly and would not preclude the necessity of structure demolition and fill removal prior to data-recovery excavations. In a worst case scenario, such limited test excavations might fail to discover important resources that would then be found during construction excavations, requiring costly delays. We have adopted the second alternative.

The identification, evaluation, and data recovery work (Phases 1-3) will be collapsed into a single operation. This work will begin following demolition of standing structures and with removal of paving by the construction contractor. In selected high sensitivity areas, archaeologists will direct removal of structure floors, building foundations (which may be left in place), paving, and fill soils down to the original ground surface, where important archaeological features are expected to occur. Archaeologists will expose this original ground surface and identify any features associated with it. Immediately, the significance of those strata or features will be evaluated and then data recovery undertaken on deposits considered to be legally important. After the archaeologists have evaluated and treated the resources in an area, it would be cleared for further construction activities.
The legal acceptance and success of this consolidated approach requires that a detailed research design and treatment plan be developed and filed with the SHPO prior to any construction activity that might disturb important archaeological resources. The research design sets forth a context for evaluating the significance of any discoveries, assuring quick and justifiable decisions regarding research potentials and the need for data-recovery. Employing specific criteria in this research design, evaluations will be made during the combined identification/evaluation stage. In short, the legal importance of archaeological features will be evaluated as they are uncovered. Where a feature does not meet criteria presented in this document, it will be considered ineligible for further treatment under the CEQA. Deposits that exhibit the specified characteristics will be regarded as “important,” and data recovery will be carried out according to the treatment plan developed here. The treatment plan describes the methods and procedures that will be used for each phase of the work, from discovery through data-recovery excavations, analysis, and report preparation.

**Report Goals**

According to National Park Service (NPS) guidelines, archaeological sites in urban areas “are likely to be more or less invisible, buried under modern created land surfaces.” For this reason, the discovery phase of urban archaeological research (“reconnaissance”) “consists of field checking predictions made on the basis of archival research” (NPS 1985:36).

Guidelines issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) in its booklet *Identification of Historic Properties* provide more detail, stating that the identification phase consists of using “available information to develop a ‘predictive model’ indicating where historic properties are likely to exist.” The guidelines go on to state that “a predictive model should not be regarded as reliable until it has been tested against objective information derived from field work.” To test a model, it is necessary to inspect “both locations that are predicted to contain historic properties and locations that are predicted not to contain them” (ACHP 1988:21-22; emphasis in original).

The ACHP's regulations for *Identification and Consideration of Archaeological Properties in an Urban Context* (36 CFR 301) also recognize the problems in identifying urban archaeological phenomena. The regulations require archival research to define the likelihood that (1) legally important properties may have been created on the site and that (2) subsequent disturbance would have destroyed them. Where legally important properties are likely to be present, the project proponent must “fund a professionally supervised and planned archaeological salvage program.”

Since following a consolidated approach, evaluations are to be made in the field—allowing little time for the archaeologists to reflect on their decisions—it is essential that criteria are available that define the qualities that a property must possess for it to be legally important. Thus an important goal of this document is to provide this essential guidance in the form of a detailed research design.
The goals of this document are to identify archaeological test locations where high research and survival potential coincide with project impacts; to provide the historic context, including research questions, evaluation criteria, and data requirements, within which to evaluate properties discovered during testing; and to supply a Treatment Plan for data recovery for legally important properties.

METHODS AND SOURCES OF DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

As part of the prefield research phase of the project, a number of repositories and individuals were contacted to identify known historic land uses and the locations of research materials pertinent to the project area. These included the published and unpublished documents housed at the Haggin Museum, San Joaquin County Library, the Holt-Atherton Special Collections Department at the University of the Pacific, Stockton; the offices of the San Joaquin County Recorder, Assessor, and Department of Public Works; Stockton; San Joaquin County Historical Museum, Lodi; and the California State Library and Caltrans Office of Environmental Analysis, Sacramento. Other major sources of information consulted include:

1. Review of listings in the National Register of Historic Places and current updates (Directory of Determinations of Eligibility, California Office of History Preservation, Volumes I and II, 1990; and Office of Historic Preservation Computer Listing 1990 and updates);
2. *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976);
3. *California Historical Landmarks* (1990);
4. *California Points of Historical Interest* (May 1992 and updates);
5. Miscellaneous local inventories and histories of historic and prehistoric resources (see References Cited and Consulted).

Several knowledgeable individuals were consulted regarding the architecture and history of the area. Dr. Donald Walker (University Archivist, Holt-Atherton Special Collections Department, University of the Pacific, Stockton) was enormously helpful and conducted special research for this project. Susan Benedetti (Librarian-Archivist, Haggin Museum, Stockton) also provided invaluable assistance.

Primary historic themes within the project area focus on early settlement, Stockton as a transportation center, the development of commerce, Chinese and German communities, and baseball.

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Three archaeological surveys have taken place in and around the Stockton waterfront project areas. Shenk and Dawson’s 1929 publication, *Archaeology of the Northern San Joaquin Valley*, was the first to record the large Yokut village site (CA-SJO-80) on the northern edge of the Stockton Channel (Shenk and Dawson 1929). Located on the water
between Harrison and Edison Streets (west and contiguous to Site 2 North), it contained human burials and abundant artifacts. The site stretched 300 feet along the shore and was reported to be partly covered with fill from levee construction. Later, the site was referred to as the “Stockton Channel Mound” and speculation suggested that it was the historic village of Passisimas, chronicled by Padre Durán in 1817 (Hoover et al., 1966:368). James Bennyhoff (1977:51) identified the site as the Plains Miwok tribelet center of the Yatchicume peoples. Information derived from this site “contributed to the early development of the prehistoric cultural and temporal framework known to California archaeologists as the Central California Taxonomic System (Fredrickson, 1974)” (in Chavez 1979).

In 1986, when Kyle Napton surveyed the waterfront prior to construction of the new north Stockton Channel sea wall (between Madison and Edison Streets), he observed that the site of CA-SJO-80 was covered with levee fill, dense vegetation, and a “considerable amount of stacked metal.” He concluded, however, that the “archaeological potential of this site is considerable” and recommended subsurface testing prior to seawall construction as well as monitoring during project earth-moving (Napton 1986:14).

South of the Stockton Channel, an archaeological survey took place in 1979 on 70 acres of land (which includes all of present Site 2 South) (Chavez 1979). The surveyed blocks were boarded on the east by Commerce Street, on the south by Washington, on the west by Interstate 99, and on the north by the Channel. Chavez noted “…the presence of paved roadways, commercial buildings, and some older residential structures,” general surface disturbances, and “a fair amount of fill material…at some of the vacant lots.” No prehistoric remains were noted in the area. Historic period resources, not routinely addressed in the 1970s, were not mentioned.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY**

**Historic Period**

There is a high probability for encountering important historic-period archaeological remains within two of the project site areas: Site 1 and Site 2 South. Documentary research demonstrated the presence of diverse historic activities including early single-family domestic residences (of German immigrant and Anglo-American blue-collar workers), commercial residences (hotel/lodging houses), commercial sites (Chinese laundries, and retail stores), and industrial enterprises (a brewery, planning mills, and a windmill factory). Some of these archaeological deposits contain legally important information and have a high likelihood of having survived intact into the present.

**Prehistoric**

Site 2 South has been previously surveyed for prehistoric resources with negative results. The low-lying nature of the land around the waterfront – formerly occupied by sloughs and
marshes – makes it unlikely that prehistoric and protohistoric peoples would have occupied these areas for any length of time when higher and drier ground was available nearby on both Webber Island and the Stockton Channel Mound. It therefore appears that the project Sites are unlikely to contain important prehistoric or protohistoric cultural resources. The only location that appears to have a high potential for containing prehistoric resources is Block 20, in the potential development area west of the Site 2 North and adjacent to archaeological site CA-SJO-80, the Stockton Channel Mound. Because of the proximity of this well-known archaeological site, and the uncertainty of its boundaries due to overlying levee fill, a testing program is recommended for Block 20 prior to any development. If any prehistoric resources are found in any of the Site areas during the historic-period archeological investigations described below, or during subsequent project construction, they will be evaluated and a mitigation program devised.

PROSPECTUS

The following chapters present an archaeological research design and treatment plan for the Stockton Waterfront Projects. Chapter 2 provides an historic overview of the project sites, including the natural setting and the cultural development of the vicinity. Chapter 3 identifies important research issues to which a property must contribute to be considered legally important. This research design constructs a series of general historical themes, poses a number of specific archaeological questions and identifies types of properties that are expected to be encountered. Chapter 4 identifies the test areas for each project site and presents testing methodologies and a Treatment Plan for data recovery, analysis, and report preparation. It includes a discussion of all components of data recovery plans mentioned in the ACHP's *Treatment of Archaeological Properties* (1990).
Figure 1. Location of the three project sites in Stockton’s Waterfront area.
Figure 2. Site 1, location of proposed theaters, restaurant, and retail complex.
Figure 3. Site 2 South, one of two locations under consideration for the Stockton Port's new stadium.
Figure 4. Site 2 North, one of two locations under consideration for the Stockton Port's new stadium, and two western blocks of potential future development.
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Chapter 2
HISTORY OF THE WATERFRONT AREA

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project area is located in the Great Central Valley Belt (Storer and Usinger 1963), bounded on the east by the Sierra Nevada and the Coast Range on the west. The northern part of the valley, the Sacramento is drained by the Sacramento River and its tributaries, while the southern part is drained by the San Joaquin River and named for which it is named. The waters of the two rivers merge in the Delta near Suisun Bay, passing through the Coast Range and into San Francisco Bay. The area has historically been quite hot in the summer, and cold in the winter, with temperatures ranging from 105-34 degrees F. Dense fogs form during the winter months, named for the tules which grew in the lower areas of the Delta.

Waters in central California generally flow westerly from the Sierra Nevada, through the foothills, and into the Central Valley. The Calaveras River, Littlejohns Creek, and other tributaries pass through San Joaquin County on their way to the River. Within the Project area, the Stockton Channel of the San Joaquin River terminates at the west boundary of Site 1, while Sites 2 North and 2 South are located on the north and south sides of the Channel. Mormon Slough, which once coursed through Site 2 South, has been truncated and filled-in to a great extent. The sloughs which once fed into the Stockton Channel have also been filled-in, except for the small arm of McLeod Lake.

In the prehistoric era, most of the land in the area would have been marshland and sloughs, but earthen mounds or rises may have existed. Bunchgrasses and tules would be expected in the understory, with an overstory of valley oaks. The Central Valley was described by John C. Fremont, in his 1845 *Report of the Exploring Expedition to the Rocky Mountains in the Year 1842, and to Oregon and North California in the Years 1843-1844*, as a land lush with grasses which supported flowers, massive oaks in groves, and deer, pronghorn, and elk grazing in the fields. Grizzly bear were common in the brush and willow thickets (Davis-King 1998:2.9-3).

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

A summary of the geologic, prehistoric, and historic period are presented, followed by more detailed discussions of the historic-period themes which predominate in the waterfront project areas.
Prehistoric and Hispanic Periods

When the first Spanish explorers entered the San Joaquin Valley, they encountered several inhabited villages, located on low mounds which rose above the flat landscape. Village mounds located near the waterfront area include Pescadero mound (near Bethany on Union Island), Pool mound (nine miles southwest of Stockton), and Ott mound (southeast of Stockton and north of French Camp Slough). More than 100 Indian mounds have been located within the boundaries of present San Joaquin County, many of which have been excavated or studied. The Stockton Channel mound, or Pasasimas village, was located between Edison and Harrison streets in Stockton, near the Site 1 Project area, and was probably the village described in detail by Padre Duran in 1817.

Little is known about the prehistory of the immediate area, however, as there have been few scientific excavations, and very little information from archaeological surveys. Few ethnographic studies have been undertaken and the sites investigated were looked at by untrained researchers. It is likely, however, that the prehistory of the Project area is similar to that in nearby communities. The Central Valley was linguistically complex, with over 30 dialects of nine distinct languages spoken.

The San Joaquin Valley appears to have been settled relatively early in prehistory, certainly by at least 10,000 years ago. The Farmington Complex tools recovered on Littlejohns Creek at CA-STA-44 and other sites, just east of the community of Farmington, tentatively date to 7,000 - 9,000 years B.P., and are generally formed from “Farmington Chert,” a metachert or greenstone found as cobbles in Littlejohns Creek.

In ethnographic times the area now overlain by the City of Stockton was occupied by the Yatchicumne (Yokuts), especially along the Calaveras River. Nineteenth and twentieth-century Yokuts’ material culture, language, social lifeways, and customs have been documented in several monographs and overviews. As this information was collected decades after the disruption of their pre-contact lifeways, the studies reflect the Yokuts’ transition into the European world.

The ethnographic Yokuts (which means “people”) lived in the Great Central Valley, and were unusual among California groups in that they lived in true tribes, with distinct dialects, territories, and names. Northern Valley Yokuts territory extend from the Diablo Range in the west to the Sierra Nevada foothills in the east, with the San Joaquin River as their core. They arrived into this region about A.D. 1,500, moving from their prior homeland due to environmental and other conditions.

Both the Northern Valley and Foothill Yokuts were disrupted by early contact with the Spanish beginning in the mid-1700s. The removal of many people to the coastal missions, and contracting of imported diseases, served to destroy their population base and lifestyle. A malaria outbreak in 1833 wiped out whole tribes and decimated their population, while the ensuing years of the Gold Rush succeeded in the near extermination of their people.
European Settlement

The first Anglo-European settlement in the Stockton area was located at French Camp, where a group of French-Canadian trappers employed by the Hudson’s Bay Company established a camp in 1832. The site became the terminus of the Oregon Trail, in use from 1832 to 1845, after which time the trappers abruptly departed the region. During their occupation, however, the camp had been visited in the fall of 1841 by Captain Charles M. Weber on his way to California with the Bidwell-Bartleson Party, one of the first overland parties to come to the San Joaquin Valley area intending to settle permanently.

Weber was impressed with the fertile lands and stately oaks on the lower banks of the San Joaquin River, but moved further west and in 1842 settled in the Pueblo de San José, forming a partnership with William Gulnac. Gulnac was a blacksmith who had arrived in California in 1833, becoming a naturalized Mexican citizen and later marrying a Californio. In the spring of 1843, the two men formed a company of twelve to found a colony at Campo de los Franceses (French Camp). Being a Mexican citizen, Gulnac petitioned for a grant of land in July 1843, receiving a large tract which included both French Camp and the site of Stockton in January 1844.

The first American to build a dwelling in what is now Stockton was Thomas Lindsay, who arrived with the first group of settlers led by Gulnac in August 1844. Lindsay built a tule hut at the west end of what is now East Lindsay Street, but was killed by Indians in the spring of 1845. Before long, Indians, illness, poor food, and primitive conditions took their toll, and Gulnac sold his lands and interest in the area to Weber for $60, the amount of a grocery bill owed.

Weber continued to reside at Pueblo de San José, occasionally traveling to his grant to bring supplies to his vaqueros, who ran cattle on the land. He continued his efforts to establish a settlement, however, offering much of his land at low prices to those who agreed to settle in the area. Free lots in town and acreage in the country was offered to those with no funds to purchase property. In 1847 he laid out the town of Tuleberg (later Stockton) and hired Jasper O’Farrell and Walter Herron to survey a block of lots bounded by Weber Avenue, Center, Main, and Commerce streets, with the head of the Stockton Channel as its focal point (Minnick 1988:30). More tule and log houses were built in the spring of 1848 and the small settlement had become fair-sized. The first commercial establishment; Bussell’s Tavern, had become a favorite watering hole for travelers between Sacramento and San José. Wheat was planted, the beginnings of San Joaquin Valley’s vast agricultural legacy, often with seeds, horses, and agricultural equipment provided by Weber (Shebl1993:64).

Gold Discovery and Early Development

For the future of Stockton (and San Joaquin County), the most important event to occur in its early history was the discovery of gold on the American River on January 24, 1848. This event set off a worldwide rush of peoples to the gold fields, the greatest mass migration in human history.
Recognizing that it would be more profitable to build a city to serve as a supply and shipping center for the southern mines than just an agricultural settlement, Weber took up residence in Tuleberg, resurveying and renaming it Stockton in 1849 in honor of Commodore Robert F. Stockton, whom Weber had earlier met and admired (Hoover et al. 1990:350). Situated at the head of the navigable San Joaquin River and heavily advertised in the San Francisco Alta California, by late 1849, Stockton had achieved a population of nearly 1,000, and a steamboat from San Francisco was making weekly trips. From Stockton, various trails led to the gold fields over roads named for their destinations: Mariposa, French Camp, Sonora, Mokelumne Hill, and Lockeford. Freighting activities grew, and agriculture and stock raising increased to serve the goldseekers, establishing Stockton as a permanent settlement, one of the most important interior towns in California.

Returning Traveler Bayard Taylor described the scene in 1849:

I found Stockton more bustling and prosperous than ever. The limits of its canvas streets had greatly enlarged during my week of absence, and the crowd on the levee would not disgrace a much larger place at home. Launches were arriving and departing daily for and from San Francisco, and the number of mule-trains, wagons, etc., on their way to the various mines with freight and supplies kept up a life of activity truly amazing (Taylor 1988:76).

Although, he went on to note the disadvantages of Stockton’s location on the slough, especially in the wet season when the streets were awash with mud, Taylor correctly observed:

There seems, however, to be no other central point so well adapted for supplying the rich district between the Mokelumne and Tuolumne, and Stockton will evidently continue to grow with a sure and gradual growth (Taylor 1988:76).

Initially only the downtown core, around the Commodore’s Levee and the head of the Channel, was developed. But, by the spring of 1849, the city of Stockton had outgrown the original O’Farrell and Herron map and Weber commissioned Major Richard P. Hammond to resurvey the town in a grid pattern of his own design. Measuring one mile square, the survey, which became the base for the modern city, encompassed an area of sixteen by eighteen square blocks, separated by sloughs, levees, and islands, with 17 blocks set aside for public lands and parks (Minnick 1988:33). Each block included sixteen lots, six each on the north and south frontages and two each on the west and east (Figure 5).

As noted by journalist James M. Hutchings, by December of 1849 cloth tents and houses had sprung up “as if by magic” when the “linen city” (named for the vast array of canvas tents) was swept away by fire at a loss of about $200,000. A new and cleaner linen city, with a few wooden buildings, was soon erected in its place. By the following spring most of the cloth houses had been replaced by wooden structures and the city grew “substantially in importance” (Olmstead 1962:378).
By 1850 the population had increased to 5,000, the bustling city was incorporated and had become the county seat (Gudde 1969:321-322; Hoover et al. 1990:348).

The same year that Stockton was incorporated, Charles Weber was married to Helen Murphy, the daughter of Martin Murphy, Sr., who had come to California overland with the Murphy-Stevens Party in 1846 and settled in the Santa Clara Valley. The newlyweds made their residence in a large adobe and redwood house recently completed on “Weber Point.” Three children were born to the family: Charles M. in 1851, Julia in 1853, and Thomas Jefferson in 1855. All were to be involved with Stockton and its development for the remainder of their lives.

A fire in 1851 nearly destroyed the entire city, at a loss of $1,500,000, with the result that a large number of the rebuilt structures were constructed of brick and stone. Successive fires in 1850, 1851, 1856, and 1862, which burned the tents and frame buildings, created a need for more permanent structures and brick and stone establishments were soon constructed in the commercial district, situated around Hunter Square and the Court House. A new city hall was erected in 1852, as well as the south wing of what became the State Asylum for the Insane (Olmstead 1962:378).

When the Belgian argonaut Jean-Nicolas Perlot revisited Stockton in 1857 after an absence of seven years, he remarked upon its improvements:

It (the city) was already populated by twenty to twenty-five thousand inhabitants, had superb streets, drawn on the square (tires au cardeau), cutting each other at right angles, sixty feet wide with sidewalks twelve feet wide, and bordered by houses of two and three stories. But all this was of wood, even the sidewalks, even the pavements; some houses, however, formed an exception: some were of brick, others of iron. In the evening, gas lighted everything, the telegraph tied the city on one side to Sacramento, on the other to San Francisco. I marveled at everything I saw there: how many changes in seven years! [Perlot 1985:313].

By 1859 when journalist James Mason Hutchings visited the city he noted two daily newspapers, four public schools, four private seminaries, a fire department, and “Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Catholic, Methodist Episcopal South, First and Second Baptist, Jewish Synagogue, German Methodist, and African Methodist” churches (Olmstead 1962:378). Stockton was indeed a melting pot. (Figure 6).

Weber, ever a firm believer in the future of his burgeoning community, set up a real estate business and continued advertising lots for sale. By the early 1860s, however, with final confirmation of his land grant received, only three of the seventeen public blocks given to the city had been developed (Shebl 1993:111). Determined to develop a city modeled on the foreign cities he had known, Weber was often stymied by difficulties arising from squatters settling on his land, financial difficulties resulting from the defense of his title, the failure of his efforts to improve conditions resulting from floods, and the lack of money in the city treasury to enable his plans to go forward (Shebl 1993:112).
Weber’s legacy, however, has given Stockton its wide streets, city parks, civic monuments, and numerous churches. As described by his longtime secretary, L. M. Cutting:

He gave all the park sites within the old city limits in order that the people might enjoy the open air and have breathing places in the heart of the city during all the coming generations. He donated sites to all the churches, regardless of creed, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Catholics and all the other congregations organized at that time. He gave the Jewish People their cemetery, It did not make any difference to him what creed or faith people held. He served them all alike.

He gave the county the site for the court house, the city its waterfront, the ground for the fire houses and other public buildings [1923 edition of the Stockton Record, in Shebl 1993:113].

When Taylor revisited Stockton ten years later he described the “Broad, cheerful, watered streets, suburban gardens, neat churches, and a glimpse of shipping in the tide-water slough” (Taylor 1951:127). Perhaps Weber’s success was greater than he knew.

**Residential Development**

Residential development in Stockton was first scattered throughout the downtown core, with homes interspersed with business establishments and spreading north, east, and south. By the mid-1860s, however, separate residential neighborhoods began to be developed as the Weber family sold off more and more of its landholdings. Most of the original homes were one and two-story frame dwellings with gable roofs, surrounded by trees, wooden fences, and with sheds, stables, and privies in the rear yards (Koch 1870; Sanborn 1883, 1895; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat 1867).

With a high water table as an abundant source of the precious resource, Stockton soon sprouted numerous windmills, earning the sobriquet “The Windmill City.” Within the Site 2 South Project area, the R.F. Wilson Wind Mill and Tank Manufactory Company was established on the southwest corner of Lincoln and Main streets, while numerous residences sported both attached and separate windmills (Sanborn 1883, 1895).

Beginning in the 1860s, the city commenced work on civic improvements. By 1867 Stockton possessed ten schools, fourteen churches, and three volunteer fire companies. Public works, such as graveling and grading city streets, as well as the construction of two turnpikes leading from town cost over $200,000 in 1867 (Minnick 1988:126). During another round of civic improvements in the mid-1880s and continuing through the 1890s, the Board of Public Works instituted a program of street improvements and sewer work throughout Stockton, resulting in the elimination of separate privies and the graveling of streets (Sanborn 1917; Stockton Evening Mail, November 15, 1897).

**South of the Channel**

The residential area within the Site 2 South began to be developed during the mid-1860s, with homes constructed on Blocks H, I, and M by 1870 (City Directory 1871; Koch 1870;
Over the succeeding years, the slough which had traversed the area was filled in and homes constructed on Blocks K, N, and O (as well as others without the Project area) by the 1890s (City Directories 1888, 1893, 1900-1; Sanborn 1883, 1895). (Figure 7).

The residences in the area were both owner and tenant occupied; with some local homeowners owning several nearby rental homes. Most of the occupants were families, with blue-collar and lower-middle class white-collar workers predominating. Many worked in the nearby grain and woolen mills, as clerks and laborers, and several were associated with the adjacent shipping industries. Those who resided in the neighborhood were of mixed ethnicity, with Anglo-American, European, Italian, Irish, German, and other nationalities residing side by side (City Directories 1883-4, 1888, 1893, 1900-1; San Joaquin County Assessment Plats 1881, 1895, 1901).

The only exception to this pattern, located immediately south of the Project lands, was the Colored School, established on the southeast corner of Washington and Monroe streets in 1868. The school was operated until 1874 by the Reverend Jeremiah Sanderson, an eastern-born Black minister-schoolteacher Miss Susie Baxter succeeded Henderson as teacher and continued until the school was closed in 1879. Most of the black families who resided in the neighborhood built their churches and residences south of Washington Street. In 1904 the Monroe School, designed by Louis Stone (who later designed many of the buildings at the University of the Pacific), was built on the site. The first Mission-Revival style school to be constructed in Stockton, it was planned to be the best school in the city, and to provide for the poorest children in the worst neighborhood (Bonta and Spencer 1981:35-36; Donald Walker 1999).

During the 1880s and 1890s the area on the southern edge of the channel began to be industrialized, with large grain mills and warehouses constructed on the waterfront, and lumber yards and manufacturing plants nearby. Neighborhoods marched northward from the Stockton Channel, into areas of former farmland. The lots in the Site 2 South area, however, continued primarily in residential use until the 1940s industrialization of the entire channel area caused an exodus of families. By the 1950s the neighborhoods had declined dramatically and numerous inroads had been made by local industries (Sanborn 1946, 1950). The Crosstown Freeway project and redevelopment efforts have totally eliminated all the pre-1950s structures within Project boundaries.

TRANSPORTATION

From its inception Stockton was, and remains so today, the central transportation hub of the San Joaquin Valley. From Gold Rush years, when it was the transhipment point for goods and people from the waterways to the foothills, until its present role as the Valley’s major agricultural shipping point, Stockton has played host to numerous shipping, freighting, staging, railroading, and automobile and trucking services.
The Inland Waterway: Shipping

From Asia, Europe, Australia, and the Eastern United States, cargoes of people and goods were shipped to San Francisco’s deep-water port for transport to the mines. With virtually no interior roadways, the inland waterways of the Sacramento and San Joaquin deltas became the primary mode of transportation to the interior of California.

The inland port city of Stockton, located at the terminus of a waterway navigable to San Francisco, was, for the first fifteen years of its existence, the logical depot for all freight and passenger traffic between the coast and mining communities in Calaveras, Tuolumne, Merced, Mariposa, and Fresno counties. As its boosters touted, the “Gateway to the Southern Mines” rapidly developed as a supply and shipping center from the head of navigation on the San Joaquin River to the mining districts. Goods, food, supplies, equipment, machinery, and men were transported from the port of San Francisco through San Francisco Bay and the Carquinez Strait up the San Joaquin River to the Stockton Channel for transshipment to pack trains, stages, and freight wagons. As one of the three main interior towns of northern California—which included Sacramento and Marysville—Stockton shared a proximity to the gold fields and easy water access to San Francisco Bay.

When former soldier and converted miner James Carson returned to Stockton in May 1849, a year after his first visit, he remarked upon the changes that had come over the city:

The spiral masts of barques, brigs, and schooners were seen high pointed in the blue vault above--while the merry “ye ho” of the sailor could be heard, as box, bale, and barrel were landed on the banks of the slough. A rush and whirl of noisy human beings were continually before the eye. The magic want of gold had been shaken over a desolate place, and on it a vast city had arose at the bidding [Carson 1991:19].

In December of that same year a writer remarked that:

Stockton is situated on a slough of the same name, three miles from San Joaquin River, and seventy miles from New-York of the Pacific. The slough is navigable for steamers and barges of four hundred tons. The location is excellent, embracing the peninsula between the two principal sloughs, and extends south to Mormon Slough. Population about 3,000. It contains some good buildings, and presents the appearance of considerable business activity. It is the great depot for the southern mining region, and is destined to be a place of much importance [William A. Jackson, Appendix to the Map of the Mining District of California, in Perkins 1964:92].

Although sailing vessels were the first to access the inland ports, by mid-1849 numerous steamers and paddle wheelers were plying the waters between San Francisco and the Great Central Valley, completing the journey in seven to twelve hours. First-class passengers paid 25 cents for a cabin, while steerage cost 10 cents and freight from 30 to 40 dollars per thousand board feet for lumber (Minnick 1988:30). By April of 1850 steamers were
leaving regularly from San Francisco to Stockton, and returning at the same rate (Perkins 1964:148).

The accounts of diarists and others during the first years of the Gold Rush attest to the flotillas of abandoned ships lining Stockton’s Channel, a problem that became so acute in 1850 that the merchants of the community petitioned Captain Weber to dispose of them. He accordingly had them towed them to Mormon Slough where they were burned.

By the mid-1850s, a consolidation of the earlier shipping lines resulted in the formation of the California Steam Navigation Company, which thereafter dominated traffic on California’s inland waterways. Nelson Anderson’s California Transportation Company also ran a line of steamers from San Francisco and Stockton beginning in 1856 (Guinn 1909:327). In March 1856 alone, two ships of the California Steam Navigation Company unloaded 2,598 tons of freight at Stockton, including: 235,000 feet of lumber; 50,000 shingles; and 4,000 bricks, during a period when as many as ten steamers made thrice-weekly runs between San Francisco and Stockton. Goods brought to Stockton on these vessels were taken by draymen to brick warehouses owned by Stockton commission merchants, who then hired local teamsters to transport the goods quickly to merchants in mountain locations.

In 1860 the population in the Southern Mines was over 100,000, and all of their food, clothing, tools, machinery, building materials, and furniture were shipped from San Francisco by way of Stockton. In 1867 the Stockton harbormaster’s annual log showed 619 steamers and 447 sailing vessels entering Stockton’s port and carrying a total of 147,000 tons of freight and passengers. Throughout the Civil War years, the bulk of the outgoing goods consisted of copper from the mines in Calaveras County, as well as grain and cord wood (Minnick 1988:126).

**Mud and Dust: Trails, Roads, and Freighting**

The transportation hub of Stockton, located at the head of Stockton Channel, quickly developed as the center of the freight and warehouse business. Livery stables, shipping companies, freight companies, stage lines, carriage makers, blacksmiths, railroad stations, and warehouses were established north, south, and east of the channel terminus.

Radiating eastward like spokes in a wheel, the earliest roads from Stockton reached into the Sierra Nevada foothills to the numerous gold camps and supply centers in the California Mother Lode. At first, following established Indian trails into the mountains, men on foot, horseback, and pack trains traversed the plains and gentle slopes into the steep river canyons. Soon enterprising stagers and freighters established a series of improved routes to the Southern Mines, most of which were later accepted into the state highway system.

About 200 tons of freight were weekly packed on mules from Stockton to Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and Tulare counties. Each train had 40 or 50 mules, mostly Mexican,
each carrying from 300 to 350 pounds, and traveling 25 to 35 miles per day (Olmstead 1962:114). Visitor Bayard Taylor described the colorful scene in 1849:

All the roads from Stockton to the mines were filled with *atajos* of mules, laden with freight. They were mostly owned by Americans, many of them by former trappers and mountaineers, but the packers and drivers were Mexicans, and the *aparejos* [pack saddles] and *alforjas* [saddle bags] of the mules were of the same fashion as those which, for three hundred years past, have been seen on the hills of Granada and the Andalusian plains. With good mule-trains and experienced packers, the business yielded as much as the richest diggings [Taylor 1988:75-76].

As the mining population expanded, so did demands for food, mining supplies, and other merchandise. Wheeled vehicles were needed to deliver these materials to the developing towns, from where outlying camps and inaccessible mining districts were served by pack trains. From the head of Stockton Channel, stage lines and freight services spread out over the plains and into the mining regions. The California Stage Company consolidated most of the numerous small stage companies by 1854. The Concord coach, made at the Abbott, Downing & Company factory in Concord, New Hampshire, reached the peak of its utility by becoming the major carrier of goods to the foothills.

Wagon roads from the Southern Mines’ principal source of supply at Stockton were at first few and difficult. The life of a teamster in those early years was extremely disagreeable, as the grading of these earliest roads left much to be desired. They were narrow and rough, incredibly dusty in summer, and full of mudholes in winter. Long detours were necessary around winter quagmires. A traveler who survived the stagecoach trip from Sonora to Stockton in the late summer of 1851 described the journey through the foothills as being fairly pleasant traveling, but went on to recount that:

...the most wretched part of the journey was when we reached the plains. The earth was scorched and baked, the heat was more oppressive than in the mountains, and for about thirty miles we moved along enveloped in a cloud of dust, which soaked into one’s clothes and hair and skin as it had been a liquid substance. On our arrival in Stockton we were of a uniform colour all over—all identity of person was lost as much as in a party of chimney-sweeps...[Borthwick 1948:307].

The fastest way to transport goods to the mountains was in a large wagon holding from five to eight tons of freight and drawn by sixteen mules. Fall was the busiest season for teamsters, since mountain storekeepers were obliged to lay in winter stocks before snow made travel difficult. During this season roads to the mines were so crowded that on one occasion as many as 70 freight wagons were counted within fifteen miles of one another along the Sonora Road.

In 1859 James M. Hutchings described the traffic:

One of the principal features connected with the commerce of this city, is the number of large freight wagons; laden for the mines; these have, not
inappropriately, been denominated “Prairie Schooners,” and “Steamboats of the Plains.” Some of these have carried as high as 32,000 pounds of freight [Olmstead 1962:379].

The 1852 Stockton Directory lists six commission merchants, seventeen draymen and eight teamsters, while the 1856 Directory lists double those numbers. Most of the firms found in these directories maintained offices and warehouses along the Weber Avenue levee between Centre and Commerce Streets. Several ethnic groups were prominent in the freighting business: Mexicans were most often in charge of mule pack trains while Italians J. D. Peters and the Capurro bothers, Irishman D. J. Oullahan, African-American Moses Hamilton, and others drove mule-powered freight wagons. While most of the commission merchants were Euro-American, Stockton historian George Tinkham noted that the Chinese had their own Stockton merchant, “China John,” who chartered all mule teams delivering goods to Chinese miners (Donald Walker 1999).

Within Site 1 Project boundaries, early enterprises catering to the travel and freight business included the Joseph Hansel carriage manufactory and Stockton Milk Depot on Hunter Street (Block 70 2/3, Lot 15), the Willows Brewery Depot on Miner Avenue (Block 70 2/3, Lot 8), and Johnson’s Livery on the corner of El Dorado and Miner (Block 70 2/3, Lot 2). North of the channel, were located the transfer sheds of M. K. Bell and the City Storage company. By the mid-1890s, these buildings were occupied by the Union Transfer Company’s freight warehouse (Figure 8) and in the 1910s by the California Transfer Company’s freight shed (Sanborn 1888, 1894, 1917).

Roads to the Mines

By the early 1850s numerous roads had been established from Stockton to all the major mining districts in the Southern Mines, and to Sacramento, the largest internal city in California. Spreading north, east, and south from the inland port, the roads earned different sobriquets over their years of operation, defining their destinations during each period of time. Although roads were subsequently altered somewhat, and re-engineered in modern times, they essentially follow the original Gold Rush era routes to a remarkable degree. (Except as otherwise noted, information on early roads was obtained from Hoover et al. 1966).

The Mokelumne Hill Road (Old Calaveras/Linden Road/Highway 26), along the Calaveras River, was the earliest and most traveled route to the mines. It served camps along the way, camps on the Mokelumne River to the north, and Angels and Murphys camps through a branch stretching south from San Andreas. Another branch of the road passed through Jenny Lind and Salt Spring Valley, where it connected with the Stanislaus ferry roads (Fuller, Marvin, and Costello 1996:9). In the early years of its operation, when the Calaveras River crossing was made at the Davis and Atherton Ferry, 17 public houses lined the road.

The Waterloo Road (Lockeford Road/Highway 88) coursed northeasterly from Stockton through the community of Waterloo to Lockeford, laid out on the Locke ranch in 1859. Dr.
Dean J. Locke had erected a log cabin there in 1851, envisioning the community as the future head of navigation on the Mokelumne River. Although he never fulfilled his dream, the road through Lockeford became one of the most important routes from Stockton to Amador and Calaveras counties, continuing northerly to Jackson (present Highway 88) and branching easterly to Valley Springs and San Andreas (Highway 12). By the mid-1850s, it had supplanted the Mokelumne Hill/Old Calaveras Road as the major route to the northern diggings in Calaveras County.

The Copperopolis and Milton Road (Antelope Trail/Stanislaus Trail/Old Stockton Trail/Highway 4) was the most direct route from Stockton to the Stanislaus Diggings, known in these early years as the Old Antelope Trail. Its use was promoted by Calaveras County Sheriff Ben Marshall in 1849, through Antelope Ranch (Marshall’s) to Rock Creek, Salt Spring Valley, and over Bear Mountain to Angels Camp, Murphys, and the Stanislaus River ferries to Sonora and Jamestown (Fuller, Marvin, and Costello 1996:9). After copper was discovered at the present site of Copperopolis in 1860, the road was rerouted through that burgeoning community and over the Angels Road to the higher camps (Highway 4).

The Sonora Road to Knight’s Ferry, soon superseded the Old Stockton Trail to the upper Stanislaus River ferries. Established in 1849 by William Knight, the ferry was in use as early as 1850 by thousands of miners. From Knights Ferry the road continued easterly to Chinese Camp, Woods Creek Diggings (Jamestown), Sonora, and Columbia (Highway 108). In later years the Sonora Road was renamed the Farmington Road, for the community that developed at its crossroads with the Escalon-Bellota Road. The first stopping place at what was to become Farmington was the “Oregon Tent,” established by Nathaniel Harrold, who purchased the Oregon Ranch in 1852, building a large brick house there in 1862.

The Mariposa Road, radiating southeast from Stockton, and also known as Lone Tree Road, was the main route to the Mariposa and Coulterville mines in the earliest years. In 1850, Dr. L. R. Chalmers, who settled at the site of Collegeville by 1850, persuaded the government teams en route to Fort Miller to pass by his establishment, thus ensuring its success. Numerous waystations, ranches, and small settlements grew up at intersections and branches along its route, as enterprising settlers established stores and stopping places for hungry and weary travelers to the Tuolumne River ferries.

The French Camp and Sonora Road, a wet-weather route to Sonora, was declared a public highway on December 3, 1850. It proceeded southeast across Township 1 South, Ranges 7 and 8 East to Atlanta, then due east toward the county line (eventually passing the twentieth century town of Escalon), and finally heading south again to cross the Stanislaus River at Riverbank—a course followed more or less exactly by modern Highway 120. In 1852 the only building on this road between French Camp and Heath and Emory’s Ferry on the Stanislaus was the Zinc House west of Atlanta. Even though not more than one-sixth of all the land on this route was occupied or under cultivation as late as 1859, the road was much appreciated since the sandy soil on which it was laid permitted
teams to pass in winters when other routes to the mines became adobe quagmires (Donald Walker 1999).

The San Joaquin County leg of the Upper Sacramento Road was approved June 10, 1851 by the County Court of Sessions. It proceeded north from the intersection of American and Miner streets in Stockton, crossing the Calaveras River at Simpson’s Ranch and the Mokelumne River at Weston and Staples’ Ranch (east of modern Highway 99) to the county line. The Court ordered (in 1852) that the road be one hundred feet wide (Donald Walker 1999).

The Lower Sacramento Road segment within San Joaquin County was approved June 10, 1851 at the instigation of Charles M. Weber and Thomas Baker. This route left Stockton via Beaver (later Madison) Street, proceeding north through the lands of C. M. Weber, crossing the Calaveras River at a place called “Sly’s” and again proceeding north just west of the timber along Bear Creek (present Micke Grove) to a ferry on the Mokelumne River known as “Benedict’s” (east of Cherokee Lane). The road then proceeded northwest to a place on the east bank of the Mokelumne known as “Davis’s” and then due north to the county line at Liberty. This route was later modified through the initiative of Jeremiah Woods, founder of the town of Woodbridge, who erected a bridge at his townsite (1853) and influenced the County Supervisors to direct the road’s course from the Calaveras River due north to Woodbridge (Donald Walker 1999).

Cherokee Lane was declared a public road June 5, 1861. It commenced at the Mokelumne River on the dividing line between Ranges 6 and 7 of the state land survey and proceeded southward to the Calaveras River where it joined the Upper Sacramento Road (Donald Walker 1999).

The Transportation Miracle: Railroads

The coming of the railroad was to forever alter California’s established transportation patterns, replacing the huge freight and pack teams. Stockton, however, retained its position as one of the most important interior towns of California, shipping wheat, grains, nuts, fruit, and other crops to the cities and towns of California and the eastern United States, while importing hard goods and luxury items from worldwide markets. While the railroads reached up and down the valley, and even as far east as Milton by 1871 and Valley Springs by 1884, freight and stage lines still departed the port city daily for the more distant and less accessible regions.

The history of the Central, Southern, and Western Pacific Railroads has been recounted at length elsewhere, and will not be repeated here, but those lines have played an important role in the history of Stockton and the development of the central San Joaquin Valley. As the transportation hub of the region, Stockton was immensely attractive to the railroad entrepreneurs of the state. Almost immediately after the opening of the transcontinental link, completed in May of 1869, plans were afoot to extend the line to Stockton.
On August 12, 1869, the Central Pacific’s “Governor Stanford” entered Stockton from Sacramento, the first excursion train to the city over the newly-laid rails. By the first week of September the extension of the line had been completed from Sacramento, through Stockton, to Oakland and the port city had true transcontinental rail service (Wood and Covello 1977:27).

Although Stockton was the major city of the area, the first diversion point for the railroad was established at Lathrop, due to a dispute over free land for the station. The Central Pacific soon capitulated, building three consecutive passenger stations in downtown Stockton. The first Central Pacific depot was located on Sacramento Street, between Market and Washington streets. Taken over by the Southern Pacific in 1884, the railroad continued to serve the city. In 1909 the Southern Pacific constructed a new station, in the shingle style, one mile south of the present brick structure (located east of Aurora Street on the west side of the tracks, between Miner and Channel), which was completed in 1930 (Wood and Covello 1977:36).

In addition to the Central Pacific/Southern Pacific line, Stockton boasted two other transcontinental railroads. The Santa Fe Railroad Company purchased the San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railroad in 1898 and built their Mission Revival station south and west of the Southern Pacific site, their tracks running in parallel lines north and south through the community. In 1909 the Western Pacific purchased the Salt Lake City and San Francisco Line, thus establishing Stockton as a major railroad center in California.

When a large deposit of copper was found in the foothills east of Stockton in 1860, the mining boomtown of Copperopolis was created almost overnight. Throughout the Civil War as many as 6000 tons of copper ore per month was shipped through Stockton from the Calaveras foothills, and entrepreneurs like pharmacist E. S. Holden decided that this freight traffic could be handled more cheaply by rail. Holden and his partners achieved a railroad right-of-way by 1867, and by 1870 trains were proceeding from the Stockton & Copperopolis Railroad depot (corner of Weber and Center) east on Weber Avenue and out into the countryside. Unfortunately, when the demand for copper diminished with the end of the War, the rail line nearly failed. It was later acquired by the Southern Pacific Railroad (1888) and its depot and Weber Avenue tracts were subsequently removed at city expense in 1901. Within a year, however, local investors began a standard gauge trolley line on Weber, between Center and Aurora. This street railway was operated between 1906 and 1940 by the Central California Traction Company, which also offered electric rail service from Stockton to Lodi and Sacramento (Donald Walker 1999).

Proposed railroad developments in Stockton include the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission’s plan to rehabilitate the Southern Pacific Railroad Depot building for use as the Stockton Multimodal Station for commuter services, and the Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company’s proposal to construct an intermodal container and trailer transportation facility west of Jack Tone Road, southeast of Stockton.

A Modern Machine: The Automobile
It was the automobile, however, that would most dramatically alter the nineteenth-century character of Stockton. The twentieth century brought the advent of the automobile and the need for good roads. In response, numerous Good Road clubs were formed in California in the 1910s and the years following World War I to improve the infrastructure. Shipping, freighting, and railroading were quickly supplanted by car and truck transportation, as the American public took to the roadways in droves in the 1920s. Although the transformation didn’t take place overnight, Stockton’s commercial center began to erode—spreading north and east, as did its expanding neighborhoods.

Within the Site 1 Project Area, the Hansel and Ortman automobile dealership and garage was opened in 1914 on the block between El Dorado, Hunter, Miner and Channel streets (Block 70 2/3). The enterprise eventually took up the entire block, with salesrooms, facilities for auto repair, painting, upholstery, electrical, and fueling (Sanborn 1917). Founded by wheelwright Joseph Hansel as a carriage manufactory by the early 1870s, the company took over the firm of Muell and Salbach in 1908 and formed the Hansel and Ortman auto dealership, selling Rios and Cadillacs. By the early 1920s the firm had 75 employees, was selling Oldsmobiles and Cadillacs, and were the primary dealers for San Joaquin, Tuolumne, Calaveras, and Amador counties (Tinkham 1923:1163-1164).

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

By 1854 Stockton had become the fourth largest town in California, and its population, as well as the vast hordes of people pouring through its doors, required numerous goods and services to sustain them. Business establishments were erected almost overnight, in tents (as was Weber’s first store) to begin with, but as the market and the city grew, frame, brick, and wooden buildings were constructed to house the merchants and commercial services. As is true for port cities, the first establishments in Stockton tended to be those which catered to travelers: liveries and stables, hotels and lodging houses, restaurants, bathhouses, saloons, and dry goods and produce stores. Situated at the head of the Stockton Channel, the land now occupied by Site 1, was rapidly developed in response to these needs.

Hotels and Lodging Houses

One of the first hotels in the area was the Stockton House (later St. Charles Hotel), begun in the fall of 1849 and completed the following year by Messrs. Doak, Bonsell, and Scott at a cost of $75,000). Located on the southeast corner of Channel and El Dorado (facing El Dorado), the three-story frame building was the first luxury hotel in Stockton. Visiting dignitaries, including Jacob Bachman in 1851 and Horace Greeley in 1859, stayed there when passing through the city. Renamed the St. Charles in 1854, it was the first building in Stockton to have gas lights (1859) installed. Running water was provided in 1861 because the mosquito problem was so bad in the area that it was thought discourteous to oblige guests to use an outside pump for bathing and ablutions. The hotel had become a boarding house by the time it burned to the ground on November 21, 1871 (Stockton Evening Herald, November 22, 1871; Donald Walker 1999).
The Hotel de Mexico, built by Colonel Frank Cheatham was erected in 1849 on the east side of the alley bisecting the block bounded by Channel Street and Bridge Place (the early name) (Block 63 3/4, Lot 2). It was replaced in the 1850s or 1860s by Joseph Breidenbach’s Philadelphia House. Guinn, in his history of Stockton published in 1909, mentions that the Philadelphia House was constructed by Breidenbach in 1871, but this appears to be in error as by 1867 Breidenbach was listed as the owner of the rooming house and saloon, and it was depicted in an 1870 lithograph as a two-story building facing Bridge, with a three-story section facing Channel (City Directory 1867, Koch 1870). As the structure was damaged, but not destroyed, in the fire of the adjacent St. Charles Hotel in 1871, this date appears to reflect a refurbishment of the building rather than a construction date (Stockton Evening Herald, November 22, 1871).

Joseph Breidenbach, a furniture maker and native of Germany, arrived in Stockton in 1860 from New York. The following year he was married to Marie Muench, a native of New York, in San Francisco. During the early 1870s the family was joined by Frank Breidenbach (presumably a brother), a cabinet maker, and were residing in the building with their children, Joseph, Jr., Louis, and Anna. Joseph retired in 1884 and the couple traveled to Europe and New York, leaving Joseph Spengeman in charge as proprietor of the hotel. In 1888, however, Breidenbach was again listed as the proprietor of the establishment, but by the early 1890s the couple and son Louis had moved to a residence on San Joaquin Avenue, where Joseph was now listed as a “capitalist” (City Directories 1871-72, 1883-4, 1888, 1893; Koch 1870; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat Maps 1867, 1881, 1901).

Joseph died in 1907, Marie in 1908, and in 1909 the old Philadelphia House was converted to the B&K Store, operated by Joseph Breidenbach, Jr., and remodeled in the then popular Mission or Spanish Eclectic style (Guinn 1909:324-325). By the 1930s the complex was known as the B&M Building, for owners Joseph Breidenbach, Jr., and Alexander McDonald. It now houses the State of California Department of Corrections.

On the block north of these hostelries were located the French Hotel, established by the early 1850s, and the Ohio House, located on the corner of Miner and Hunter (Block 70 2/3, Lot 11). The French Hotel was occupied by Chinese by the early 1850s and consumed in the fire of 1862, but the Ohio Rooming House, built in the 1880s and mentioned as “one of the old reliable rooming houses, with pleasant desirable rooms and recently renovated,” was operated by Mrs. M. I. Vignola in the mid-1890s (Dakin 1895). It was still in operation, with stores on the lower floor and lodgings on the upper through the 1910s; Mary E Howell/Collier was the owner during those years (Sanborn 1895, 1917; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat Maps 1895, 1901). By the 1940s it had been replaced by a tire service business (Sanborn 1946).

Located at the head of the Stockton Channel, on a segment of reclaimed slough, the Capital Lodging House was constructed in the early 1880s (Block 63 3/4, Lot 4, west end). Of wood frame construction with metal roof and siding, it was soon named the “Tin House.” The lower story housed meat, sausage, and cobbler shops and a saloon, with lodgings on the upper floor (City Directory 1893; Sanborn 1895). The building was
demolished before 1908, when the Hotel Stockton, the grandest hostelry in town, was completed.

The Hotel Stockton, a five-story reinforced concrete building built in the “Spanish Renaissance style with Mission arcades,” was financed by the Stockton Investment Company. At the time of its construction, it was considered a “monument to the enterprise of the people of Stockton who subscribed a half million dollars as an endowment to provide comfort and extend hospitality to the guests who enter the city.” The $500,000 structure opened to the public on April 10, 1910, and soon became the social center of the city, with “unequaled facilities,” including banquet and ball rooms, assembly rooms, and sample rooms (Martin 1955:111; Stockton Hotel Brochure). Constructed initially to take advantage of the river traffic, the hotel also benefited from the nearby railroading and freighting enterprises. The hotel also accommodated the automobile by providing garage facilities for its customers (Figure 9).

As the years went by and the neighborhood’s desirability as a residential area declined, some residences were operated as boarding establishments. These included a frame dwelling on the southeast corner of El Dorado and Miner owned by Louis Waggenmann (Block 70 2/3, Lot 1), and a two-story frame duplex located on Miner Avenue occupied as furnished rooms and owned by attorneys J. M. Hogan and J. M. Kile (Block 70 2/3, Lot 9) (Sanborn 1883, 1895, 1917; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat Maps 1881, 1895, 1901).

Fraternal Organizations

Several fraternal organizations were established in Stockton in the early days: Masonic, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Druids. The Masonic Order purchased the old Stockton House/St. Charles Hotel property in 1875, evidently taking over the City Hotel (which had been constructed after the St. Charles burned) and using it for its facilities. In 1883 the lodge constructed a new three-story brick Temple. Retail businesses and offices were located on the lower floors, while the lodge rooms and Music Hall were located on the upper stories. At various times the post office, a glove factory, book bindery, and other offices and stores rented space from the order (City Directory 1883, 1895; Sanborn 1883, 1895, 1917; San Joaquin Assessment Plat Maps 1895, 1901). The building was demolished in 1933 and by the 1940s a tire sales and service building was constructed on the site (Sanborn 1946).

Retail Establishments

The most important, and long-lasting, retail establishment within the Site 1 Area was the Hansel Grocery. It was established as the Pioneer Grocery in 1850 in a one-story brick building on the southwest corner of Hunter and Channel Streets (Block 63 3/4, Lot 3) The business was purchased, in 1862, by Louis Hansel, a native of New York and descendant of German immigrants. By 1867 Hansel had added a second story, leasing it to the Druids for their meeting hall, and was operating his business as Hansel and Wollner’s Grocery (City Directory 1867; Stockton Evening Herald, November 22, 1871). Hansel’s business
was mostly involved in trade with freighters for the mining regions until the railroads usurped his customers in 1869-1870.

Hansel was evidently quite successful at his trade, for by the mid-1880s all the lots from Channel to Bridge facing Hunter were covered with the two-story brick Hansel Block. In 1890 the *Stockton Independent* newspaper moved to the Hansel Building, which by then was also occupied by a harness shop. During the 1890s the grocery business was operated by Hansel & Strohmeier. Although Hansel and his wife Katerina, with whom he raised six children, traveled extensively in Europe in the early 1890s, he continued to operate the business until his death in 1907 (Lewis Publishing Company 1890:421-422). In 1917 the *Stockton Independent* moved to a new location, and most of the building was vacated. The entire block was remodeled in the 1930s; the lower story rented for retail businesses, while the upper story was composed of rented rooms, with access from Bridge Street (Sanborn 1946; Yardley n.d.). It is now known as the Orlando Building.

Other long-standing business in the area were located in the two-story brick building on the northwest corner of Channel and Hunter (Block 70 2/3, Lot 12) and occupied as a residence by Charles and Catherine Brutschy from at least 1867. Brutschy, a saloonkeeper by trade, operated the Old Lodge Saloon on Main Street and the Courthouse Exchange with a man named Esbach. By 1888 Brutschy was deceased and the building was assessed to his wife. During the 1880s the lower corner story was occupied as the Depot Saloon, operated at that time by John Hoerl and in the 1890s by Henry Rohrbacher of the Willows Brewery. The adjoining storefront was occupied by Frank Sievers as a meat market (City Directories 1871-72; 1883-4, 1888, 1900-1; Sanborn 1883, 1895, 1917; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat Maps 1867, 1881, 1895, 1901). During the 1940s tenants of the building included a restaurant and store (Sanborn 1946).

Other occupants of Block 70 2/3 included the 1890s Stockton Milk Dairy on 225-231 Hunter Street (Lot 15) which was occupied by Mowrey’s Livery and Feed in the 1910s. During the 1890s Willows Brewery Depot and Bottling Works, owned by Henry Rohrbacher, operated on the north side of Channel Street (Lot 8). Two Chinese laundries, discussed in the chapter below on Chinese ethnicity, were also located on the block (Lots 16 and 6) (Sanborn 1895, 1917). By the 1940s all the individual enterprises had been subsumed by the Hansel and Ortman automobile business (Sanborn 1946).

One of the most unusual establishments within the Project Area were the Weber Baths, built in 1883 on the future site of the Stockton Hotel (Block 63 3/4, Lot 4, central portion). Known originally as “Weber Hole,” the block was reclaimed from a slough at the head of the Stockton Channel. The swimming tank, which varied from three to eight feet in depth, was 32 feet wide by 75 feet long and heated by a gas well located beneath the Court House. The facility had 42 dressing rooms, several diving platforms, and was originally lighted by gas and then by electric arc lamps (Martin 1955:130). The baths, as well as the adjoining fruit store, coal yard, nursery, and “Tin House” were all demolished before the construction of the Stockton Hotel in 1908.
Grain and Industry

It was agriculture rather than gold, however, that was to provide for the long-term development and success of the inland port. In describing the inducements for settling in the “Tulare Plains,” in 1850 James Carson noted the agricultural opportunities of the fruitful valleys, as well as remarking that “The rivers are highways to market, for all the produce raised in this section of country, and Stockton a market house for its reception” (Carson 1991:70).

By the time Charles Nordhoff published his guide to California in the early 1870s, the entire landscape between Stockton and Merced, 600 square miles, was planted in wheat. He described the scene:

The railroad train runs through what appears to be an interminable wheat-field, with small houses and barns at great distances apart, and no fences, except those by which the company has guarded its trains against the cattle, which are turned into the fields after harvest to glean the grain and consume the stubble.

Wheat, wheat, wheat, and nothing but wheat, is what you see on your journey, as far as the eye can reach over the plain in every direction. Fields of two, three, and four thousand acres make but small farms; here is a man who “has in” 20,000 acres; here one with 40,000 acres, and another with some still more preposterous amount—all in wheat [Nordhoff 1973:182].

By the 1880s Stockton had become the wheat-processing center of the state, which led the nation in grain production, with the Sperry Flour Company on the Embarcadero the largest mill in California. The Crown Mills and others were located nearby. Stockton’s merchants, manufacturing companies, farmers, and flour companies provided goods and produce, as well as jobs, to local, state, and national markets. Semi-skilled and blue-collar workers found an abundance of work in these industries, as did unskilled and common laborers in railroad construction, reclamation, public works, and farm labor work.

Numerous other important industries had been established by this period of abundance, including the Stockton Woolen Mills in 1870 and the California Paper Company in 1878, both located on Lincoln Street south of Mormon Slough. During this decade four banks and three newspapers catered to the population of over 15,000. Other industries included an assortment of iron works, foundries, tanneries, and lumber and planing mills.

The earliest industries to achieve national (and international) importance, however, were those which produced agricultural equipment. The Matteson Company had made farm plows as early as 1856, while by the 1870s six major implement manufacturing companies were in business producing reapers, harvesters, and gang plows. Included among these was the Stockton Wheel Company, founded in 1883, forerunner of the Holt Manufacturing Company (Minnick 1988:126-127).
ETHNIC DIMENSION

As soon as the first ships reached Stockton from San Francisco, men from virtually all countries of the world rushed through the inland port on their way to the mines. Many enterprising individuals, however, quickly decided that it would be more profitable to establish businesses in the developing city. These included men, and women, from the eastern United States, Great Britain, Ireland, France, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Australia, Hawaii, and China. Many of them plied trades and enterprises learned at home, while many more took advantage of the wide-open opportunities to establish themselves in a new enterprise, often changing jobs and locations as the vagaries of commerce demanded.

Two ethnic groups predominated within the Site 1 Project boundaries in the 1850s and early 1860s: German and Chinese. Both groups built their religious and heritage centers adjacent to the Project Area and several resided within its boundaries. The only exception to this was the home of Edward and Ellen Tretheway, natives of Cornwall, and their relatives, who resided in two homes on the south side of Miner Avenue from the late 1860s through at least the early 1900s (City Directories 1872, 1884, 1895; San Joaquin County Assessment Plat Maps 1867, 1881, 1895, 1901).

German

As is the case for many patterns of migration, it may have been the Bavarian ancestry of Charles Weber that attracted so many of his countrymen to settle in Stockton. Certainly his knowledge of the language and affinity for those of his native land may have influenced the first German immigrants to stay, while they undoubtedly encouraged others of their nationality to immigrate and settle locally. The first synagogue in Stockton, completed in 1852 at a cost of $35,000, was located on Miner and Hunter streets, one block north of the Site 1 Project boundaries. In 1856 German immigrants built their Turnverein Hall on Hunter Street, adjoining the Chinese temple on its south side, across the street from Site 1. Espousing activities of mutual aid and fellowship, the Turnverein facility had many similarities to the Chinese joss house next door (Minnick 1988:38).

Several natives of Germany settled within the northern portion of Site 1, on the block bounded by El Dorado, Hunter, Miner, and Channel (Block 70 2/3). One of the first to build a home in the area was Louis Waggenmann, a butcher who was residing on the southeast corner of Miner and El Dorado Lot 1) by 1867, while the Rosenthal family’s house was located mid-block on Miner Avenue (Lot 7). Around the corner on Hunter, Joseph Hansel operated his carriage business (Lot 15) and Charles and Catherine Brutschy resided in the upper story of their commercial building on the corner of Channel (Lot 12) (Brutschy operated the Old Lodge Saloon and later the Courthouse Saloon in partnership with Mr. Esbach on Main Street). Completing the block, Louis Gerlach, a butcher, resided on Channel Street in the 1870s and 1880s (Lot 8), at the 1890s location of Henry Rohrbacher’s Willows Brewery Depot. By the turn of the century most of the families had moved away and the area had become more commercialized (Sanborn 1888, 1895;
South of Channel Street and north of Bridge Street were located two of the most prominent businesses operated by Germans in Stockton: the Pioneer Grocery of Louis Hansel (born in New York of German parentage) and the Philadelphia House operated by Joseph Briedenbach, both discussed at length above.

Chinese

By 1850, there were 53 Chinese men (no women) residing in Stockton, and hundreds more enroute to the Southern Mines passed through the city daily. Others wintered there, when the high waters in the gold districts precluded mining. Most of the original Chinese in Stockton were associated with Sze Yup and Heungshan cultural affiliations, with a few Sam Yup. All hailed from Guangdong Province in southeast China, where local political upheavals and crop failure spurred emigration, but they spoke different dialects and belonged to different cooperative systems. As in other Chinese settlements, most of the men were traders, stewards, and cooks, catering primarily to Chinese clientele (Minnick 1988:36-37). Like the first wave of most immigrant groups the Chinese were predominantly male. But unlike Europeans, the Chinese men did not send for families or brides, but sent money home to buy land and establish themselves for their eventual return.

The first Chinese quarter in Stockton, established by 1851, was located within the Site 1 Project area, in the block bounded south by Bridge, north by Channel, east by Hunter, and west by El Dorado (Block 70 2/3). A hotel, located on the corner of Hunter and Channel Street, was one of the earliest Chinese businesses in Site 1, while a former French hotel and several one-story shacks held other of their commercial concerns. The first Chinese businesses in Stockton, however, were two restaurants, located on the waterfront.

By the mid-1850s, the Chinese had become so numerous that the Heungshan colony erected a joss temple, on the east side of North Hunter Street, facing Bridge Street. In 1882 the wood frame structure was replaced by a brick building at a cost of $7,000, with an altar, sanctuary, and interior furnishings costing $5,000, the only official Chinese house of worship ever built in San Joaquin County (Figure 10). In 1923, after the difficulties between the Sze Yup and Heungshan had dissipated, the temple and artifacts were relocated to the new Chinatown, at 134 1/2 East Washington Street, where the Yeong Wo Association (Heungshan District company name) found a new home. The temple was closed during the 1960s redevelopment actions and the artifacts were sent to San Francisco (Minnick 1988:266-267).

Numerous complaints were lodged against the Chinese in the early years: overcrowding, filthy living conditions, gambling, and noisemaking. By 1854 a reform movement was unleashed in the areas surrounding Hunter Square, and the Mexican fandango houses south of Main Street were closed down. Shortly thereafter, the editor of the San Joaquin Republican wrote an editorial suggesting that the Chinese section be cleansed by hosing it
down with fire hoses. The following night, September 19, 1854, a group of men tried to wash it out with a fire pumper. The attempt failed, but the criticism continued.

Fire, which plagued all early California settlements, visited the town in 1849, 1851, and 1856. Chinatown managed to survive these, but succumbed to the 1862 fire which destroyed many of its buildings. Although the Chinese quarter was not totally demolished, the Sze Yup took the opportunity to move, leaving the Heungshan behind, and migrated south to Washington Street, between Hunter and El Dorado. The Heungshan remained near their temple in the Channel Street area.

By the 1860s Chinese laundries had been established in all the major, and most minor, towns in the west, filling a void in the growing communities. In 1885 Stockton had 24 laundries, 22 operated by Chinese. As none were located in Chinatown, they apparently catered mostly to Euro-Americans, mostly in the downtown area. While Chinese operated the laundries, the property was owned by others, several of whom were prominent citizens. In 1886 former mayor J. K. Doak collected rent from Feng Sing, Sing Wong Chung, and Woo Lee, all located in the new Chinatown.

Anti-Chinese sentiment, which culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, continued through the 1880s in Stockton, with stricter laws and controls over their activities enacted by local politicians. An attempt to ban Chinese laundries from all but the Mormon Slough area was instituted in 1885, and passed in early 1886, but was declared unconstitutional by U.S. Circuit Judge Lorenzo Sawyer. The ordinance would soon have failed on its own, however, as no “white women” took up the call to replace them (Minnick 1988:143-148).

Within Site 1 were located two long-term Chinese laundry establishments: that of Sam Lee (or Lee Sam) on Hunter Street and another on the north side of Channel Street. Nearby were located the laundry businesses of Gun Wah and Lee Tang (City Directory 1888; Sanborn 1895, 1917).

Sam Lee’s laundry fell victim to the celebration which attended the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, when his window panes were broken by a shower of cobblestones. But he was evidently well-liked by the local community for, according to the Daily Independent:

The Chinese appeared to be of the inoffensive group who attend strictly to their business and enjoy the reputation of being excellent and reliable laundymen. Such demonstrations of hoodlumism are deserving of condemnation of every law-abiding citizen [in Minnick 1988:134].

By 1920 the Chinese population had dwindled and only two laundries and the temple were extant in the Channel Street area. By the 1940s, they too had disappeared (Minnick 1988:43; Sanborn 1917, 1946). The Washington Street Chinatown was demolished for the planned Crosstown Freeway and the redevelopment actions of the 1960s.
Euro-American

Ethnicity in the Site 2 South Project area, however, was mixed from the time the first residences were constructed in the 1860s until the turn of the nineteenth century. As the second generation to settle in Stockton, those who resided in the area were natives of the United States, England, Ireland, Italy, and Germany.

BASEBALL

During the late 1880s, when baseball came of age in America, Stockton fielded one of the most important teams in California; one which also became well-known throughout the country due to Ernest Thayer’s enduring poem, *Casey at the Bat*.

Named Banner Island because Captain Weber, a staunch Unionist, flew the American Flag there during the Civil War, the site became the location of Stockton’s most famous baseball field. During the war of insurrection, local southern sympathizers once raised the Confederate flag on Weber’s 120-foot standard. Arising early the next morning, Weber took down the offending banner, balled it up and shot it through his cannon, and replaced the Stars and Stripes. By the 1880s the island had silted in, but was still undeveloped. It was, therefore, one of the few vacant tracts in central Stockton large enough to accommodate the oval field required by the rapidly expanding audience attracted to the sport. The old ball field lies within the boundaries of the Site 2 North Project area (Figure 11).

Mudville 9: Stockton Team of the California League

Baseball had its beginnings in Stockton as early as 1860, but it wasn’t until they entered the California League and moved to Banner Island in 1888 that the Slough City Team became well-known. The California League, which functioned for 30 years (1886-1915), was the primary instrument in the development of the Stockton team as a major player in Northern California. In 1887 the Sacramento Atlas team left the California League to form another Northern California league and Stockton was invited to take its place. Located near the head of the San Joaquin River and about the same distance from San Francisco and Oakland as Sacramento, it was equally as accessible by rail or river to the other teams in the league.

In 1888 the team moved from their original playing field at Goodwater Grove (present Oak Park) to Banner Island, no longer an island but a silted-in area west of downtown Stockton. The new ball park was erected at a cost of $2500, the “largest in the country with the exception of the Detroit Diamond.” Accommodations for 4000 were provided, 2000 in the stands and 2000 others in carriages and standing. A bicycle track and driveway were also constructed at the site (Figure 12). Salaries were heavy, but a strong club was organized and the team’s management hoped that new grounds and a fifty cent tariff for home games would pay their way.
Announcing an expanded schedule, the league set up 75 games in San Francisco and 61 in Stockton between March 25 and November 25, 1888. Games were booked for every Saturday, Sunday, and holiday at the Haight Street field in San Francisco and most Saturdays and every Sunday in Stockton. When Stockton was traveling, the other two teams played at Banner Island.

The Slough City Team had a strong first line-up, luring Eddie Lorrigan, the league’s most effective pitcher in 1887, away from the San Francisco Pioneers and Jack Flynn, a star rookie for Chicago, as change pitcher. The team earned $1300 in salaries the following year, the year the “Mudville 9” were immortalized in Ernest Thayer’s poem, “Casey at the Bat”. Thayer, an editor at the San Francisco Examiner, attended some of the home games in 1887 and likely saw Flynn, believed to have inspired the character of Casey, and others perform for the Stockton team (Spaulding 1992:33-34).

During 1888, the team’s management continued to develop a winning team, signing many important players. Flynn, whose arm had been injured during his Chicago days, never recovered and was replaced by 22-year old rookie George Harper. Teaming up with two eastern pitchers, Harper and the team won the league that year, winning the series for Stockton (Baseball Exhibit notes on file, Haggin Museum; Spaulding 1992:35,37). The team won the league with good fielding and timely hitting, with the best batting average. Stockton was to win the league pennant nine times over the ensuing years.

The team drew well in San Francisco, with a crowd of more than 12,000 watching the game at Haight Street on August 5. Attendance at Stockton, however, was not always so successful, and the teams went on the road in an attempt to attract a new audience. In 1889 the California League teams were taken over by private investors and a community-oriented league established which could develop rivalries between Oakland and San Francisco, Stockton and Sacramento. As noted in the San Francisco Chronicle, “although Stockton has expended a great deal of money on its club and grounds, her citizens feel it has been well invested, as it has brought the city into notice throughout the country” (Spaulding 1992:38).

The Mudville 9 continued to play at Banner Island through the mid-1890s, but by 1897 had returned to Goodwater Grove, for an account that November noted that they beat Oakland there (Stockton Evening Mail, November 8, 1897). Banner Island had been returned to the Weber family, and Charles Weber’s granddaughter recalled that cows kept on the island would swim over to the Commodore’s Levee from there during the 1890s (Shebl 1993:87).

During World War II, the Hickinbotham and Gunnert & Zimmerman shipyards were constructed on the channel, building and launching numerous ships for the war effort (Figure 13). By the 1950s, auto body shops, lumber and steel companies, and other industrial buildings had been constructed on the site of the Mudville 9’s triumph.
CASEY AT THE BAT

The outlook wasn't brilliant for the Mudville nine that day;  
The score stood four to two with but one inning more to play.  
And then when Cooney died at first, and Barrows did the same,  
A sickly silence fell upon the patrons of the game.

A straggling few got up to go in deep despair. The rest  
Clung to that hope which springs eternal in the human breast  
They thought if only Casey could but get a whack at that—  
We'd put up even money now with Casey at the bat.

But Flynn preceded Casey, as did also Jimmy Blake,  
And the former was a lulu and the latter was a cake;  
So upon that stricken multitude grim melancholy sat,  
For there seemed but little chance of Casey's getting to the bat.

But Flynn let drive a single, to the wonderment of all,  
And Blake, the much despis-ed, tore the cover off the ball;  
And when the dust had lifted, and the men saw what had occured,  
There was Johnnie safe at second and Flynn a-hugging third.

Then from 5,000 throats and more there rose a lusty yell;  
It rumbled through the valley, it rattled in the dell;  
It knocked upon the mountain and recoiled upon the flat,  
For Casey, mighty Casey, was advancing to the bat.

There was ease in Casey's manner as he stepped into his place;  
There was pride in Casey's bearing and a smile on Casey's face.  
And when, responding to the cheers, he lightly doffed his hat,  
No stranger in the crowd could doubt 'twas Casey at the bat.

Ten thousand eyes were on him as he rubbed his hands with dirt;  
Five thousand tongues applauded when he wiped them on his shirt.  
Then while the writhing pitcher ground the ball into his hip,  
Defiance gleamed in Casey's eye, a sneer curled Casey's lip.

And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air,
And Casey stood a-watching it in haughty grandeur there.
Close by the sturdy batsman the ball unheeded sped—
"That ain't my style," said Casey. "Strike one," the umpire said.

From the benches black with people, there went up a muffled roar,
Like the beating of the storm-waves on a stern and distant shore.
"Kill him! Kill the umpire!" shouted some one on the stand;
And it's likely they'd have killed him had not Casey raised his hand.

With a smile of Christian charity great Casey's visage shone;
He stilled the rising tumult; he bade the game go on;
He signaled to the pitcher, and once more the spheroid flew;
But Casey still ignored it, and the umpire said, "Strike two."

"Fraud!" cried the maddened thousands, and echo answered fraud;
But one scornful look from Casey and the audience was awed.
They saw his face grow stern and cold, they saw his muscles strain,
And they knew that Casey wouldn't let that ball go by again.

The sneer is gone from Casey's lip, his teeth are clenched in hate;
He pounds with cruel violence his bat upon the plate.
And now the pitcher holds the ball, and now he lets it go,
And now the air is shattered by the force of Casey's blow.

Oh, somewhere in this favored land the sun is shining bright;
The band is playing somewhere, and somewhere hearts are light,
And somewhere men are laughing, and somewhere children shout;
But there is no joy in Mudville-- mighty Casey has struck out.

DECLINE AND REDEVELOPMENT

As the transportation hub of the San Joaquin Valley, Stockton continued to grow both geographically and financially, until it became the burgeoning city of today. Home since 1924 to the University of the Pacific, the state’s first chartered institution of higher education (1851), Stockton is also an ethnically diverse area with over a quarter million inhabitants.

With the decline of gold mining, the introduction of agriculture and the coming of the railroads have coincided to make Stockton the San Joaquin Valley’s major agricultural shipping point. Because so many agricultural crops funnel through Stockton, it is also a center for migrants seeking employment in California’s vast central valley (Johnson et al. 1993:69).
Within the Site 1 Project area, however, with the decline of downtown Stockton as the commercial center of the community, the Hotel Stockton lost its luster and the Hansel and Ortman auto dealership moved away. A redevelopment project in the 1960s sounded the death knell for the downtown and its historic core. Most of the buildings remaining from Stockton’s golden era (within the nine blocks bordered by Weber Avenue and Hunter, Washington, and Commerce Streets) were demolished in that effort (Hoover et al. 1966:370). Parking lots, vacant lots, and modern concrete buildings occupy the site of Weber’s former boomtown and bustling inland port (Figure 14).

Downtown Stockton today is experiencing a revitalization of its role as a transportation hub, as the deep water channel for large ships is providing an impetus for the development of intermodal and multimodal transit in the area. New developments planned for Stockton’s downtown core bode well for the future of the Sunrise Seaport and the recreation of Weber’s dream.
Figure 5. 1849 Map of Stockton by Major Richard P. Hammond. (Courtesy of Holt Atherton, Pacific Center for Western Studies, University of the Pacific, Stockton)
Figure 6. Etching of Stockton in 1859 from James Hutchings *California Magazine*. (Olmstad 1962:380).
Figure 7. Birdseye view of Stockton in 1870, by Alfred Koch. (Courtesy of Holt Atherton, Pacific Center for Western Studies, University of the Pacific, Stockton)
Figure 8. This scene shows the Stockton Channel from atop the county courthouse during the flood of 1893. (Martin 1969)
Figure 9. Skyline view looking west over the Delta with a good view of the Stockton Channel, the courthouse is in the left foreground, c. 1925. (Martin 1969).
Figure 10. Sketch of the 1882, two-story brick Heungshan Joss Temple on Hunter Street, by Ralph Yardley, well known illustrator for the *Stockton Record* in the 1930s.
Figure 11. Ralph Yardley sketch of the Banner Island Baseball Grounds in 1889 (Courtesy of Haggin Museum).
Figure 12. Area 2 North, with 3 northern fence lines from 1895 Sanborn map; location of stands and ballfield reconstructed from historic documents.
Figure 13. 1950 Sanborn map showing shipworks on the blocks south of W. Lindsy Stret.
Figure 14. Stockton waterfront area after redevelopment in the 1960s. (Courtesy of Holt Atherton, Pacific Center for Western Studies, University of the Pacific, Stockton).
Chapter 3
RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter provides the basic tools for evaluating the potential importance of historic-period archaeological remains in the Stockton waterfront area. Included is a theoretical basis for considering the potential of historic period resources to provide important information on the past. Types of archaeological “properties” (specific types of remains and features) that may be expected are identified, the concept of “integrity” discussed, and research themes and questions presented.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

An archaeological research design identifies important questions that (1) could be addressed by the kinds of data that the property is likely to contain and, that (2) cannot be addressed using data from other sources. This research design relies heavily on ones developed for the cities of San Francisco (Praetzellis and Praetzellis, eds., 1993), Sacramento (Praetzellis 1991; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1993), and Oakland (Praetzellis 1994). For more than a decade, versions of this research design have been applied successfully on numerous urban California deposits, each enlarging and building upon knowledge gained from each project. The version of the research design presented below, written largely by Mary and Adrian Praetzellis, was published in the Headquarters Facility Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Costello et al., 1996). The research design follows a contextual approach in the evaluation of the significance of properties.

The following sections summarize the research context within which the expected deposits in downtown Stockton are meaningful. The waterfront area developed from sloughs and marshes, to a critical Gold Rush supply center, to a modern commercial port. Such intensive occupation over an extended period inevitably creates a rich material record in the form of archaeological deposits, the formation processes of which are described below. The final sections in the chapter present a series of research questions for the archaeological property types that the preceding historical, archival, and archaeological research has indicated may be present within Stockton’s waterfront project areas.

MODERNISM, VICTORIANISM, AND ETHNICITY

The history and archaeology of the project areas will be viewed within the framework of an issue that is of importance to social historians: the process by which people from traditional, premodern cultures—both immigrant and native-born—adapted to life in an industrial society (Gutman 1977).
Modernism

While the great exhibitions of the 19th century were displaying the newly available products of the industrial revolution, the very process of industrialization was transforming Western society and culture. In 19th-century America, this process involved a change from a traditional, “face-to-face” society (Redfield 1955) to one that emphasized rationality in economic relationships, specialization, and efficiency, and in which attainment of the goal of an improved future was to be measured by material progress (Brown 1976:29; Wallerstein 1983). Until as late as the 1970s, many economic historians conceived of 19th-century modernization as a simple, linear process (e.g., Rostow 1960). According to this model, societies evolved in a straight-line path from traditional, agrarian-based communities, in which social control was maintained by church, family, and an inviolable social order, to industrialized ones in which “centralization, bureaucratization, and role segmentation” were the rule (Bender 1978:56).

A parallel interpretation, and one which has come to predominate in recent years, rejects the idea that all vestiges of the pre-industrial past were shed by all segments of society undergoing urbanization. Glazer and Moynihan's (1963) classic examination of the strength of immigrant ethnic culture in New York and studies of resistance to industrial culture on the part of workers (e.g., Hirsch 1978; Rodgers 1978) have contributed to the view of urban pluralism developed by Bender (1978). Bender proposed that the modernization of 19th-century American urban dwellers was multilinear and complex: multilinear because various class and ethnic groups participated to varying degrees; and complex since individuals and families were simultaneously involved with both traditional and modern ways of life. Through the mechanism of family and social networks, national, religious, and ethnic ties remained strong and encouraged communal, traditional values and practices (Bender 1978:122; Haraven 1978). At the same time, industrial time discipline, the cash economy, and relationships with government institutions necessitated that individuals be able to function within the modern order (Rodgers 1978).

It has been suggested that a set of cultural values, practices, and aesthetics known as “Victorianism” (Howe 1976; Wiebe 1967) came to predominate among the Euroamerican cultural and political establishment of this modern society. Victorianism is said to have been an “homogenizing force” (Hardesty 1980) upon the cultures of immigrants and the native-born working class alike, which attempted to replace traditional mores with modern values and patterns of behavior suited to their roles in an industrial society. Archaeological research is in a unique position to measure both the relative pervasiveness of Victorianism as well as degrees of resistance to the values of the emerging industrial society in the form of development of a distinctive working-class culture.

Victorian Values and Practices

Victorian values had strong and clear behavioral and material correlates, many of which were displayed in the home (Praetzellis 1991). The essential moral quality of a Victorian family was expressed by the presentation of tasteful, Gothic-style artifacts in their appropriate context (Eastlake 1878). To maximize this effect, the home itself had to be of the correct style
and internal arrangement. The relationship between Gothic architecture and mid-19th-century Christian values has been examined by Clark (1976). This architectural form, with its church-like exterior and functionally discrete interior spaces, provided the ideal context in which highly formalized Victorian social interactions, dubbed “secular rituals” (Moore and Meyerhoff 1977), were carried out.

Artifacts played an essential part in Victorian families' household rituals. On the largest scale, Romantic Revival houses were themselves designed to accommodate these rituals (Clark 1976:51-52). If a prospective visitor were allowed beyond the front stoop of a middle-class home, the hall stand would receive their visiting card. This piece of furniture was a veritable icon of respectable values because of its role in this highly formalized practice of social visiting, an essential part of 19th-century manners (Ames 1978; Lynes 1963:147). Proceeding through the hall, the new arrival would be ushered into the parlor. It was here that morning callers were received and afternoon tea parties and evening receptions were held. In the parlor, the guest would experience an environment created solely for such formal receptions; a room through whose embellishments was expressed the public face of both middle- and working-class households (Cohen 1986). The parlor's interior was a vision of respectable clutter: weighty, dark-stained furniture shrouded in swags of heavy fabric; walls jammed with copies of famous works of art; and every flat surface home to some figurine or gilded trinket (Seale 1981; Vaux 1864:95-97). The expense of outfitting a middle-class parlor in 1877 was more than three times that of any other room (Lynes 1963:142). Only in the homes of the rich was it not maintained at the cost of some inconvenience, for this room took away space from a family's informal living area. A suburban landlady, cited by Calvert Vaux, claimed that “all the best families lived in the basement . . .” leaving the parlor, according to Vaux, as “a sort of quarantine in which to put each plague of a visitor” (1864:97). The volume of good taste in the parlor was redundant to the point of being overwhelming, and its cultural significance was understood by all who entered (Grier 1988).

The dining room was also a public room in the Victorian house. The rules to be obeyed here were even more elaborate and intricate than in the parlor, and the display of fashionable artifacts, such as dinner ware, was equally important. The best dinner service, crystal, and silver were displayed in a dresser, while decorative platters and bric-a-brac ringed the wall on a shoulder-high plate rail. Under the popular “English” system of dining, serving vessels were passed from hand to hand around the table; plates never arrived pre-portioned from the kitchen in a well-regulated Victorian household. At a formal dinner, each table setting included several drinking vessels; until the rise of the temperance movement in the 1880s, each course might be served with its own type of wine (Lynes 1963:176-199).

Nineteenth-century intellectuals from John Ruskin to Henry Ward Beecher fostered the belief that beautiful surroundings created good people (McLoughlin 1970; Ruskin 1959; Watkin 1977). While tasteful design could educate, bad design was berated as an immoral influence (e.g., Beecher 1868). Starving a child's soul of beauty condemned it to an empty life of frustration and despair. Material culture had the power to improve and uplift, and reformers explicitly promoted specific decorative modes to achieve their religious and social ends. The moral connotations of material goods, however, shifted through time and according to observer. Whereas the Gothic Revival inspired middle-class European and American
consumers from the 1840s through the 1870s, the embellishments that had formerly designated comfort came to be seen as cluttered gaudiness, connoting sloth by the 1890s. The Arts and Crafts and Colonial Revival movements and the Centennial celebration inspired pride in America and its accomplishments. A “Buy America” campaign stressed not only products of local origin, but products along a certain line. These goods wedded the wonders of technology with the simplicity of nature, a marriage that can be seen most clearly in Craftsman-style architecture. According to Gustav Stickley, a proponent of things Craftsman, “Luxurious surroundings . . . suggest and induce idleness. Complex forms and costly materials have an influence upon life which tells a sad story in history. On the other hand, chasteness and restraint in form, simple, but artistic materials are equally expressive of the character of the people who use them” (cited in Cohen 1986:264). By the turn of the century, the American middle class had by and large rejected Victorian fashion and adopted a style of decor that was seen as simple, natural, and efficient (Cohen 1986:275).

**Ethnic Display and Boundary Maintenance**

Beliefs, cultural attitudes, and values are not directly accessible through archaeological data (Binford 1962, 1965). Ian Hodder, however, pointed out that ethnicity is an appropriate subject for archaeological studies, if it is defined as the “mechanism by which interest groups use culture to symbolize their within-group organization in opposition to and in competition with other interest groups” (1979:452, emphasis in original). Ethnic groups cannot be defined by a cultural trait list and its material correlate because the system is changeable, not static, and the overt signs of a group may change without affecting that group's identity (Barth 1969; Spicer 1971:798). Ethnicity is a function of self-identification and ascription, not objective identification from outside (Barth 1969). Spicer points out that “what becomes meaningful is probably a function of the oppositional process” (1971:798), and Barth likewise places the emphasis on “. . .the ethnic boundary that defines the group” (1969:15). Therefore, it is ethnic strategies such as boundary maintenance, expressed in patterns of behavior that took material form, that can be studied archaeologically.

Much has been written by ethnographers on ethnicity as a social process among the overseas Chinese. On the community relations level, it has been noted that where the host people have been hostile to the Chinese traditional values, behaviors and organization among the immigrants have been reinforced (Glick 1942:647-675; Coughlin 1960:192). Conversely, where relations have been good, outward signs of Chinese ethnicity have become less noticeable (Amyot 1973:82). In personal interaction across ethnic lines, John Omohundru reported that Chinese merchants “advertise their ethnic distinctiveness and consequently shift the stress inherent in face-to-face commercial transactions at the ethnic group level” (1978:130). In this way, each party involved in the transaction has mutually understood expectations of the other which helps to regularize their business relationships. The Chinese merchant community itself has strong reasons for preserving its ethnic boundaries: “the reason is business, the method is to organize an entire commercial ethnic group” (Omohundru 1981:84). The commercial advantages of exclusiveness include the ability to deter competition, fix prices, obtain credit, and to settle disputes informally.
Merchants were the usual choice to represent the Chinese community as a whole to local government officials and other influential bodies (Coughlin 1960:80; Glick 1938:74; Lai 1988:191). The Chinese middleman was often someone with ties to specific native individuals whom he could call upon when needed (Omohundru 1981:114). When not excluded by law or practice, Chinese businessmen became involved with local government and may serve as official intermediaries by virtue of their bilingualism and their positions of respect in both communities (Glick 1938:740).

It is clear that a Chinese merchant's ethnicity involved more than simply cultural display for its own sake. The actor's emphasis on ethnic differences will vary “from time to time, from situation to situation, depending on the way they interpret their interests” (Coughlin 1960:191-192). As an active force, ethnicity can be a strategy for both survival and economic advancement.

**Working-Class Cultures and Resistance**

The modernization of the cultures of 19th-century urban dwellers neither proceeded uniformly across society nor immediately supplanted all pre-industrial modes of life (Bender 1978). The meaning and value of material goods shifted for working-class urban dwellers as they did for members of the middle class.

The existence of an urban, distinctly working-class, culture in England was recognized by E.P. Thompson (1963) as an outgrowth of the industrial revolution. Although the traditional rights and responsibilities of craftsmen were being eroded by creeping industrialization, these values retained their strength and eventually jelled into the trades-union movement. Later writers have emphasized not only working-class political movements but also class-specific values and mores, often interpreting these as resistance to the Victorian values of the time. Stedman Jones, for example, points to the rise of a “working class culture which showed itself staunchly impervious to middle class attempts to guide it” (1974:462). The working class was said to be governed by “strict rules of propriety” (Booth 1902, cited in Stedman Jones 1974:463). These rules, however, were not the same as those of the Victorian middle-class, who sought to reform the manners and morals of the working class through the medium of universal education. For example, unlike the middle class, working people did not save money to accumulate capital but rather to buy objects and clothing for display: “evidence about patterns of spending... suggest that a concern to demonstrate self-respect” was more important than saving for the future (Stedman Jones 1974:473).

The continuance of barter in the face of the rise of a cash-based economy is another area in which 19th-century working-class resistance can be seen. Despite efforts at regulation, barter survived in urban areas in a vigorous trade in secondhand goods—ranging from household furnishings to clothing—supported by many working-class people. In junk stores, the money economy was suspended and barter was acceptable. Goods were exchanged for goods and bought or sold for cash or credit; the relationship between merchant and customer was intensely personal, and deals were highly negotiable.
As a mode of exchange, barter was still widespread well into the 18th century (Braudel 1975:328, 333), and products of the farm and forest were regularly exchanged for manufactured goods at many country stores in America throughout the 19th century (Carson 1954:19-38). Cord wood was offered for sugar; embroidery could pay off a grocery bill. In this environment, obtaining goods was a face-to-face operation between buyer and seller, in which the value of things was judged in relation to other things. When facing off, the actors knew each other's financial condition, credit worthiness, and reputation as a bargainer. Was the cord of wood worth ten pounds of sugar to a local merchant, or twenty? The answer might depend as much on the bargainers' relationship as on the storekeeper's assessment of local needs.

By the mid-19th century in the cities, however, economic relationships had become almost exclusively money-based. Until this time, transactions between urban merchants and their clients were personalized to the degree that credit was relatively easy to obtain, the price of merchandise was not marked on items, and their cost fluctuated with the customer's ability and willingness to pay the asking price. By the 1870s, this old system was fading rapidly, and in urban areas the “cash store” predominated.

It was a short step from the one-price system to marketing on a national scale. Mass retailing—based on high turnover and low unit price, anonymity, and the one-price system—completed the depersonalization of the storekeeper/customer relationship and established the mode that has come to typify such relationships in mature capitalist economies. It was, in short, an inevitable part of the process of economic modernization.

The non-economic principles behind the one-price system were classically Victorian: the system was a rational one based on fixed standards, reproducible conditions, and efficiency (Brown 1976:42-43). It could be applied to all persons equally since the customer/merchant relationship was not interfered with by the individuals' social roles outside the transaction. Proponents conceived of it as yet another example of the evolution of 19th-century society, whereby the practices and methods of rationalized business “were a natural outgrowth of a general law of Progress” (Polanyi 1957:274).

While the use of secondhand stores was clearly motivated by economic concerns, it is also a clear example of resistance. The modes of barter and variable prices were embedded in community social relations and were precisely the kind of premodern arrangements that were contrary to all things Victorian. Where the Victorians had absolute values for things, the premodern system had negotiation and variability. Where the new way involved standardized, role-specific performances, the old way had complex, multi-level relationships that spilled over the boundaries between Victorian social roles.

A market in secondhand clothing flourished in much of the 19th century due to the inability of manufacturers and retailers to produce and distribute clothing at prices working-class people could afford (Lemire 1988:23). Technological advances, however, eventually resulted in mass production of inexpensive goods, efficient distribution networks, and annual catalogues to accommodate and encourage changes in fashion influencing the purchasing patterns of many members of the working class. As the consumer revolution progressed, junk stores declined
and the mass retailers, through their department stores and catalogues, came to serve as a sort of “cultural primer”—the source for ideas about how one should dress, furnish a home, and spend one's leisure time (Miller 1981:53, 183).

The consumer revolution and success of the labor movement increased the purchasing power of many late-19th-century working-class households. Although these households may have accepted middle-class purchasing modes, they did not necessarily accept middle-class tastes or purchasing strategies. According to Cohen, the choices of working-class people in decorating their homes was not a “simple emulation of middle-class Victorian standards with a time lag due to delayed prosperity, but rather a creative compromise forged in making a transition between two very different social and economic worlds” (1986:274). Despite efforts by domestic reformers, these choices often centered on the comfortable, curtained, clutter of Victorian decor roundly rejected by this time by those in the vanguard of middle-class taste (Cohen 1986:274).

**Archaeology and Material Culture Studies**

The interpretive approach taken by archaeologists studying the employees of the Boott textile mills in Lowell, Massachusetts, is a good example of how archaeology can contribute to an understanding of the lives of working people. The approach, which is based on Antonio Gramsci's notion of cultural hegemony, allows “working-class ideology and working-class culture creative, active roles in the social process, rather than viewing them as dictated by and distilled from the ideologies and cultures of politically or economically dominant groups” (Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski 1991:165). Using this orientation, material remains are interpreted as derived from working-class culture per se, rather than as merely reflecting an attempt to emulate the middle class.

In their archaeological study of workers in the Boott mills, Beaudry, Cook, and Mrozowski (1991) identified specific types of activities, including public drinking and smoking, that served to enhance working-class solidarity and can be seen as a form of resistance to the imposed structures of domination. Paynter and McGuire cite malingering, “draft dodging,” strikes, and revolution as examples of resistance that take the form of open defiance. They point out that archaeology has demonstrated its “special access to the resistance of everyday life” in studies of enslaved African Americans and mid-19th-century industrial workers (Paynter and McGuire 1991:11-16).

Archaeology is also one of the few sources through which the secular rituals practiced by many ordinary 19th-century families can be examined. Documentation of the American home found in studies of literature and art stress the practices of the social and intellectual elite; an exception is the innovative analysis of the interiors of working-class homes by Lizabeth Cohen (1986). Similarly, as Dell Upton (1985) has pointed out, normative, prescriptive sources, such as manuals of household management and etiquette and advertising copy, have limited value as indexes to actual behavior.

Unlike literature and art, archaeological data are democratic in that poorer people and cultural minorities, who are meagerly represented in the written record, are as likely as the rich to
have left archaeological remains. Equally significant, however, is the ability of the archaeologist to associate remains with historically documented households of known ethnic, national, and economic characteristics. In this way, the archaeological data are sufficiently controlled to allow both synchronic and diachronic comparisons within and between these groups.

In predominantly working-class areas, it is postulated that some people maintained traditional practices while also conforming or converting to certain formal Victorian mores and tastes. Archaeological excavation, in combination with documentary evidence, can supply the specifics of the blend of Victorian and pre-industrial or ethnic modes that existed side-by-side in the pluralistic society that was 19th-century Stockton. The use of artifacts as material symbols to maintain social distance between these groups may also be visible in the archaeological record. Consumer behavior, fueled by the industrial revolution, presents numerous avenues of inquiry when it is informed by the ethnic, economic, and demographic characteristics of the household associated with each recovered archaeological deposit.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL FORMATION PROCESSES

It is essential to understand the processes by which cultural and natural strata are formed in order to interpret archaeological data and to evaluate their importance. When working in complex urban contexts, it is especially important to understand archaeological deposits in terms of the events that created them, not merely through the artifacts they contain. The excavation and recording system developed by Edward Harris (1979, 1989) aids in interpreting these events. Under this system, archaeologists must take note not only of solid features (such as walls) and negative features (such as pits), but also of contiguous interfaces that are created where stratigraphic units come into contact with one another. Thus, Harris recognizes layer interfaces, feature interfaces, and period interfaces—“a surface composed of a number of layer and feature interfaces” (1979:47). Leonard Wooley provides another definition of this concept: “the sum total of the ground surfaces which were ground levels in use at one and the same time” (1961:24).

Archaeological deposits reflect either periods of continuity or intervals of transition in site occupation or use. Continuous deposits are archaeological layers or living surfaces that become recognizable and distinct when buried by natural strata (i.e., flood silt, ash) or cultural strata (i.e., fill, roadway, building). Continuous deposits can form over periods of thousands of years, as on California prehistoric sites, or in just a few years, as in the sequence of fire, flood, and fill found in Sacramento. It is a transition, natural or cultural, that results in a layer interface and the sealing of a continuous deposit into an archaeological layer. A process of continuous discard produces “sheet refuse” or gradually fills hollows and negative features. Because they accumulate gradually, these strata are highly susceptible to depositional and post-depositional disturbance. Archaeologists employ assemblages recovered from stratified, continuous archaeological layers to examine a variety of research problems concerning changes through time.

Archaeological strata formed during incidents of transition accumulate very quickly, often through a single depositional event in response to an abrupt change in the nature of site
occupation and use. Activities such as the creation of a new feature interface (the removal of strata—hole digging) or the deposition of materials within a previously existing feature interface (the addition of strata—hole filling) often mark intervals of transition. Such deposits are more likely to retain their integrity than are continuous deposits and, therefore, possess greater visibility and focus in the archaeological record. In addition, deposits formed during intervals of transition may often be associated through historical research with specific households.

In urban areas, transitional feature interfaces and the strata that create them are often the result of changes on two levels: (1) those that result from the new use of a particular parcel due to the presence of a different commercial enterprise, occupant, or owner, or from modifications made by a continuing one; and (2) those produced by widespread responses to either natural disaster, such as floods or fires, or to municipal regulations governing sanitation practices, water delivery and storage, or street and lot improvements. More broadly, the latter transitions may be viewed as the movement by City government away from unplanned growth and development toward urban planning.

**PROPERTY TYPES**

The definition of what constitutes “important” information is related to the property type being assessed. Each property type is composed of a number of individual resource types or archaeological features that contain important archaeological data. A property type is a grouping of properties that share some important characteristics, such as dwellings in the Queen Anne style or examples of rock-art form known as the California desert intaglio. Historical research suggests that examples of five historic-period archaeological property types may be present within the Stockton waterfront project areas. These property types are: (1) domestic occupation refuse (single and multi-family), (2) commercial refuse, (3) domestic and commercial architecture, (4) industrial architecture and refuse, and (5) landfills. The complex array of behaviors and functions represented by each property type is reflected in the individual resource types that comprise it.

**Domestic Occupation Refuse**

Examples of this property type—which largely occur in association with residences—may be expected to contain resource types that share the characteristic of being hollow features that, before the days of organized refuse collection, were used as receptacles for the by-products of everyday living: discarded ceramics, food bones, glass containers, broken personal items, etc. These hollow features include wells, cisterns, subterranean basements, outhouse pits, and lined, reusable garbage pits, and are all sources of assemblages of historic artifacts. These kinds of features and their contents may have research potential that gives them legal significance.

In addition, domestic occupation sites frequently contain deposits of sheet refuse, upcast, and intentionally brought-in fill that accumulate on the horizontal plane and that sometimes build up to several feet in depth. Because they create sealed contexts for caches of artifacts, these deep sheet deposits often yield artifact assemblages that may be used for the same type of
analysis as the discrete refuse caches described above. In addition, they can provide evidence of change over time in a way that discrete caches—often the result of sudden, transitional changes—cannot. The reconstruction of backyard use, functional layout, and vegetation may be possible by means of continuous pollen samples obtained from this type of archaeological deposit.

**Commercial Refuse**

Refuse caches and sheet deposits of refuse and fill, similar to resource types that occur on domestic sites, may also be expected on commercial sites. The artifact collections, however, will reflect the orientation of the business that contributed to it. Three principal types of commercial establishments have been identified in the study area: laundries, retail stores, and hotel/lodging houses. Collections contained in property types related to retail stores may be expected to consist of broken or otherwise unsalable goods.

**Domestic and Commercial Architecture**

These are the architectural remains of residences, businesses, and outbuildings. For brick or earthen buildings, the remains would take the form of footings. Most wooden structures leave few remains except, perhaps, for discontinuous footings or posts dug into the ground. Buildings whose characteristics are known from the historic record would generally not be considered legally important.

**Industrial Architecture and Refuse**

This type includes the archaeological remains of buildings and structures that housed or aided various industrial processes. The legal status of this type of resource hinges on the degree to which the architectural details are a matter of record. If the remains can yield previously undocumented information, then they would be considered legally important. The term industrial refuse refers to the evidence of industrial processes themselves, as distinct from the buildings in which these processes were housed. The range of these processes is considerable. Some processes, such as the de-gasification of coal and the firing of bricks, are likely to have created archaeological features, while others, such as box-making, could have been carried on for many years and yet have left little or no evidence.

Industrial processes likely to be encountered in the study area include the remains of various industries related to a brewery, planning mills and windmill manufacturing. The legal importance of these types of deposits hinges on their potential to yield information about the processes represented that is not available from other sources. To the degree to which a process is not reliably documented, these archaeological features are important because they can provide the only surviving source of information. It should be noted that some of these processes also left contaminated soils that may preclude field work.
### Landfills

Examples of this property type consist of material brought into the study area to fill the low ground of channels and sloughs around the waterfront area. The California Register eligibility of this type of deposit would depend upon the integrity and focus of the landfill and its relationship to larger issues.

### INTEGRITY

Integrity refers to the degree to which a property has retained the character it possessed during its period of significance. Like the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register recognizes seven types of integrity, each of which addresses a different component of this important quality: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. A property must possess integrity in those areas that are relevant to its area of importance. The level of integrity that is necessary to qualify examples of various property types for the California Register under Criterion Four is measured by the ability of the remains to contain the types of data necessary to answer questions identified in a formal research design. In this context, integrity means that the archaeological property is “sufficiently intact to yield the expected important information” (NPS 1991:23).

### RESEARCH THEMES

All historic archaeological deposits possess information. The problem is to evaluate whether this information could be obtained in a more cost-effective and straightforward manner through the documentary record, oral history, or other non-archaeological data sources. To be effective, an archaeological research design should link archaeological deposits with historically documented events and processes so that significant archaeological research questions may be identified.

The research themes outlined below are currently being studied by historical archaeologists working in urban contexts. This version, largely written by Mary and Adrian Praetzellis, was published in the *Headquarters Facility Project Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan* (Costello et al 1996). The themes are broad and could be studied in most urban areas, given an adequate archaeological and documentary record. Some of these questions require the analysis of only one deposit; others must be viewed at the parcel, block, neighborhood, city, or even inter-city level. In addition, Theme E addresses interpretive potential and identifies those classes of resources important for their public values.

The research questions are phrased so that they may be used to evaluate the importance of archaeological deposits as they are encountered in the field. Within a contextual approach, questions will build upon each other as new data is gathered from the ground, from the archives, from maps and photographs, and from oral history informants. The answers, when woven together, will provide a richer more human history of Stockton and a deeper understanding of the working-class people who once lived there.
**Theme A: Consumer Behavior/Strategies**

**Question 1.** Does this resource enable us to describe the consumer practices and disposal behavior of a household or business with specific social, occupational, economic, and/or ethnic characteristics?

This is one of the core questions of the research design. It identifies archaeological deposits created by the disposal of refuse. As in the present day, refuse includes the remains of food preparation and consumption (containers, left-overs, bones, seeds, spoiled food, etc.), as well as broken and unwanted household paraphernalia. Archaeologists study refuse deposits associated with specific households to understand the way of life of people in the past at a level that could never be achieved through the written record: What did they eat? How did they allocate their money? Where did they shop? How was food prepared and served? Was dining formal or informal? How were they influenced by fashion, mass marketing, and/or social movements? What household items did they consider disposable or unwanted? What medicines did they use and how do these correlate with gender-specific, age-specific, or occupation-specific epidemiology?

Home life, even in one of the lodging houses once found along E. Miner Avenue, is private and enables individual variation, even deviance, to exist behind public facades that appear similar. Strategies for living vary from family to family. They often adhere to tenants of regional or ethnic cultures but may vary markedly, depending upon the upward social and economic aspirations of particular households and their place within the family development cycle. Both family and individual behavior, however, is constrained by community values and access to resources, as well as by other influences, including personal choices, individual psychology, and historical change. Such behavior is enlarged by a breadth of imagination and a willingness to accept and try new strategies, products, and opportunities (Yentsch 1993a:278).

For example, from the refuse deposit associated with working-class Irish widow Mary Collins and her children in Sacramento around 1900, we learn that the family purchased inexpensive, brightly colored ceramics of the type marketed by Sears, Roebuck, & Co., as well as other widely distributed and advertised items sold by department stores and by mail. The family possessed attire for both everyday and special occasions, and invested in personal grooming and hygiene products. The archaeological collection provided a view of the spread of what had been solidly middle-class ideas about beauty into more generally accepted practices associated with appearance and hygiene on the part of people of all social classes and cultural backgrounds (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1990a).

In the late 19th century, the Stockton waterfront area was occupied primarily by working-class families and individuals along with some middle-class merchants. Both economic groups came from a wide range of ethnic, regional, and national backgrounds, including immigrant Asian and German, and native-born Americans of European descent. The ethnic and kin/non-kin mix varied considerably within the hotel, lodging houses, and family residences; for example, the Miner Avenue neighborhood catered to German immigrants. Archaeological studies within the project area should attempt to elucidate the material
correlates of working-class culture as this might have varied by ethnicity and occupation over time. Given the previous discussion of resistance to, modification of, or acceptance of middle-class values and material culture on the part of urban working people of various ethnicities and occupations, the consumer and disposal practices of Stockton residents would provide a wealth of comparative data from a wide range of household types that could make important contributions to the understanding of this important issue. Did households purchase new or used goods? Did they shop in junk stores or from mail-order catalogues? Were dwellings decorated with items that were currently fashionable among middle-class consumers or with outmoded items? Was cost, quality, fashion, or efficiency the prime influence on consumer choices? Did the interior decor and eating and serving habits of Stockton lodging houses reflect their varied inhabitants and exterior facades? Did the quality of food served correlate with Groth's (1983) classification of boarding house statuses?

**Question 2.** Does this resource add to our knowledge of the availability of various classes of consumer goods at a specific place and point in time (i.e., material remains associated with a mercantile establishment)?

The question of availability must be addressed along with that of consumer choice. In some contexts, the cost and availability of goods may have had the greatest influence on consumer choices. During the Gold Rush, for example, merchants from around the world are said to have dumped their obsolete and damaged merchandise on desperate Californians scrambling for scarce consumer goods. Archaeological excavations in the remains of the Warren and Cotherin stores that burned in Sacramento's great fire of 1852 support this proposition and show the relatively limited range of goods available in early Sacramento (Butler 1979). Likewise, excavations at the Pioneer Junk Store elucidate the range of goods available secondhand in turn of the century Sacramento and provide evidence of recycling (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1990b).

Shops within the Site 1 project area included laundries, general merchandise, carriage trimming, saloons, butchers, groceries, and a cobbler. Refuse deposits associated with these ventures would give a partial answer to the question of availability. It is possible that some merchants catered, in whole or in part, to specific ethnic groups selling exotic foodstuffs essential to the preparation of traditional ethnic meals.

**Question 3.** Does this resource add to our knowledge of adaptive behavior in urban settings associated with the acquisition and consumption of foodstuffs or the organization and use of space?

Although limited by factors of cost and availability, 19th-century urban dwellers had potentially good access to a variety of commercially supplied foodstuffs. The choices made by individual households in these and other purchasing decisions can be reconstructed through archaeology. The contribution to the urban diet through the efforts of individual householders can help us to gauge the level of reliance on commercial versus self-procured food resources.
While the yards of the merchant class may have been used more for aesthetic than economic purposes (Mrozowski 1987), those of artisans were sometimes used to produce food for the family (e.g., Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1989, 1992a). Pollen studies can often contribute to this work on a block or parcel level by providing evidence of vegetable gardens (Kelso and Beaudry 1990); whereas the discovery of the remains of non-commercially taken fish or evidence of animal husbandry could allow statements to be made about the food-acquisition practices of individual households. These approaches could contribute data to address Theme D.3 by examining the data on a neighborhood level.

Urban householders frequently raised chickens and eggs in their backyards. A Sacramento family in around 1900, for example, developed a poultry sideline with limited capital outlay for poultry raising equipment by reusing household items, such as saucers and Mason jars for feeding and kerosene lamps for heating. Although apparently financially secure, the multi-generational family was large and growing. At the time of their poultry venture, the elder members may have passed their peak income years, while the younger members had yet to become established. The available labor within such a large household may have been considerable and was evidently used to undertake a small-scale agricultural endeavor. The backyard raising of chickens in urban settings may be a transitional activity, associated with large, multigenerational families in times of financial insecurity (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992a).

The working-class residents of Stockton undoubtedly experienced periods of financial hardship. How did households balance their economic strategies? Did all available family members work outside the home or did some members contribute to the family livelihood by working at home (e.g., taking in laundry) or through backyard agriculture? Historical maps show a dense urban environment and many lots with numerous outbuildings to the rear. How did households use what yard space remained available to them? Did this vary by ethnicity or occupation? What can be learned about the daily diet from the assemblages recovered from various backlots? Did residents fish in the nearby San Joaquin River or hunt? Were any animals butchered on site? Did the use of backyards change through time?

**Question 4.** Does this resource, in combination with other classes of data, aid in the understanding of landscape alteration, water and waste management, outbuilding construction, and dwelling renovation as these relate to changes in household composition?

For some years, archaeologists have recognized that household demographic events and processes affect the architectural and archaeological records (Brown 1987). These transitions are regarded as useful phenomena in that they often result in the creation of refuse-filled pits, drains, cisterns, and cellar holes that contain tightly dated, reliably associated assemblages of artifacts. By looking at the features themselves, however, one might ask how the use of space and facilities changed in response to documented changes in household composition or employment status. Was the conversion of a portion of a recreational garden to a vegetable patch a response to economic necessity due to unemployment? Or was it done because the resident family had become larger? Archaeology has the potential to examine various issues in relation to family change. Abandoned features themselves may have interpretive value as the actual products of transition, in addition to the artifacts they contain.
Data Requirements

Archaeological: feature and/or layer interfaces, broad exposure
Historical: associated with specific household/business
Oral history: interviews with representatives of various ethnic groups to establish relevance of foodways and yard use in traditional behavior
Faunal remains: economic scaling and ranking of butchering cuts (Lyman 1987; Schulz and Gust 1983); frequencies of types—domestic/wild; presence/absence of types
Botanical remains: frequencies of types—domestic/wild; presence/absence of types
Ceramic and glass function: MNI frequency/proportion
Social science: explicit social, economic, and status categories
Household demography: size, composition, life-course
Documentary: Mail-order catalogues, advertisements, commercial inventories, merchants' and householders' accounts

Theme B: Ethnicity/Urban Subcultures

Question 1. Does this resource reflect the rise or relative influence of Victorianism as a class-based ideology? Does this resource reflect resistance to Victorian or post-Victorian tastes and mores?

Victorian values were the values of middle-class commercial and professional interests during much of the 19th century. Others have suggested that these characteristics included (in no particular order and with some redundancy): piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity in women (Welter 1966:152); rectitude, thrift, sobriety, and hard work in men (Wiebe 1967:4); self-discipline, temperance, and respect for authority (Mann 1982:210); and steady work, punctuality, and compulsive behavior in general (Howe 1976:10). Apparent inconsistencies—such as hard-headed rationality along with drippy sentimentality—pervade the system. These inconsistencies emphasize the transitional quality of Victorianism, which sought to “soften the hard edges of modernization” with glances back to a bucolic, preindustrial past and visions of a better future through science, education, and Progress (Brown 1976:31). Victorianism as a statement of fashion transformed into the Arts and Crafts movement; the values remained the same, but their appropriate material manifestation evolved to express the triumph of technology and progress.

As a multifaceted set of values that influenced the lives of its predominantly middle-class participants in many ways, Victorianism (and post-Victorianism) found its way into artifacts, behavioral patterns, and specific historical events and processes on many levels—from municipal public works, to children's toys and decorations in ordinary families' homes, to archaeological site structure and content (Praetzellis 1991).

Diana Wall (1991) has considered how ceramic assemblages varied from one neighborhood to another within lower Manhattan. She saw variations in wealth reflected in the ceramic assemblages; more importantly, she identified ways in which the use of tableware in urban
homes reflected a broader set of values developing within American culture. The separation of home and work place with its concomitant enhancement of women's roles in the home can be seen in the archaeological record. The “cult of domesticity” was especially valued among middle- and upper-class families; its material expressions included social display, genteel entertaining and, especially among women, the tea ceremony.

Conversely, the distinctiveness of working-class consumer practices, in spite of assimilative pressures from domestic reformers and from society at large, can be viewed as resistance to middle-class values. For many workers, efficiency, productivity, and modernization simply meant mechanization and depersonalization of the work place and of the worker. Racism restricted the occupational opportunities and other choices for many ethnic groups and prevented participation in many middle-class activities.

Some forms of resistance may be visible in the archaeological record. For example, the discovery of 40 Vaseline jars among the refuse of Thomas Cook, an African-American barber, suggests that he engaged in barbering at home, perhaps on Sunday afternoons when his shop was closed by Sacramento City ordinance. Vaseline was a relatively inexpensive hair jell with which to create the short cropped, slicked-down hair styles popular at the time. Given that Cook could not have served blacks in his shop and survived as a business, his home customers were probably African Americans who could not be accommodated during normal business hours (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992b). In this case, resistance to the practice of segregation achieved middle-class fashionable attire beyond “one's place” in society. Assimilative hair styles can be viewed as contrary to contemporary racist stereotypes.

Archaeological deposits associated with mid-19th-century households can be examined for evidence of their respective degrees of participation in or rejection of Victorian and post-Victorian patterns of domestic behavior. In particular, artifacts associated with formal entertaining can be examined for evidence that these practices became more important through time. The archaeological remains of landscape values and disposal practices of individual households can be viewed within their backlots. The survival of ethnic foodways and other practices can be studied in deposits associated with downtown Los Angeles's various ethnic groups, who lived in close proximity to each other at this time.

**Question 2.** Can this resource help us to understand the dynamics of cultural pluralism and social stratification during the 19th and early 20th centuries? Does this resource possess material remains that could elucidate the relative influences of economic distinctions and the development of mass production and world trade on the material manifestations (i.e., artifacts) of ethnic and subcultural distinctions?

Analysis of the effects of ethnicity on material culture is more sophisticated than it was a decade ago (e.g., Schuyler 1980). Several newer studies are directly pertinent to looking at 19th- and early 20th-century households in the study area. These include a study of Washington, D.C., neighborhoods that indicated that “ethnic-based differences could be isolated while economic-based differences could not” (Cheek and Friedlander 1990:34) and the contrary findings of O'Brien and Majewski (1989), that immigrant families from the American South were clearly distinguished in the archaeological record of Missouri based on
wealth and status. Stewart-Abernathy's work on rural families in Arkansas also yielded little indication that food use was an indicator of the ethnicity of a prominent Jewish household, whereas there were other definite and material signs of both religious conformity and a prosperous standard of living (Stewart-Abernathy and Ruff 1989; Stewart-Abernathy 1986).

A number of studies in the eastern United States suggest that ceramics, whose availability is determined by the marketplace and global-scale economics, reflect a dulling sameness within many working-class and middle-class households in the late 19th century (De Cunzo 1987; Cheek and Friedlander 1990). It is proposed here that the situation in 19th-century cities presented a range of options even for families at roughly the same social and economic level. For example, the range of ceramics recovered from the homes of small entrepreneurs in Sacramento indicates individual differences among these families; faunal analysis and preliminary linkage of its results to cooking techniques also indicates individual household behavior (Praetzellis 1991).

Within a contextual framework, artifacts take on meaning outside of their obvious physical characteristics. Comparison of two archaeological collections dating to around 1900 and associated with the Collins family of Irish-American descent and the Cook family, who were African-American, showed that both households were very similarly appointed. Both families had comparable material goods and spent their money for food in similar ways, but there were differences between the meals served to the two families—if not in the plates from which they ate. These surface similarities, however, masked profound differences in their lives: for although their plates were similar, the Cooks and the Collinses would not have eaten at the same table; nor would they have had the same expectations or the same opportunities (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992b). The influences of racism and resistance, as discussed previously, were also visible in the Cook collection.

To best see the variation (or lack thereof) requires tying together the ceramic, faunal remains, and other artifact classes by means of a contextual analysis. Considering the major artifact classes individually, combining these data to establish an archaeologically derived spectrum of lifeways, then checking for inter-household similarities or differences, would illustrate how study-area households were like others in California (e.g., Sacramento and Los Angeles), in the West (Phoenix, San Diego, Seattle), in the Midwest, South, or in the East (Boston, New York). It is also a way to see whether the city's public facade was paralleled by a similar unifying kinship through objects—household furnishings, utensils, daily foods—kept and used inside family homes (Yentsch 1993a:278).

**Question 3.** Does this resource possess artifacts and/or faunal remains that could be used to elucidate the role of symbols in defining and maintaining boundaries between groups?

Scholars have been suggesting for some time that archaeologists could make a contribution to the study of ethnic boundary maintenance (Brown and Bragdon 1982; Kelly and Kelly 1980; McGuire 1982). Social boundaries are marked by material symbols of ethnic differences—style-bearing artifacts. The historic record of the Chinese community in the West, for example, shows that style was expressed through differences in landscape, public display, dress, and language. Although the latter two characteristics have left little or nothing for the
historical archaeologist to work with, historical studies of landscape and ethnically specific public display have been rewarding. For example, the site of the Sacramento Overseas Chinese community bordering Sutter Slough was geomantically favorable and provided the perfect stage for cultural displays, such as boat races, on the lake itself. While collections of artifacts that include both Chinese and Euroamerican items are generally interpreted as evidence of acculturation on the part of the Chinese, a contextual approach provides an alternative explanation for this pattern in the 1850s Chinese merchant community in Sacramento. Here, the non-Chinese materials reflected the merchant household's superior access to goods compared with the non-merchant population. Artifacts used by merchants themselves also may have served a stylistic function in boundary maintenance displays to emphasize the differences between themselves, as boundary people, and the Chinese community at large (Praetzellis, Praetzellis, and Brown 1987).

The varied ethnicities of the Stockton waterfront project areas—particularly the Chinese and German—may be expressed in material form on the landscape as gardens, fences, and in other forms of public display.

**Data Requirements**

This theme builds on an understanding of the data analyzed for Theme A.

*Archaeological:* period interface composed of feature and layer interfaces; many households

*Historical:* specific historical associations for each stratum

*Documentary:* understanding of ethnic foodways, style-bearing artifacts, etiquette books, fashion magazines

*Archival:* ethnic identification, historical background

*Oral history:* interviews with representatives of various ethnic groups to explore the relevance of traditional material culture, foodways, and community life

*Ceramic, glass, metal containers:* MNI frequency/proportion

*Faunal Remains:* frequencies of types/domesticates/wild; presence/absence of types; butchering cuts

*Botanical remains:* frequencies of types—domestic/wild; presence/absence of types

**Theme C: Industrialization/Technology**

**Question 1.** Does this resource contain evidence of undocumented or poorly documented industrial processes that could add significantly to our knowledge of the development of a specific industry? Does the resource contain evidence of local innovation or “appropriate technology” as opposed to the adoption of standardized tools and materials? Is there evidence for extensive reuse of equipment, sites, buildings, or artifacts?

In the reconstructionist tradition of industrial archaeology, archaeologists have tended to concentrate on exposing and interpreting remains for the purpose of public interpretation and preservation (Teague 1987:130). Representative excavations include work in the late 1940s and early 1950s at the 17th-century Saugus Ironworks in Massachusetts (Robbins and Jones 1959) and at the early 18th-century blast furnaces and founding floors used to produce iron
for cannons in Pippingford, England (Crossley 1975). The principal goal of these investigations was to record the structure and function of the foundries.

The reconstructionist approach has been applied to the study of industrial remains in situations where the structure and function of the sites is well documented in the written record and at sites where less is known. George Teague (1987:204-205) has pointed out, however, that although industrial trappings (i.e., machines and structures) are more visually appealing, waste products are often better sources of information about undocumented technologies. Physical analysis of archaeologically recovered cast-iron products and by-products have been performed by Unglik (1984, 1990) and Council, Will, and Honerkamp (1982). These studies have offered insights into technological innovation and the processes and materials used at particular sites at a level that cannot be approached through historical research. The physical analysis of these industrial by-products allows the researcher to reconstruct many details of the industrial process that otherwise would be lost.

Properties likely to contribute data to this question include blacksmith shops and the various processing points of the Los Angeles Vintage Company winery and distillery.

Question 2. Does this resource demonstrate the impact of industrialization on landscape, environment, or public health?

Industries commonly took advantage of the process of filling land or covering “miasmas” to use the area as dump sites for what are now known as hazardous wastes. “Out of sight, out of mind” was the watchword of these early polluters, who either had no idea that their refuse might be dangerous or were callous in regards to the consequences of their actions. Archaeological analysis and field investigation can identify potential locations where toxic substances may have been discharged. This study can contribute not only to academic knowledge of historic practices but also to contemporary attempts to clean up these noxious “resources.” The location of Hansel and Ortman’s automobile complex on Block 70 2/3 of Site 1, may contain contaminated areas.

Data Requirements

Archaeological: feature and/or layer interface  
Historical: associated with industrial activity  
Archival: company records and accounts of wine-making processes  
Ceramics and glass function: MNI frequency/proportion  
Faunal remains: economic scaling and ranking of butchering cuts (Lyman 1987; Schulz and Gust 1983)

Theme D: Urban Geography

Question 1. Does this resource help us to understand the characteristics of the natural environment and the landscape modifications made during the historic period? Does this resource aid in our understanding of the beginnings of urban planning and infrastructure—water supply and storage, trash and sewage disposal, fire protection, drainage—in this city?
Civic improvements that are carried out by government agencies are generally planned and well documented. In western cities of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, these projects were often undertaken on a large scale to overcome the natural disadvantages of the city's site. Sacramento, for example, was a classic “instant city” that sprang up to take advantage of a particular historical phenomenon: the Gold Rush. Situated at the junction of two seasonally flooding rivers, the city was assaulted by several major floods that, for a time, threatened its status as regional commercial center and state capital. The city's reaction was to raise the level of its business district by as much as 16 ft.

The history of a city as seen through its fill is a history that “tells it like it was” (Geismar 1987). Filling took place for economic reasons, such as improving the value of property or making otherwise useless areas useful for everyday human activities. It is clear, however, that people of the 19th century had a passion for cutting, filling, and leveling land that went beyond rationality (Upton 1992; Yentsch and Kratzer n.d.), as can be seen in the histories of landscape alterations made to cities like Boston (Upton 1992:figure 3), San Francisco (Praetzellis and Praetzellis, eds., 1993), and Seattle (Ostrogorsky 1987). Sometimes the varied topography was seen as an “offense to the public,” an element of the cityscape that they sought to displace. The history of the process by which the landscape was re-formed can be read in sequences of purposeful fill (Yentsch 1993b:334).

The progress and process of street raising are generally well documented in contemporary primary and secondary sources (e.g., Lagomarsino 1969). The responses of the citizenry itself, however, are largely unknown since this level of activity occurred one parcel at a time and varied significantly throughout the city in spite of City ordinances that attempted to regulate them (Praetzellis 1991). Although Stockton was not subjected to such large-scale improvement projects as portions of Sacramento, laws and regulations were set up by the City regarding the filling of channels and sloughs that were imperfectly complied with and enforced. Archaeology is the only source through which we can examine the responses of individual residents to some legal norms established by the City. For example, in many cities “earth closets” (i.e., privies dug directly into the ground) were outlawed in the 1880s, and historic records document many sewer hook-ups at this time. Archaeological evidence, however, demonstrates that some urban households and neighborhoods continued to use earth privies well into the 20th century (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992b). Similar examples of ad hoc drainage, fire protection, and refuse disposal have been discovered archaeologically. In the mixed-use neighborhood of Site 1, how did residents respond to City ordinances? Did residents of Site 2 South keep prohibited livestock, engage in unlawful activities, build or use facilities that did not “meet code”?

**Question 2.** Does this resource demonstrate the relationship between public perceptions of the environment and public policy? How did society's perceptions of the cultural landscape and modifications to the environment change over time?

Joan Geismar has studied variability in fill sequences in New York City, viewing fill layers in tandem with City and State health legislation to ascertain the response of inhabitants to health regulations. By 1790 as medical knowledge of disease grew, City authorities began to link
aspects of refuse disposal with the spread of diseases like yellow fever. Whereas waterfront fill in the mid-1700s included ship's ballast, abandoned ships, tannery refuse, butchery waste, construction debris, garbage from city food markets, and even human waste, refuse disposal became more highly regulated in the 1800s. During periods of yellow fever outbreak (or of similar contagious diseases), Geismar found that layers of fill deposited in city environs were relatively sterile (i.e., contained very few or no artifacts). As the number of years after an outbreak increased, however, residents once more began to see filling activity on city lots as an opportunity to rid themselves of household and industrial wastes. Thus alternate sequences of semi-sterile fill (what people of that era called “clean, wholesome sand”) interspersed with sequences of refuse-laden fill can be read, in New York City, as a record of the health of city dwellers (Yentsch 1993b:333-334, citing Geismar 1983, 1986, 1987).

**Question 3.** What information about neighborhood formation (i.e., residential differentiation and the emergence of homogeneous neighborhoods along social and economic lines) is available from this resource?

It is not always possible, nor is it necessarily always desirable, to orient urban archaeological research to features within a particular parcel with well-defined historical associations and occupants. This theme directs research away from the household and asks what process differentiated neighborhoods from each other. Separating the influences of ethnicity and economics on a neighborhood level has proved difficult (Cheek and Friedlander 1990). These methodological problems must be overcome, however, in order to do what Salwen (1987) described as archaeology of the city rather than merely archaeology in the city.

The features examined in Question 1 may form the basis of comparisons between historically defined neighborhoods—as these data become available—to search for distinct patterns of behavior. Did, for example, certain neighborhoods move more quickly away from earth privies and other features than others? The understanding of the material culture and adaptive strategies of individual households developed in Themes A and B will be combined to develop neighborhood characteristics.

**Data Requirements**

*Archaeological:* period interface composed of feature and layer interfaces  
*Historical:* land-use study, patterning identified from archival sources  
*Archival:* photographs and accounts of industrialization; information on legal statutes  
*Environmental:* reconstruction of local vegetation based on pollen record  
*Faunal/Botanical remains:* frequency of types; domesticates/wild; presence/absence of types; paleoscatological remains

**Theme E: Interpretive Potential**

**Question 1.** Does the resource have public interpretive potential for a museum or public display? For example, could the site provide information about the lifeways of a poorly documented ethnic or occupational group that can be used to better explain the group's position in the city's history to visitors and residents?
The value of archaeologically derived materials for use in exhibits is beyond question. A carefully planned display of artifacts, text, and photographs can move and educate an audience. The lives of the people who once occupied the Stockton waterfront area were interesting and diverse, but how they constructed their material world has gone unremarked. Results from the multidisciplinary investigation proposed herein could form the basis for a sensitive rendering of the mixed-use neighborhood that became downtown Stockton in a way that could not be accomplished without the active voice provided by the tangible objects of the past that now lie buried.

**Question 2.** Does the resource contain artifacts that could be used to interpret the past as a tangible, hands-on component of a teaching unit developed for use in schools?

The South Street Seaport Museum in New York City routinely uses archaeologically recovered artifacts from within the city in its exhibits, in its hands-on teaching program for students, in its public outreach, and as a means to illuminate different facets of history (Yentsch 1993a:279). The large volume of materials expected to have survived in the archaeological record of downtown Los Angeles could form the basis for type collections to be used by local public school teachers in their California History units. For example, a teaching unit focusing on the material culture of various ethnic or family groups residing in Los Angeles in the 19th century could be developed.

**Data Requirements**

*Archaeological:* artifacts and historical associations of interest to the public

*Oral History:* interviews to document the lifeways of poorly documented ethnic or occupational groups
Chapter 4
EVALUATION AND TREATMENT PLAN

This plan follows a Consolidated Approach to CEQA compliance in which the discovery, evaluation, and treatment phases are collapsed into a single operation. Preceding chapters established the historic setting of the site areas and provided a theoretical context for evaluating historic remains. This chapter identifies which locations within the three site areas have the highest potential for containing important archaeological remains, outlines methods for the identification and evaluation of historic archaeological remains, and provides a Treatment Plan for those remains determined to be potentially important. This Evaluation and Treatment Plan relies heavily on one implemented for the Cypress Freeway Replacement Project in Oakland (Praetzellis 1994); the text of the Testing Methodology and Treatment Plan sections is largely repeated from an earlier implementation of this plan at the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California’s Headquarters Project in Los Angeles (Costello et al., 1996).

All archaeological work will be conducted according to guidelines as set forth in Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook (ACHP 1990) and Archaeology and Historic Preservation: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines (NPS 1983; 48 CFR 44716-44742). Investigations will be performed under the supervision of historical archaeologists and historians whose education and experience meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (NPS 1983; 48 CFR 44738-44739).

ASSESSMENT OF HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A summary of the archaeological potential of each site area is presented below. Detailed historic data on specific buildings and residents, gleaned from the sources discussed in preceding sections, are presented in Appendices A and B. The identification of archaeological Test Areas is based on four criteria which address the potential of identified property types to answer the research themes identified in the preceding chapter, and to have survived intact to the present day (i.e., not to have been destroyed by later constructions). As none of the potential architectural or industrial remains meet these criteria, testing areas consist of domestic occupation and commercial sites pre-dating ca. 1890. This date is when Stockton’s refuse collection and sewer systems were being widely implemented, and after which dense artifact deposits on individual lots disappeared rapidly. As the location of these deposits are universally near backyard fence lines, these lot areas have been identified for archaeological testing. Test areas are identified for Site1 (Block 70 2/3) and Site 2 South (Blocks H, I, and M).
Selection of Test Area Locations

Archaeological sites in urban areas "are likely to be more or less invisible, buried under modern created land surfaces." Here, "the reconnaissance consists of field checking predictions made on the basis of archival research" (NPS 1985:36). Except for Site 2 North, the project areas are largely covered in asphalt, concrete, or buildings. Predictions as to the location, nature, and significance of archaeological resources will therefore be made on the bases of the archival record and previous experience with similar deposits.

The locations recommended below for testing appear likely to contain property types that may be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 4, their ability to answer important questions. The actual survival of important deposits is currently unverified. Field work will be necessary to determine the existence and integrity of the predicted archaeological remains.

The only method that would ensure discovery of all legally significant historic-period archaeological features would consist of stripping all areas of direct impact to their various 19th-century ground surfaces. As the time and cost involved in such an undertaking would be prohibitive, the following selection criteria were employed. These criteria have been used with success in other urban California contexts to help predict the location and potential research value of archaeological remains.

1. Is there evidence that the parcel in question was occupied before or during a transitional event, either regulatory (e.g., city water/sewer installation) or natural (e.g., fire or flood)? Is there evidence that the parcel contains feature or layer interfaces?

2. Is there evidence that these interfaces may have survived to the present (i.e., absence of deep basements; presence of concrete surfaces)?

3. Can potentially significant archaeological property types be reliably linked to a specific household or activity whose economic and demographic characteristics may be constructed from the documentary record?

4. Can potentially significant archaeological property types be reliably linked to a particular household or activity that is representative of a type whose specifics are often very difficult to trace through the documentary record?

Site 1

Block 63 3/4. The northern portion of this block was evidently occupied since the beginnings of Stockton. The frame St. Charles Hotel, Stockton’s finest of the day, was located on El Dorado, between Bridge and Channel. It burned in 1872 and was replaced in 1883 by the three-story brick Masonic Hall, torn down in 1933. The brick Philadelphia House, located in the center of the block on the site of the Hotel de Mexico, was owned and occupied by the Breidenbach family from the 1860s through the early 1900s. In 1909 the building was remodeled and converted into a grocery store by a member of the family. The 1850s Pioneer Grocery store, on the northeast corner of Hunter and Channel, was purchased in 1862 by Louis Hansel, who, by the 1870s, added a second story and
additional buildings to the original brick structure. Known as the Hansel Block, it was in use by the Stockton Independent for many years in the late 1890s and early 1910s. It is believed to have been remodeled in the 1930s and subsumed beneath the present stucco facade.

The southern portion of the block was originally known as “Weber’s Hole” and was simply a swammy arm of the Stockton Channel, framed in by streets and bridges. By the early 1880s Captain Weber had constructed the “Weber Baths,” a swimming pool complex in the center of the block, while the “Tin House,” a frame two-story building clad in corrugated metal, was built on the west end of the block. The Tin House housed stores and saloons on the lower floor, with lodgings on the upper. Two other frame buildings, occupied by various enterprises over the years, were located between the two structures. By 1908 construction had begun on the Hotel Stockton, a four-story reinforced concrete structure, which occupies the site to this day.

Block 70 2/3 - This block was the site of Stockton’s first Chinatown, established by 1851. As the Chinese first occupied a former French hotel, there were apparently earlier residents. After Chinatown burned in 1862, most of its populace moved south to the area around Washington Street, although the famous Heungshan Joss Temple stood on Hunter, between Channel and Bridge Streets, from 1882-1923. During the 1870s, the northern half of the block began to be developed with frame homes, primarily single-family dwellings facing Miner and El Dorado. Some of the homes were owner-occupied, while others were rented out. Ethnically, the population consisted of a mix of German, Jewish, and Anglo-American folk. Across Hunter Street to the east was the Turnverein Hall, a German social and athletic club. In 1895 two two-store frame lodging houses with first-floor store fronts stood on Lots 9 and 11.

The block was bisected by Miner Slough, which coursed through from east to west until it was filled in the early 1900s. South of the slough the neighborhood was largely commercial, with only two homes facing Channel Street by 1870 (Lots 6 and 8) and another facing Hunter by 1881 (Lot 16). A two-story brick building was constructed on the southeast corner of the block by the 1860s. One Chinese laundry occupied the old house on Lot 16 during the 1890s, while another laundry (or perhaps the same one at a new location) was on Lot 6 on Channel Street until 1917. By the late 1910s the entire block had been taken over by the Hansel and Ortman automobile dealership, garages, auto repair, etc.

Block XX. By 1870 a one-story frame storage shed had been erected at this location on Commodore’s Levee. It was owned by M.K. Bell from 1888 until at least 1894, and served as a freight warehouse until the mid 20th century. In 1894 City Storage Shed company was sharing the building which the next year was known as the Union Transfer Company freight Ware House. Probably about 1910 (along with the Hotel Stockton), a two-story stucco Mission-style ticket office and baggage room constructed facing El Dorado Street; this is the first identified building in the small project area on this block. By
1917 the freight shed had been rebuilt or enlarged by the California Transfer Company, and in 1946 these buildings were occupied by the River Lines boat and motor freight terminal.

**Test Areas.** The southern blocks, Block 63 ¾ and Block XX, do not have any archaeological research potential. Those portions which might contain significant remains are either currently occupied by historic buildings, such as the Hotel Stockton, or have been disturbed to some depth by earlier construction.

Block 70 2/3 does contain potentially important archaeological remains associated with the early residences (1860s-1890s) and with the Chinese laundry on Hunter Street (1880s-1895). Later development of the Hansel and Orman automobile dealership likely paved over the buried deposits with concrete slabs. It is possible that artifact-filled features such as privies and trash pits may be located in the rear yards of these dwellings. Alternatively, it is also possible that the adjacent slough was used for refuse disposal and that the abandoned privies were filled with clean earth. Two areas are recommended for testing: Test Area 1-A, north of the old Miner’s Channel, encompassing the rear of Lots 1, 3, 5, and 7; and Test Area 1-B, south of Miner’s channel, including the rear of Lot 16 (Figure Treat:1). The later automotive industries may also have left contaminated soils, which will prevent excavation in some areas.

**Site 2 South**

All of the blocks in this Site area were owned and subdivided by the Weber family. Most of the southwest vicinity was occupied by an arm of Mormon Slough and a swamp as late as 1870. There were no improvements on the Site area lots prior to 1867. Shortly thereafter, single-family residential development began from the northeast and spread south and west, culminating in an almost complete build-out of lots by the mid-1890s. All of the dwellings were of frame construction, both one- and two-stories, while several had attached tankhouses. Sheds, privies, stables, and other outbuildings were located in the rear yards, primarily along the fence lines. The residences were both owner- and tenant-occupied, mostly by Anglo- and Euro-American families, most of whom were second or third generation Americans. The occupants worked in lower middle-class or blue collar jobs, as carpenters, laborers, clerks, janitors, postal service, tailors, and saloonkeepers, as well as toiling in the shipping industry, local grain and woolen mills, etc. Three late nineteenth century commercial enterprises were located within the site area, the R.F. Wilson Wind Mill and Tank Manufactory on Block E, the J.F. Hoerl Planing Mill on Block I, and the Simpson and Gray Lumber Yard on Block F. By the 1960s most of the families had moved from the area and it had become industrialized.

**Block E.** This block was occupied by several residences by the late 1870s, two on Lots 8 and 10 facing West Main Street. The rear portion of these lots, with potential artifact deposits, however, fall outside of the Site boundaries. The R.F. Wilson Wind Mill and Tank Company was also located on the southwest corner of the block.
Block F.  This entire block, except for a residence on the northwest corner built in the 1890s, was occupied by the Simpson & Gray Lumber Yard from the 1890s through the 1910s. It was occupied by the Union Oil Company in the 1950s and 1970s.

Block G.  The east half of this block, located within the site area, was occupied by the Tidewater and Associated Oil Company from the 1910s through the 1970s.

Block H.  This block was fully developed by 1881 when homes were present on every lot. Ship captain Charles McNeil and his wife Bridget (both from Ireland) owned Lots 5, 7, 9, and 11 bordering W. Main Street, living on Lot 9 and putting rental houses on all the others. Three lots were developed by a local real estate firm while others were owner-occupied. The only exception to this was the dwelling and grocery store of Mrs. Minerva Bachman (ca. 1893-1901), located on the southwest corner of the block, that burned in 1901.

Block I.  By the early 1870s there were five frame residences on this block (Lots 7, 11, 10/12, 8, and 6) with two more added by 1881 (Lots 15 and 16). By the 1890s the western side of the block was largely occupied by J.F. Hoerl’s planing mill operations.

Block K.  A marshland and slough area in the early years, this block was developed residentially by the mid-1890s. The earliest house was on Lot 1/3, built by 1884.

Block M.  Only the northern portion of this block is in the site area. It was almost completely built-out by 1881. The Black School, and later Monroe School, were located on the southeast corner of the block, outside of the project area.

Block N.  The west half of this block was developed residentially by the early 1890s, while the east half remained vacant until the 1940s.

Block O.  Once part of Mormon Channel, residential dwellings were not constructed on this block until the early 1890s, with total build-out by the early 1900s.

Test Areas.  This was one of the early residential areas in Stockton, and the homes from the 1870s and 1880s have the potential to provide important information on the family life of these decades. Test areas have been identified on the rear of lots located on three blocks in Site 2 South: Block H (2SH), Block I (2SI), and Block M (2SM). None of the industrial areas appear to contain important archaeological remains and no testing is recommended in their vicinity.

Site 2 North

Blocks 17 1/2, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25; and potential development Blocks 20 and 26. A large prehistoric Yokut village, known as the Stockton Channel Mound, has been identified.
directly west of Blocks 20 and 26 and may extend into these areas. With European contact, the village disappeared and the land north of the Channel, like most of Stockton, was owned by the Weber family. Site 2 North encompasses what was once known as Banner Island. Although joined to the mainland when the estuary silted in by the 1880s, the name was always associated with this local. In 1888, the Stockton Team of the California Baseball League built their new stadium on Blocks 24, 25, 18, and 19; where they played until the late 1890s. By about 1900, the California Navigation and Transportation Company had constructed their ship yard on Block 20, and two frame dwellings were on Block 26. The Island Transportation Company erected their machine shop and wood works on Block 17½ by 1917. During World War II the Gunnert and Zimmerman and Hickinbotham ship building yards were located along the channel. The shorefront was subsequently occupied by steel and boat yards through the early 1970s. Industrial buildings were constructed on the northern portion of the project area in recent years. Miner Levee, a section of levee constructed in 1927 and aligned with of Miner Avenue, was also the location of ship-building activities.

**Test Areas.** Although historically important, both Banner Island and the Mudville ball field would have left little archaeological evidence, and later shipbuilding and industrial works has completely obscured whatever remains might have survived. The industrial facilities do not contain archaeological potential and thus no excavations for historic period remains are recommended. The proximity of the Stockton Channel Mound to Blocks 20 and 26, however, make it quite possible that this Yokut village site may extend into these areas. Prior to any development of these blocks, a research design and testing program for these prehistoric resources should be developed and carried out.

**TESTING AND EVALUATION METHODS**

Although the archaeological investigations will occur in one effort, the work in each Test Area is subtly divided into two phases: “testing” and “treatment.” Test excavations determine the presence or absence of legally important property types; those resources determined to be important are then treated to alleviate the negative impacts of project development.

**Demolition and Construction Monitoring**

The essence of the proposed testing strategy is that only those areas within each project Site that are most likely to contain legally significant archaeological properties will be examined. The best predictive-modeling strategy, however, cannot take into account all potentially significant property types. The locations of some simply cannot be known ahead of time, such as unrecorded buildings and structures, fire devastation, clandestine burying, prehistoric remains, and the results of eccentric human behavior. This leaves the possibility that important properties may be present in locations that are not identified for testing. Archaeological monitoring, during both demolition and construction, is a solution to this problem.
Monitoring consists of an archaeologist being present on-site and observing any earth moving within Site development areas. Demolition can involve removal of buildings, structures, pavement, parking areas, and utility lines. Demolition which needs to occur within the Test Areas prior to archaeological investigations will be monitored by an archaeologist. The locations of areas to be monitored during project construction will be determined after the archaeological field work has provided a better understanding of each Site area. In this instance, the monitor would be present until it was determined that excavation had reached the maximum depth at which important remains could be expected to occur. Should potentially important remains be found, the monitor will be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition activities, construction workers, and heavy equipment until the discovery is evaluated.

Exploratory Methods

Prior to field work, a health and safety plan specific to the archaeological investigations will be developed. The plan will stipulate precautions to be taken to avoid exposure to contaminated soils and other potentially dangerous conditions. Additional site investigations for hazardous materials may be necessary to identify all areas of high risk prior to field work. As a general principle, field work will not be considered for areas of high risk. Where the Field Director has reason to believe that hazards exist on a site, archaeological investigations will cease until and unless it is demonstrated that no hazards exist.

As described previously, archaeological testing has two goals: to identify potentially important archaeological remains and to evaluate them. The identification phase presents challenges to conventional methods since urban archaeological deposits are often covered by fill or obscured on the surface by subsequent activities. For these reasons, the Test Areas will be scraped with a hydraulic backhoe/loader with a 36-in.-wide bucket to expose previous ground surfaces in plan view. At the completion of a backhoe scrape, the top of features will be exposed in the trench floor, not in its sides. The historic lot lines are then resurveyed over the Test Area and each feature can be associated with its historic residents.

The Site 1 project area has been subjected to the most extensive surface disturbances including excavation of basements. The depth of these disturbances and their relationship to archaeological deposits are currently unknown. However, it is likely that development of Hansel and Ortman’s early 20th century automobile complex largely involved simply pouring concrete floors over the previous historic ground surface. Locations which are found to be disturbed areas will be abandoned in favor of others. The Site 2 South Test Areas are quite different: here there appears to have been little later construction after the removal of the houses and the backyard deposits are expected to be largely intact.
Identification of Property Types

The research design specifies several types of archaeological resources that may contain the types of data necessary to address identified research questions. The research questions fall into two general classes that have some correspondence with these types of archaeological features: questions that require primary deposits and landscape features that are arranged horizontally (such as sheet refuse and gardens, and structural remains such as building footings); and questions that require secondary deposits of artifacts that are often arranged vertically (such as are often found in hollow/filled features such as backfilled wells, refuse pits, and outhouses).

The questions specified in the research design relating to domestic and commercial property types, emphasize both types of archaeological features. Sheet refuse accumulates on living surfaces and may be the product of either primary or secondary deposition, or of a catastrophic event. Such a deposit may appear as either a relatively thin layer of debris located at an archaeological layer interface or as a series of superimposed layers of substantial thickness. Primary deposits of this type, which often have the potential to address research questions concerning the spatial organization of activities, will be investigated horizontally in broad exposures. Special care will be taken in recording the spatial relationships of artifacts. Conversely, secondary depositions of fill tend to be relatively thick, reflecting their historic function to raise low ground. Since primary deposits often occur at the interfaces of these layers, care is always taken when exposing these surfaces in areas such as domestic backlots. To the degree that the artifacts contained in a horizontal secondary deposit can be dated and associated with a household, they are of potential value as sources of important data and will be retained. However, artifacts will not be recovered simply “because they are there” since the important information in such a deposit may often be recovered by simply recording its structure.

Hollow/filled features, also secondary deposits, are potentially important sources of discrete refuse caches. These features, their contents, and deposition dates can often be accurately identified and assigned to a historically documented household or business. The contents often include household ceramics, glass containers, food bone, and personal accouterments. Features that have documented associations and a range and quantity of artifacts (see QIVA criteria above) are among the most important potential sources of data that can be used to address the research questions. These features will be excavated in a strictly stratigraphic manner, that is, according to the physical layers of deposition. The strata will be used as the primary provenience for artifacts contained in them. Cross-sectioning is usually employed as a testing technique to view both the feature’s contents and structure.

Several kinds of data must be recovered from every property in order to realize its research potential: the deposit's structure (including stratification and features, aerial extent and depth), and content (including the nature and quantity of artifacts). In addition, the feature must be placed in its temporal and cultural/historical contexts. Additional detail is provided below.

Excavation Techniques
As cultural features and stratification are identified during the test investigation, they will be exposed in plan by hand, photographed, and mapped in relation to a permanent datum. The evaluation phase involves determining the features' structure and stratigraphic integrity, approximate date of deposition, and range and quantity of artifacts. The approximate depth of refuse-filled pits may often be gauged by probing with a steel rod. To assess a feature's content and integrity, an appropriate portion of each will be hand excavated. In the case of a refuse-filled pit, for example, the feature could be cross-sectioned and part of each layer excavated. The proper level of effort for each feature will be determined by the Field Director during excavation. As a general rule, the minimum amount of excavation should be performed that will allow the evaluation to be made.

All excavations are by natural stratigraphic layers. Strata are recorded and analyzed according to procedures described in *The Principles of Archaeological Stratigraphy* (Harris 1979). Where physical layers of deposition are not present, excavation will be controlled by means of successive 10 cm (or thinner) arbitrary levels. The material will be excavated using hand tools and, where appropriate, the soil passed through 1/4-in. screen. To facilitate the recovery of tiny artifacts, smaller screen size may be used. Each unit of excavation will be recorded on detailed forms on which the excavator and/or supervisor will note site structure and content. Artifacts will be bagged according to provenience; the bags will be marked with the provenience designation, screen size, excavator's name, and the date. In general, artifacts whose archaeological context is uncertain (i.e., unstratified finds) will not be collected unless they are of potential value for public interpretation. Excavations will be mapped in relation to permanent datum points. Excavations will be recorded on plan and cross-section drawings drawn to scale, as well as by 35-mm black and white print photographs and color slides.

Artifacts catalogued in the field will not necessarily be removed from the site. The “discard policy” will follow that developed for the Metropolitan Water District project in Los Angeles (Praetzellis and Costello, 1997). Some materials may, at the discretion of the Field Director, be reburied in their original proveniences (i.e., within the features from which they were excavated). This is particularly appropriate for artifacts from features that have been determined to be non-significant.

**Evaluation Procedures and Criteria**

Archaeological properties that are discovered during testing – dense deposits of household and commercial artifacts – are evaluated in the field for potential legal importance. After each feature is partially excavated, the artifact contents are examined in light of four specific values, summarized in the acronym QIVA: Quantity, Integrity, Variety, and Association (Costello, ed., 1999:23):

**Quantity** refers to the sheer number of artifacts present, as large assemblages provide more secure interpretations: There are more datable items to determine when the deposit was made, and the collection will be more representative of the household.
Integrity addresses the physical condition of the deposit, referring to the intact nature of the archaeological remains. In order for a feature to be most useful, it should be in much the same state as when it was deposited.

Variety addresses the range of different types of items contained in a collection. The interpretive potential of a deposit is increased with the diversity of its contents.

Association refers to the ability to connect a collection of artifacts with an individual household, an ethnic or socioeconomic group, or a specific activity or property use. This is what provides the historic context for the artifacts, and is what James Deetz (1977) called “focus.”

Significance evaluations will be made through discussion between two qualified historical archaeologists: the Principal Investigator and the Field Director. In the event of disagreement between team members, a qualified third party will be consulted.

Historical Research

For the preparation of this Research Design, extensive historic data was collected, organized, and summarized. These data will allow informed decisions regarding significance to be made in the field by associating archaeological deposits with specific households and businesses. It is likely, however, that some remains will be found during testing that either are not associated with the households, industries, and businesses that were identified during the archival research phase, or require additional documentary information to interpret. In this situation, the properties' legal significance may hinge upon the degree to which they are documented in the written record. To allow a 'fast track' evaluation to proceed under these circumstances, the project historian will remain available to perform location-specific research as needed.

Discovery of Prehistoric Remains

Although proposed test excavations are designed to investigate historic-period remains in sites 1 and 2 South, prehistoric deposits may also occur in these locations (the only anticipated potential for prehistoric remains is in Site 2 North). For this reason, the following procedures will be carried out to ensure that any prehistoric deposits within test locations are discovered. Once the historic ground surface has been exposed, and during excavation of historic features and/or subsurface historic basement areas, excavation surfaces and walls will be inspected for soil changes suggesting prehistoric use of the area. The discovery of a combination of locally darkened soils, ash or charcoal deposits, and prehistoric materials will be taken as indicating the presence of a prehistoric archaeological site. Appropriate individuals will be notified and a Treatment Plan for prehistoric sites developed and implemented.
TREATMENT PLAN

This section will describe the treatment of archaeological properties that have been determined to be potentially important under California Register criteria and that may be affected by the proposed development projects. This Treatment Plan is generic in that it addresses the treatment of property types rather than specific, identified historic properties. This unusual approach is implicit in the strategy of collapsing the identification, evaluation, and data recovery phases into a single operation. As discussed previously, properties that are discovered during testing will be evaluated for their importance through discussions between two qualified historical archaeologists: the Principal Investigator and the Field Director. The mitigation strategy and level of effort that is appropriate to treat individual historic properties will be determined by consultation between the same parties. In the event of disagreement between team members, a qualified third party will be consulted.

Preceding sections of the research design have specified domestic and commercial refuse deposits as the primary archaeological property types that may be affected by the proposed development projects: These property types are likely to be important under Criterion 4 alone: historic resources that have the potential to yield information important to the history of the local area, California, or the nation. For this reason, and because it is usually not feasible to alter construction plans to avoid important features, the Treatment Plan emphasizes data recovery as the most appropriate mitigation measure in all cases. The field techniques described in the Testing Plan above are, in general, applicable to data recovery level work.

Artifact Cataloging Procedures

A provenience-based, lot cataloging system will be used to inventory artifacts. Lot cataloging is a method of inventorying artifacts of shared characteristics in groups or “lots.” The method has time- and effort-saving advantages over describing the artifacts individually. Lots are established according to rules developed by the appropriate specialists. Initially, artifacts are cataloged according to archaeological provenience and material. The catalog number, which is marked on each object, is made up of three elements: the accession number, the provenience reference, and a consecutive, unique number. Artifacts are then divided into general material types for specialist’s analysis. Artifacts are identified by standard attributes. They are also clarified according to the general functional categories devised by S. South (1977) as modified and expanded for later periods and western US contexts (Costello 1991). These include categories such as kitchen, architecture, interior furnishings, clothing, personal, and transportation. Artifacts are stored according to material and provenience.
Artifact Analysis

Artifacts recovered from the Stockton waterfront project areas will be analyzed with two goals in mind: to allow the investigators to address questions identified in the research design, and to generate comparative data for other researchers to use. The utility of the data to be obtained and the cost of analysis will be the determining factors in the decision to initiate a particular form of analysis. Furthermore, it is common on archaeological excavations that field operations may recover data that may not be fully analyzed. For example, some soil samples—which are expensive to analyze—may be collected, stabilized, and curated, but not analyzed.

In historical archaeology, the “site” is often an artificial construct that consists of the totality of archaeological remains in a defined location, regardless of their period of deposition or historical association. Defined in this way the “site” is meaningless as an analytical unit. Unless historical documentation or archaeological evidence indicates a single archaeological component, analysis of each excavation site will be geared toward the interpretation of individual proveniences or a number of proveniences that have demonstrable historical associations. Intra-site comparisons will be made between proveniences.

The enormous range of consumer goods available in late 19th-century California makes it impractical to specify the analytical procedures that may be carried out on all types of material that may occur. Rather, four of the most common classes will be described here: ceramics, glass containers, buttons, and ferrous metal artifacts; bones (zoo-archaeological remains) are described in the following section. Although particularistic issues can be tackled by the examination of individual classes of artifacts, it is emphasized that many of the identified research questions require insights that are obtained from a synthesis using data from several classes. The contribution of integrated artifact analyses is described in Chapter III.

Ceramics will be sorted and tabulated by functional type, fabric, form, decorative treatment, and, where possible, place of origin. The minimum number of items (MNI) represented will be calculated as will the proportion of each type of the total class represented. Ceramic analysis can contribute to the determination of the date of deposition by using a variant on South's mean dating method that employs pieces that bear dated makers' marks. The relative cost of the collection may be estimated using price and availability data, such as G. Miller's (1991) economic scale. In the case of domestic table and decorative ceramics, the estimated dates of purchase and deposition may be used to estimate how the purchasers/users of the material responded to changes in taste and fashion, and their participation in certain culturally significant social rituals.

Glass will be sorted by functional category, color, and type. The definitions and methods developed by Parks Canada (Jones and Sullivan 1989) will be employed. Design elements and makers' marks will also be noted. The material for each provenience will be described by vessel part, body form, possible function or contents, technological characteristics, size, and decorative detailing. The MNI will be calculated, as will the proportion of each type of the
total class represented. Chronologically sensitive aspects of glassware, such as the use of the Rickett's mold or the automatic bottle-making machine, will be noted. The latter will be combined with ceramic and other artifact data to determine deposition dates. As with ceramics, the proportion of the various functional types of glassware in each provenience will be tabulated to help estimate the nature of the domestic or commercial entity that created the deposit.

Buttons will be sorted by size (in British lines and in inches), form, construction, and material type. Design elements and patent and makers' marks will also be noted. The latter marks provide useful information to help date archaeological deposits, while material, attachment type, form, and size are good indicators of garment type and function. Buttons may be associated with articles of gender- and age-specific clothing. The numbers and relative frequencies of button types can suggest site function.

Metal artifacts are often the most problematic archaeological finds since they are generally fragmentary, in poor condition, and bulky. These materials are sorted by function and material. It is anticipated that most will be of ferrous metal and a minority of copper alloy. Food containers ("tin cans") tend not to survive in some urban archaeological contexts. Should tin canisters survive in Stockton deposits, they will be identified and described according to the recording system developed by J. Rock (1987). Along with glass and ceramics, tin canisters provide information on site date, foodways, and consumer behavior and add to the reconstruction of past ways of life.

Analysis of Faunal Remains

Initially, all faunal (zoo-archaeological) remains from each archaeological provenience will be divided into burned and unburned fractions. All pieces comprising both categories will be counted and weighed. Identifiable bones then will be segregated from unidentifiable specimens. Fragmentary specimens not identifiable to species level will be identified by class, super-class, and phylum and grouped according to relative size. Thus, the large mammal grouping will include mammals comparable in size to the cow; medium mammals comparable in size from the sheep/goat to dog; and small mammals comparable to, or smaller than, the domesticated cat. The large bird grouping includes specimens larger than the chicken; medium birds include specimens comparable to chicken; small birds include specimens smaller than a chicken. Whenever possible identifiable bones will be identified to class-order-family-genus species level. This will be accomplished using comparative osteological collections.

Following identification, pertinent data will be recorded for each identified specimen. These will include, as appropriate, (1) the specimen's taxonomic identity; (2) the specimen's skeletal element; (3) the side of the body or body segment from which it comes; (4) configuration (i.e., whole element, proximal portion, distal portion, and so forth); (5) butchering cut; (6) whether the specimen was from an adult or juvenile individual; and, (7) the weight of the specimen. Additional observations that will be recorded include additional signs of cultural modification, such as intentional breakage, presence of butchering marks, burning, etc. If
present, indications of non-cultural modifications, such as animal gnaw marks, weathering, and post-depositional breakage, also will be noted for each specimen. Measurements of identified specimens will be taken and recorded when appropriate to research goals.

Skeletal element counts will be determined for each identified vertebrate taxon on the basis of the number of separately identifiable portions represented in each specimen. For example, a mandible with three associated teeth would be assigned an element count of four, since four separately identifiable portions are present. Food weight will be calculated and calculations of MNI made by counting number(s) of the most abundant skeletal element(s) of each identified vertebrate taxon. Allometric computations and calculations of species diversity and selectivity indices will be made if and when these are appropriate.

Butchering cuts will be analyzed according to late 19th-century retail values established by Schulz and Gust (1983). Food bone will be used to study retail and home butchering, ethnic foodways, consumer behavior, and adaptive strategies within urban industrial settings.

**Historical and Oral History Research**

Historical research is an essential part of data recovery. Archaeological data gains in importance as its context is refined and enlarged by information from the documentary record. Data requirements needed to answer the research questions are not all archaeological. Oral history has proven very successful to date, and an oral history program tied to the project area will be a component of data recovery and will create public involvement and support. Distinct ethnic and social groups are known to have coexisted within the Stockton project areas in the latter 19th-century, their stories can often be fleshed out through oral history and ethnographic field work. Cultural and ethnic traditions are often expressed ephemerally and may leave little or no material trace. Thus as the researchers ask the archaeological record, What kinds of meals were served in the German households, they need to also ask whether the Germans continued to cook a distinctive cuisine. How did the local Chinese community express their cultural identity? and, Was there cooperation or tension between the different ethnic and social groups?

The question of the persistence of cultural traditions in the face of a dominant popular (Victorian) culture can also be broadened through oral history and ethnographic research. The following important questions will be explored: To what extent do groups—ethnic, occupational, religious—mediate between the cultural processes of traditional versus popular or elite values and aesthetics.
Treatment of Human Remains, Burial Goods, and Items of Cultural Patrimony

Project principles will ensure that the treatment of human remains, both Native American and non-Native American, will comply with all applicable State and Federal laws and regulations. In all cases where human remains are discovered, the Field Director will immediately notify the project proponent and the County Coroner and, in the case of Native American remains, the California Native American Heritage Commission. If human remains are discovered during demolition or construction, all work will cease in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until the required studies have been completed.

Treatment of Historic Properties Discovered During Construction

Although the Testing Plan has attempted to provide for the identification and examination of the most archaeologically sensitive locations within the APE, it is possible that important properties will be uncovered in the course of construction.

To recognize and appropriately treat unexpected discoveries, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor all project activities that may affect such properties. If archaeological properties are discovered, all ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find will cease until the find has been evaluated. If the feature appears to be important, we will assume the property to be important for the purposes of compliance with CEQA. If data recovery is determined by the archaeological consultant to be appropriate, this will be accomplished with dispatch so that construction is not unnecessarily delayed.

Ownership and Curation of Archaeological Materials

According to California Law, all archaeological material belongs to the property owner. However, upon the completion of the final report on the archaeological investigations, the collection will be transferred to an appropriate facility for permanent curation where it will be available for study by researchers in the future. In addition to the artifacts, soil samples, etc., the facility will also receive copies of field notes and drawings, special studies, and the final report.

Report and Dissemination of Results

At the conclusion of data recovery, the consultant will prepare a comprehensive technical report that will describe the archaeological project's goals and methods, and present its findings and interpretations. The report will synthesize the important archaeological data recovered through excavation with the information from archival research in order to address the questions identified in the research design. Depending on the nature of the findings, it may be appropriate to produce several, stand-alone reports on particular topics that reflect the various components of the research design. Past experience has shown that this format enhances the circulation and availability of these technical reports. The final report(s) will include the following elements:
- Executive summary
- Statement of scope
- Project location and setting
- Previous research summary
- Research goals and the strategies that guided research, testing, and data recovery
- Field and lab methods
- Archival research
- Archaeological context
- Findings—site/feature content, structure, and historical/cultural associations
- Artifact descriptions
- Consideration of research problems and questions
- Conclusions
- References cited
- Appendices: reports of technical analysis

Copies of the final report(s) will be provided to the City of Stockton, the SHPO, the California Historical Resources Information Center in Turlock, public libraries, research libraries, and other interested parties. In addition, articles may be prepared for publication in professional and lay journals that will address the findings of the archaeological and historical components of the project.

It is important that the results of archaeological documentation are reported and made available to the public. The historical studies that have been and will be produced in connection with archaeological data recovery provide an excellent source of material for a range of public outreach efforts that could foster goodwill among the Stockton community as well as informing them about the results of these studies. Among the options that could be selected are:

1. Design a mobile exhibit that could be installed in various local public facilities to showcase the cultural studies.
2. Fund a program to work with Stockton public school officials to develop a teaching unit on aspects of local history and archaeology.
3. Sponsor the creation, by a local public school or college, of a video documenting local history, oral history interviews, and archaeological remains.
4. Engage a local historical or cultural group to create a public interpretive product.
5. Recast the technical report on the archaeological investigation into a popularly written monograph highlighting the history and archaeology of Stockton. This monograph would be distributed to local schools, libraries, and interested parties.
Figure 15. Site 1, Block 70 2/3 Archaeological Test Areas A and B, overlain on 1895 Sanborn map.
Figure 16. Site 2 South, Block H, Archaeological Test Area, overlain on 1895 Sanborn map.
Figure 17. Site 2 South, Block I, Archaeological Test Area, overlain on 1895 Sanborn map.
Figure 18. Site 2 South, Block M, Archaeological Test Area, overlain on 1895 Sanborn map.
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The wealth of historical detail found on Sanborn Company maps dating from the turn of the century is sometimes clouded by the abbreviations used at that time. The following list was developed by the publisher to help unravel the occupancy and usage associated with the structures. This list is neither complete nor totally correct; it serves only as a guide. Minor variations due to regional usage of some terms have been encountered. An example is the use of "Chine" and "Chinese" interchangeably. There is also some uncertainty about abbreviations such as "S" and "Sto"—there is some evidence that they had multiple uses, but only among maps made by different survey teams in divergent locations and years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Boots &amp; Saddles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; S</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Brick Chimney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Chop House (an eating place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Dry Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Female Boarding = Bordello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>General Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>House, not hotel. (Ware Ho., Out Ho., Hose Ho., etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Hydrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Millinery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Methodist-Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Saloon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Store; Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Stove Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Storage (several variations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Ware House = Warehouse. (also Wash House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Some common symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Number of stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Wooden overhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>x = shingle roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Barn or Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>T.C. = Terra Cotta Chimney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commonly Encountered Sanborn Map Company Abbreviations, by Vlad Shkurkin, San Pablo, CA.
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APPENDIX B

SITE HISTORIES BY BLOCK AND LOT

The Sites utilize block and lot numbers established by Richard P. Hammond in his 1849 map of Stockton. The plan for the size, layout, and numbering of the lots and blocks was designed by Captain Charles Weber, and are still used by the City Assessor’s Office. Initially, all the lots and blocks belonged to Weber and, after his death, to the Weber Estate. The family remained in the real estate business for many years, gradually selling off all their holdings, including individual lots as well as entire blocks. The historic data on each lot, gleaned from the sources discussed in Chapter 2, are presented here in chronological order and arranged by block and lot number to facilitate correlation with archaeological findings. Each entry includes the date (which refers to the Date Key below), followed by the information found therein. In a few cases where secondary sources were used, or where information relating to non-resident property owners is included, the citation is in parentheses. A list of sources is provided in the References section of this report.

When real estate values are entered, the 1860s and 1870s assessment amounts are for the combined value of real estate and improvements; the 1890s and 1900s amounts are presented with real estate values first and improvements second. If only one amount is reported during this period, it signifies that there were no improvements on the property.

In the summaries that follow, blocks are arranged in numerical or alphabetical order by Site. The numbering of lots starts at the northwest corner and proceeds clockwise around the block (see Figure 2, Lot 70 2/3 for the standardized lot layout).

KEY TO DATES

1849 - Hammond Map
1867 - Assessment Plat Map
1870 - Koch Birdseye View
1871-72 - City Directory
1880 - Federal Census
1881 - Assessment Plat Map
1883 - Sanborn Map
1883-84 - City Directory
1888 - City Directory
1893 - City Directory
1895 - Sanborn Map, Assessment Plat Map
1900 - City Directory, Federal Census
1901 - Assessment Plat Map
1917 - Sanborn Map
1946 - Sanborn Map
1950 - Sanborn Map
1972 - Sanborn Map

SITE 1 CHRONOLOGY BY BLOCK AND LOT

Block 63¾ (Sanborn 41) North Half
West Half
Lot 1, west portion
1849 - Stockton Hotel started, completed spring of 1850
1854 - Renamed St. Charles Hotel (SE corner Channel and El Dorado)
1867 - No listing, but St. Charles Hotel extant
1871 - Hotel burned
1875 - Masons purchased property
1881 - Masonic Hall Association, $2500/$1600, W. B. West, imps. (plat)

Fast portion
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $1600 (plat)
Both portions
Present - Glass Pro Auto Glass Shop, modern concrete building

**East Half**

Lot 2

1849 - Hotel de Mexico, Col. Cheatham

1867 - **Philadelphia House**, Breidenbach’s rooming house

1870 - Philadelphia House, both buildings

1871 - Philadelphia House erected? (Guinn 1909:324-5).

1872 - Joseph Breidenbach, furniture, 15 Bridge, residing same

Frank Breidenbach, cabinet maker, residing 15 Bridge

1881 - J. Breidenbach, $1600/$4000 (plat)

1884 - Philadelphia House, Charles Spengeman, prop., Bridge St. (Joseph Breidenbach, Jr., clerk with Theodore Kupper)

1888 - Joseph Breidenbach, proprietor, Philadelphia House, 205 Bridge; Joseph, Jr., saloon, Louis Breidenbach, boarder

1893 - Joseph Breidenbach, capitalist, residing 444 San Joaquin, 157 acres, also Louis F.

1895 - Bridge and Channel east side, Philadelphia House, including saloon (front frame, rear brick)

1901 - Joseph Breidenbach, $2700/$3500

1909 - Bridge and Channel, B&K Store, front facade altered and third story added to front, (stuccoed brick, 2-story front portion appears to be older than 3-story Italianate rear portion, but all completed by late 1860s)

1917 - East side B&K Store, west side saloon, 2 stores on Channel

1930s - B&M Building for Joseph Breidenbach, Jr. and Alexander McDonald

1946 - Store and Beer ? on Channel, stores and hotel on Bridge

Present - State of California Department of Corrections, 125 Bridge Street

Lot 3

(SW corner Channel and Hunter)

1850 - Pioneer Grocery, one-story building (photo)

1862 - Purchased by Louis Hansell

ca. 1865 - Second story added

1867 - Hansel Building, containing Hansel & Wollner’s Grocery and Druids Hall upstairs

1870 - Hansel Building

1872 - Louis Hansel, Hansel & Wollner, Hunter and Channel, residing 77 San Joaquin

ca. 1875 - Two-story building, with Druid’s Hall (photo)

1881 - Louis Hansel, $3500/$3500; Richardson, imps. $400 (plat)

1884 - Louis Hansel, Pioneer Grocery, Hunter & Channel, residing 245 San Joaquin; H. C. Hansel, clerk with L. Hansel

ca. 1885 - Hansel Block constructed, entire lot

1888 - Louis Hansel, grocer, 313 Hunter (Frederick Wollner, grocer, 312 Hunter)

1890 - **Stockton Independent** moved to Hansel Building, also Harness (photo, account)

1893 - Hansel’s Building, Hansel & Strohmeier

1894 - (Two-story brick)

L. Hansel, $12,000/$3500

1901 - L. Hansel, $12,000/$8000

1899 - Hansel & Strohmeier Grocery

1917 - Independent Job Printing, moved same year to Stockton Mail Building

warehouse, store on Hunter; stores on Bridge, bindery second

1930s - Demolished or remodeled

1946 - Entire lot: stores at 135 and 155 Hunter, restaurant at 124 Hunter, store at 133 Bridge, entrance at 137 Bridge (two-story building); store at 132 Channel (one-story building)
(NW corner Bridge and Hunter)
1870 - Vacant
1881 - Not on plat
1888 - Johnson Bros. Wood & Coal, 315 Hunter
1895 - Harness, stockroom, XXX (1-story frame); 135 etc.
1917 - Warehouse

(mid-Bridge St.)
1881 - L. Hansel, with grocery lot
1895 - XXX livery? (iron clad front)
1917 - Two stores

(mid-Channel St.)
1881 - L. Hansel, with grocery lot
1895 - XX
1917 - Independent
1930s - New or remodeled building
1950 -
1972 -
Present - Entire lot, Orlando Building, 133 Bridge Street

Block 63 3/4 (Sanborn 43) South Half

1850 - Head of Stockton Channel, slough
1860s - Not a channel (photo)
1867 - Charles M. Weber
1870 - Slough
18xx - Weber Hole
1881 - Bridge Place, Capt. C. M. Weber, $12,500
1884 - Charles Weber, real estate, corner Channel and Bridge, residing Peninsula, 6,655 acres, 2,007 acres, also acreage to Helen and Julia (Marvin Richardson, ice mfr.?)
1883-1900+ - Weber Baths
1888 - Lot 1, California Meat Market
1894 - Lot 1, Capital Lodging House/Tin House upper story; meat, sausage, saloon, cobbler, produce lower story on El Dorado (two-story frame with metal siding)
Lot 2, Salvation Army (1-story frame)
Lot 3, Weber Bath House, swimming baths
Lot 4, fruit store (1-story brick)
Lot 5, Coal Yard
Lot 6, nursery, florest, hay storage, scales in streets
1895 - Lot 1, store, saloon, coal office, etc. (two-story frame), 102-116 El Dorado
Lot 2, store and vacant, 109-115 Weber
Lot 3, Weber Bath House
Lot 4, store
Lot 5, Coal Yard, 135/137 Weber
Lot 6, florist, nursery and office, scales in streets
Weber Estate, $45,000/$750; improvements on Hunter to E. C. Clowes, $250
1900 - Buildings extant (Souvenir of Stockton)
1901 - Henry Cowell, $60,000/$500
1908 - Hotel Stockton, multi-story reinforced concrete building on entire block
Present - Hotel Stockton, vacant

Block 70 2/3 (Sanborn 39)

Lot 1
1867 - Louis Waggman, butcher, $500 (N Lot 1)
1870 - two frame dwellings, one on Miner (no longer extant 1895), one on El Dorado
1872 - Louis Waggener, market 185 Levee, residing El Dorado, between Channel and Miner
1873 - Wagman, butcher, residing on Lot
1881 - Louis Waggener, 2 houses, $600/$1400
1884 - Louis Waggenmann, butcher, residence 296 El Dorado
1895 - Dwelling, boarding establishment (frame) on north half of lot, 246-248 Miner; one-story dwelling (frame), 236 Miner

A - 3
Barbara Waggenmann, $1620/$1100 (assessment)
1901 - Barbara Gasser, $1620/$1000
1917 - Auto supplies, repairing, 102-106 Miner
1946 - El Dorado: 236 Chamber of Commerce, 240-242 store, 244 store, 248 restaurant

Lot 3
(1864 - J. W. Hart, blacksmith “resident of Miner Street” Tinkham 1923:133)
1867 - James C. Gage, $400
1881 - Mrs. B. Hart, 2 houses, $500/$700
1893 - Charles B. Hart, bookkeeper Shaw Plow Works, residing 274 Miner; Laura E., stenographer Shaw Plow Works; Libbie, student; William, farmer
1895 - Two one-story frame dwellings “special,” building behind east dwelling 110-114 Miner
B. Hart, $1350/$700 (assessment)
1901 - Mrs. S. Bettencourt, $1350/$650
1917 - Auto Service Station, 112-114 Miner
1946 - Miner: 108 store, 110 store

Lot 5
1866 - Edward purchased lot and built home (Pen Pictures)
1867 - G. W. Thretheway, $300
1872 - Edward Thretheway, carpenter, residing 36 Miner
1881 - West half, E. A. Thretheway, $350/$500
East half, Walter Yelland (family member), $235/$350
1884 - Walter Yelland, 18 acres south
1884 - William E. Thretheway, patternmaker with Farrington, Hyatt & Co., residing 293 Miner
Edward A. Thretheway, carpenter, City Mills, residing Corner Park and Union
1893 - Walter Yelland, carpenter, residing Homestead
1895 - One-story frame dwelling, 118 Miner; one-story frame dwelling, 122 Miner
Walter Yelland, $1350/$650
1901 - Walter Yelland, $1350/$650
1917 - Ignition Works, 120-126 Miner
1946 - Miner: 120 ? Service, 122 Tire Service

Lot 7
1872 - Dwelling
1881 - Mary Rosenthall, residing Miner between Hunter and El Dorado (Isaac Rosenthall, clerk William Kierski?)
1884 - Mrs. M. Rosenthall, residing 206 Miner
1895 - One-story frame dwelling, 124-132 Miner
Mary Rosenthall, $1170/$350
1901 - Mary Rosenthall, $1170/$350
1917 - Dwelling, 128 Miner
1946 - Miner: 128-130 ?

Lot 9
1864 - J. M. Hogan, attorney (Tinkham 1923:133) (non-resident)
1872 - J. M. Hogan, attorney, 222 Main, residing California and Acacia
1881 - J. M. Hogan, west half $500/$100, east half $600/$600
1884 - James M. Hogan, Attorney, residence Acacia & California
1893 - J.M. Kile, attorney Kile & Plummer, residing 322 Stanislaus (non-resident)
1895 - Two-story furnished rooms (frame with bays and central porch), 134-140 Miner
J. M. Kile, $1170/$3500 (Kile, an attorney, resides elsewhere)
1901 - J. M. Kile, $1170/$3500
1917 - Four flats, 134-140 Miner
1946 - Miner: 136 Auto Electric Service

Lot 11
1867 - James C. Gage, no improvements
1870 - Vacant
1881 - Ohio Rooming House, Mrs. M. I. Vignolo, Proprietor, 241 North Hunter. 26 pleasant desirable rooms, one of old reliable rooming houses, recently renovated and nicely furnished by Mrs. Vignolo, price from $2 to $500 per week (Stockton Illustrated).
1895 - Ohio House (frame, south 1/5 of bldg. frame special), kindergarten, stores and carriage trimming on lower, lodgings upper story
Mary E. Howell, $1800/$5200 (reduced to $4000)
1901 - Mary E. Collier, $1440/$3500
1917 - Two stores, saw filing, sign painting, print shop on 233-247 Hunter, lodgings upper
1946 - Miner: 148 Tire Service (new bldg.?)

Lot 15
1870 - Vacant
1872 - Joseph Hansel, wheelwright, 109-111 Hunter
1881 - Louis Hansel, $100/$150
1884 - Joseph Hansell, carriage mfr., Hunter between Miner and Lindsay
1893 - Hansel & Ollrich, carriages, 273-279 Hunter
1895 - Stockton Milk Dairy (brick), 225-231 Hunter
L. Hansel, $625/$125
1901 - L. Hansel, $625/$125
19XX - Livery
1917 - Mowrey's Livery and Feed, 229 Hunter
1946 - 229-235 Hunter

Lot 16
1870 - Vacant
1881 - Charles Brutschy, $500 (non-resident)
1888 - Sam Lee (Lee Sam), Chinese Laundry, 303 Hunter (others were Gun Wah, 235 Hunter, Lee Tang, 203 Channel)
1893 - Catherine Brutschy, residing 143 Fremont; Miss Kate, residing 2211 San Joaquin; Louis, tailor, Louis J., musician, both at 221 San Joaquin
1895 - Chinese Laundry (frame special) on north of lot, 221 Hunter; horseshoeing 217 Hunter
Catherine Brutschy, $900/$100
1901 - Catherine Brutschy, $900/$100
1914 - (Walter) Hansel and Ortman, new reinforced concrete garage, Cadillac and Oldsmobile dealers, 211 Hunter
1917 - Hansel & Ortman Garage, 217-223 Hunter
1946 - 227 Hunter

Lots 10 and 12
1864 - Charles Brutschy, $800 (Samuel & Thomas Fisher, $800, same property)
1867 - Charles Brutschy, $800 (S Lot 6) (resident)
1870 - Structure
1881 - Charles Brutschy, $1200/$4000
1884 - Charles and Catherine Brutschy, residence NW corner Hunter & Channel (Brutschy & Esbach, Old Lodge Saloon, 234 Main)
1888 - Frank Sievers, meat market, 309 Hunter; John Hoerl, Depot Saloon, 311 Hunter, residing 311½ Hunter (photo also)
1888 - Catherine Brutschky (widow of Charles), 143 Fremont (Brutschky & Esbach, Court House Exchange) (owner, non-resident)
1895 - Lot 10 vacant; Lot 9 two-story (brick), saloon 201 Hunter, meats 207 Hunter; furnished room upper floor; north half of Lot 9 vacant except for frame shed
Catherine Brutschy, $1800/$4500 and /$4000
1901 - Catherine Brutschy, $1800/$4500 and /$4000
1917 - Saloon, 201 Hunter; restaurant 205 Hunter
1946 - Lot 12: store 201 Hunter, restaurant 205 Hunter; bowling north half Lots 9 and 10; Lot 10 store, 133 and 139 Channel

Lot 8
1870 - 2-story structure
1872 - Louis Gerlach, butcher, residing Channel
(Louis Rohrbacker, butcher, Franklin House, non-resident, info only)
1881 - Louis Gerlach, west half $700/$600, east half $700
1884 - Louis Gerlach, baker, residing 17 Channel
1893 - Henry Rohrbacker, Rohrbacker & Boerner Saloon, Hunter and Channel
Henry Roebecker, brewer, Willows Brewery, residing 323 Channel
1895 - Willows Brewery Depot (brick), 127-131 East Channel
Henry Rohrbacker, $1800/$450 (Henry Roebecker)
1917 - Auto Repairing
1946 - Awnings and Venetian Blinds, 127-129 Channel (two-story)

Lot 6
1867 - J. R. Sayer, $450
1870 - Structure
1881 - L. Lebende, $650/$800
1884 - Louis/Leonard Lebende, (Lebende & Strading, Wines & Liquors, 186 Levee), residing north side Channel between Hunter and El Dorado
1895 - Frame dwelling, 117-119 East Channel; (frame special) (Chinese Laundry ca. 1910), 121-123 East Channel
L. Hansel, $1800/$450 (non-resident)
1901 - L. Hansel, $1800/$500
1917 - Chinese Laundry on east, dye & cleaning on west
1946 - Auto Top Shop, 123 Channel (one-story); frame dwelling 117 Channel

Lot 4
1867 - James C. Gage, $300 (operated a hackstable at another location)
1870 - Structure
1872 - Henry F. Hubbard, capitalist, residing El Dorado and Poplar (non-resident)
1881 - J. M. Hogan, $650/$800
1884 - H. F. Hubbard, capitalist, residing 149 El Dorado, 180 acres
1895 - Johnson’s Livery (with Lot 2), brick front, frame interior, metal roof “being built”
Maria and Eliza F. Hubbard, $1800/$4500 (with Lots 2 and 15)
1901 - Maria Cronise and Eliza Middlecoff, $1800/$4500
1900?- Yolland & Co. Wood, Coal & Ice
1917 - Tourist Garage, auto supplies, ice delivery shed (with Lot 2)
1946 -

Lot 2
1870 - Structure
1881 - H. F. Hubbard, $800/$100 (non-resident)
1884 - Henry F. Hubbard, capitalist, 149 El Dorado
1895 - Johnson’s Livery (frame with brick facade) SW corner, 101-115; 117-119 Channel (see Lot 4)
1901 - See Lot 4
19XX - Yolland & Co. (with Lot 4)
1917 - Tourist Garage (with Lot 4), 216-222 El Dorado
1946 - Garage and Tire Service, 200-216 El Dorado (one-story)

Lots 13 and 14
1867 - Capt. C. M. Weber
1870 - Miner Slough
1881 - C. M. Weber $25; Miner Channel
1895 - Lot 13, Barbara Waggerman, $630 (see Lot 1)
Lot 14, Eliza and Maria Hubbard (see Lot 4)
1901 - Lot 13 (see Lot 1)
Lot 14 (see Lot 4)
1917 - El Dorado Garage, 230 El Dorado
1946 - Lot 14 Auto Supplies, 222 Hunter (one-story); Lot 13 ? 28 Hunter (fa

Entire Block
Present - Parking lot on Hunter, modern buildings on El Dorado

Block XX (Sanborn 739)
1856 - California Transportation Company, Nelson Anderson, ran line of steamers from San Francisco to Stockton (Guinn 1909:327) (not certain this was in the same location)
1870 - Buildings
1888 - M. K. Bell, 189 Channel
1894 - City Storage Shed west portion, M. K. Bell’s Storage Shed east portion
1895 - Union Transfer Company Freight Ware House (1-story frame)
1917 - California Transfer Company’s Freight Shed (former bldg enlarged?), two-story Mission-style ticket office and baggage room (immediately within project boundaries)
1946 - The River Lines, boat and motor freight terminal
Site 1 Summary Information

History - This appears to be one of the oldest sections of Stockton, located at the head of the channel where goods and people were transhipped to stage lines and later railroads. The Stockton/St. Charles Hotel was the first luxury hotel in town (also first building in Stockton with gas lighting [1859] and running water [1861]). Horace Greeley stayed here and spoke from the balcony on his trip to Yosemite [1859]), burned 1871; Masonic Hall built on site 1883, torn down 1933. Early-day lodging houses (Hotel de Mexico, French Hotel, Ohio House, Philadelphia House) also in project area; as well as Philadelphia House (1860s)/B&M Store Building (1909) extant on Bridge Street. Other properties included Hansel Pioneer Grocery (1850), Hansel Block (1880s?) (probably subsumed beneath present 1930s Orlando Building), stores, Depot and other saloons, lodging houses, and dwellings. Hotel Stockton (1908) extant (NRHP). Location of early 1850s Chinatown (Heungshan and Sze Yup), burned 1862, Sze Yup moved south to Washington Street; by 1920 only two laundries remained (see Minnick 1988:36, 143, 266).

Archaeology - Block 70 2/3 was early 1850s Chinatown, burned 1862. 1890s-1920s Chinese laundries; privies behind residences and lodging houses.

Philadelphia House/B&K Building/B&M Building

By 1867 the Philadelphia House was owned and operated as a lodging house by Joseph Breidenbach. It was located on the site of the Hotel de Mexico, constructed in 1849 by Colonel Frank Cheatham. The building was damaged in the fire which consumed the adjacent St. Charles Hotel in 1872 and refurbished thereafter. The front two-story section of the building, facing Bridge Street, appears to have been constructed first, with the rear three-story Italianate portion on Channel Street completed by the late 1860s. In 1909, a third story was added to the front building and Mission or Spanish Eclectic elements added, including the tower on the southwest corner, undoubtedly in response to the recent completion of the adjacent Hotel Stockton. The complex was then known as the B&K Building, and by the 1930s as the B&M Building, for owners Joseph Breidenbach, Jr., and Alexander McDonald.


Hansel/Orlando Building on Hunter, Channel and Bridge Streets

This was the site of the Pioneer Grocery (SW corner Channel and Hunter streets), opened in 1850; the first in Stockton. A one-story brick building, it was purchased in 1862 by Louis Hansel and operated by members of his family until after the turn of the century. By the mid-1870s a second story had been added and by the 1890s the entire block was covered with the brick Hansel Block. The structure housed the operations of the Stockton Independent from 1890-1917. The store, along with the carriage works and livery to the south, were demolished or remodeled in the 1930s and a new reinforced concrete building, comprised of stores on the lower floor and rooms on the upper, was constructed.

Louis Hansel - Pioneer Grocery occupied since 1850, Hansel born Buffalo, New York 1837, parents native of Baden, to U.S. in 1832, parents to Stockton in 1875. Louis to California in 1855, mined near Murphys and 4 miles from Murphys, then teamed to mines from Stockton in 1860; purchased store in 1862. Weber deeded lot, 50’ x 50’, to Ellen Murphy, sold to Guillaume Bouillon for $2500, then to C. C. Grellet on Dec. 22, 1855, then to Deflot and Chevalier in 1857, to Lottman in 1861, to Lottman & Meyer in 1862, then to Hansel in 1862. Mostly involved in trade with freighters for mining regions, until railroads usurped work in 1869-70; married 1863 to Katrina Pforr from Hesse Cassel, to California in 1860; 6 children living (twins died early), Henry C. 1864, Emma L. 1868, Kate M., 1872, Louis John 1873, Frederica C. 1875, and Gertrude May 1878 (Pen Pictures 1890:421-422).
Louis Hansel - Right to Pass, signed by Secretary of State W. O. Graham, good for two years, issued May 29, 1893. Hansel aged 54 years, 5’6”, high forehead, grey eyes, straight nose, medium mouth, grey hair, florid complexion, oval face; accompanied by wife (Haggin Museum).

Weber Hole
1883 - Baths built, entrance on Bridge Place, water 88 degrees, from Courthouse gas well, swimming tank 32’ x 75’, 3-8’ deep, 42 dressing rooms, lighted with gas, then with electric arc lamps (Jackson Baths in McKinley Park were others) (Martin 19XX:130)
1883 - Also Tin House?
1900 - Both extant, “no building of importance ever located on site”
1908 - Hotel Stockton started construction; Stockton Investment Company, $500,000, opened April 10, 1910. First in city to be built of reinforced concrete, built in Spanish Mission Style of architecture, modern conveniences, 1925 renovation (Martin 19XX:111). George Shima major investor (Don Walker).

Henry Fitch Hubbard
Henry Fitch Hubbard born New York 1820, to California mines in 1856, started furniture business in Stockton, returned to east 4 years later, then returned to Stockton and started money-lending enterprise, married in 1867 to Maria S. Debman, had two daughters, residence at 849 North El Dorado, died 1887, aged 67 years.

Johnson’s Livery
Robert S. Johnson born Bedfordshire, England, 1835, to Montreal 1843, then Chicago and Wisconsin, then to California, looked over state, settled in Stockton in 1867 and bought livery stable of George Fox, oldest in city, started by man named Dallas. Livery business extensive and stables furnished with best of stock and equipment. Married Mary Philomenia Shaw from Maine in Racine in 1857 (died Stockton 1871), couple had three children, William Russell, Eva L. and Charles R. Then married Mary L. Chillender from Warsaw, Hancock County, Illinois (died Nov. 1889), had two children, Ida May and Roy Stephen. 1862 raised company for defense of old flag, Company K, First California Cavalry commissioned until close of war, served with Kit Carson in Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri; mustered out in 1865 at Fort Union. Returned to Stockton, member of Rawlins Post GAR, served 6 terms on Stockton City Council, 1889 elected to California Assembly, 1889-1893 one of directors of State Insane Asylum (Pen Pictures 309-310).
1893 - Yosemite Livery and Boarding Stable, Weber between San Joaquin and Stockton Streets

Tretheway Home
Edward Arthur Tretheway - millwright at Stockton City Mills, born Cornwall 1844, in New Harmony Indiana 1854. Father Richard and mother Rebecca Arthur came to Tuolumne County 12 miles from Sonora (Soulsbyville?) in November 1863, Edward joined him, built stamp mills; 1865 worked coal mines in Contra Costa County. Married Ellen Yelland in Tuolumne County in July 1865, bought lot in Stockton, built there in 1866, 1867 wife in Tuolumne, 1868 returned to reside in Stockton, 1872 worked for Stockton City Mills, 11 children born to Richard and Rebecca, 6 children to Edward and Ellen, 4 living, Edward Edgar, Ellen, Amy Arthur, Walter Yellend (Pen Pictures 516-517)

Finer Homes
Many were second homes of farmers, access to better school, better roads (Davis1998:55).
SITE 2 NORTH CHRONOLOGY BY BLOCK AND LOT

**Blocks 17 ½ (Current 2, east portion) (Sanborn 453, 463)**
- 1850 - Banner Island
- 1870 - Banner Island
- ca. 1880 - Estuary silted in
- 1881 - Valued at $75; new improvements to William West, $3000 (here or Block 18)
- 1895 - Banner Island
- 1917 - Banner Island, Island Transportation Company, 1 1/2 story frame machine shop, 1 1/2 story frame storage and wood working building, 1 story store room, “two night watchmen, electric power, no heat, to have water system for fire protection”
- 1950 - Industrial use
- 1972 - Industrial use

**Block 18 (Current 2, west portion) (Sanborn 474)**
- 1850 - Banner Island
- 1870 - Banner Island
- ca. 1880 - Estuary silted in
- 1881 - Valued at $300, new improvements to William West, $3000 (here or Block 17½)
- 1888 - New ball park erected, $2500 cost, accommodations for 4000 (Blocks 18, 19, 24, 25)
- 1895 - Banner Island
- 1917 - Banner Island, no improvements
- 1950 - Gunnert & Zimmerman Ship Building Yards
- 1972 - Gunnert & Zimmerman Yards

**Block 19 (Current 4) (Sanborn 473)**
- 1850 - Banner Island
- 1870 - Banner Island
- ca. 1880 - Estuary silted in
- 1881 - Valued at $500
- 1888 - New ball park erected, $2500 cost, accommodations for 4000 (Blocks 18, 19, 24, 25)
- 1895 - Banner Island
- 1917 - Banner Island, no improvements
- 1950 - Kyle & Co., shipbuilding, railroad trackways
- 1972 - Pittsburgh-DesMoines Steel Co.

**Block 20 (Sanborn 455)**
- 1895 - no map coverage
- ca. 1900 - California Navigation and Improvement Company Ship Yard
- 1917 - California Navigation and Improvement Company Ship Yard, planing mill and machine shop, store room, lumber storage, machinery storage, black smith, marine ways, electric power, “numerous steamboats along shore”
- 1950 - Kyle & Company, Inc. shipbuilding yard, steel products division, tool storage, marine ways
- 1972 - Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Company, buildings same as 1950

**Block 23 (Sanborn 451)**
- 1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $500, no imps. (plat)

**Block 24 (Sanborn 450)**
- 1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $1200, no imps. (plat)
- 1888 - New ball park erected, $2500 cost, accommodations for 4000 (Blocks 18, 19, 24, 25)
- 1895 - (No Sanborn)
- 1917 - Vacant, lot lines
- 1950 - Ruse Lumber Company, north half
- UPRR North Channel Fremont Station, south half
- 1972 - Auto body shop and auto storage yard (new buildings)

**Block 25 (Sanborn 449)**
- 1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $1000, no imps. (plat)
- 1888 - New ball park erected, $2500 cost, accommodations for 4000 (Blocks 18, 19, 24, 25)
- 1895 - Ball field
- 1897 - Abandoned
- 1917 - Vacant, but lot lines added
- 1950 - Lodging, storage on NW quarter
1972 - Milk depot, north half

**Block 26 (Sanborn 448)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Capt. C.M. Weber, $500, no imps. (plat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Two frame dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Frame dwellings on lots 5, 7, 11, and 16; frame two-story apartments on lot 13; small frame structure on lot 2 corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Auto repair on lot 1, frame dwellings on lots 3, 11, 16, 6, , rear of lot 2, lot 14, and lot 13; two-story apartments (5) on lot 7; small frame structure on lot 2 corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Woodworking shop on lots 1 and 3; frame dwellings on lots 5, 11, and 13; industrial building and used car storage on lots 8, 10, 12; tin shop and stationery and toy warehouse on lots 2 and 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE 2 SOUTH CHRONOLOGY BY BLOCK AND LOT**

**Block E (Sanborn 165)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Capt. C. M. Weber, west half, no imps. $400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Charles Bradshaw, $125/$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Charles A. Bradshaw, barge pilot, residing 61 Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Charles Bradshaw, employee Farmers Union and Milling Co.; J. Bradshaw, Stockton Woolen Mills; John D. Bradshaw, Laborer, Stockton Woolen Mills; Mrs. Margaret Bradshaw; Philip Bradshaw, laborer; all residing at 61 Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Charles Bradshaw, $400/$300, frame one-story dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>James Crow, $500/$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Charles Bradshaw, $125/$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>John B. Hall, attorney Hall &amp; Montgomery, residing 33 Commodore Levee (non-resident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>John B. Hall, attorney, residing Channel near Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Myles Martin, $500/$100 (with Lot 12), frame one-story dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Myles Martin, $500/$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lot 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>John B. Hall, attorney Hall &amp; Montgomery, residing 33 Commodore Levee (non-resident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>John B. Hall, $125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>John B. Hall, attorney, residing Channel near Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Myles Martin, O’Neill &amp; Martin, residing 233 Fremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Myles Martin, $500/$100 (with Lot 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Myles Martin, $500/$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lots 2, 4, 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Capt. C. M. Weber, west half of block, $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>R. F. Wilson Wind Mill &amp; Tank Manufactory on SW corner, frame one-story building housing iron and wood lathes, rip gang ?, iron planer and drill press, brick boiler and engine room on NW corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>R. F. Wilson &amp; Co., $1200/$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>WHOL Liquors &amp; XXX, bottle storage (SW corner), bottling works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Beer Warehouse 413 Main, surplus storage 437 Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Block F (Sanborn 510)**

**Lot 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Capt. C. M. Weber, no imps., $300;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Shaw, $270/$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Shaw, $270/$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Union Oil Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Union Oil Company, entire block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Union Oil Company, same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West half (excepting Lot 1)
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, no imps., $300
1895 - Weber Estate, $2425
1901 - Julia Weber, $1800
1917 - Union Oil Company
1950 - Union Oil Company, entire block
1972 - Union Oil Company, same as above

East half
1881 - 1/2 Simpson and Gray Lumber Yard, $350 (plat)
1895 - Simpson & Gray Lumber Storage Yard, dwelling and shed at 542 Weber
       Simpson & Gray, $3600
1901 - Simpson & Gray, $3600
1917 - Simpson & Gray Lumber Yard on east half, Union Oil Company on west half
1950 - Union Oil Company, entire block
1972 - Union Oil Company, same as above

Block G (Sanborn 509)
1881 - East half, Capt. C. M. Weber, no imps., $400 (plat)
1883 - Vacant
1895 - Vacant, lot lines
1901 - Lot 11, Alice Farrington, $270
1917 - Associated Oil Company office, warehouse, tank, one-story dwelling
1950 - Tidewater Associated Oil Company tanks, warehouses, no dwelling
1972 - Tidewater Associated Oil Company, same as above

Block H (Sanborn 175)
Lot 1
1870 - Vacant
1881 - Habe & Wehie, $200/$150
1895 - Vacant
       Habe & Wehie, $225
1901 - Habe & Wehie, $225
1917 - Vacant
1946 - Motor and Freight Station
1972 - Engine Rebuilding and Truck Repair (iron bldg.)

Lot 3
1870 - Vacant
1881 - Habe & Wehie, $200/$150 with Lot 1
1895 - Vacant
       Habe & Wehie, $225
1901 - Habe & Wehie, $225
1917 - Vacant
1946 - Bottled Goods Warehouse
1972 - Auto Polishing (iron bldg.)

Lot 5
1881 - Charles McNeil, $150/$200
1895 - Frame dwelling (½ story), 352-346 W. Main (privy)
       Charles McNeil, $225/$100
1901 - Charles McNeil, $270/$150
1917 - Same as 1895, 330 W. Main
1946 - No longer extant

Lot 7
1870 - Building
1881 - Charles McNeil, $150/$300
1884 - James McNeil, plumber with John Jackson, residing Main between Elk and Bear
1895 - Frame dwelling, east side (one story), 318-320 W. Main (privy)
       Charles McNeil, $270/$250
1901 - Charles McNeil, $270/$200
1917 - Same as above, 320 W. Main; but new dwelling on west side, 324-326 Main
1946 - Same as above
1950 - No longer extant

Lot 9

1870 - Building
1880 - Charles McNeil, 38, steamboat captain, Ireland
Bridget, 37, takes in boarders, Ireland
Charles, 19, river pilot, California
Daniel, 14, works in paper
James, 13
Catherine, 11
Rosanna, 4
Joseph, 1 (Census, page 10, #100, Market Street)
1881 - Charles McNeil, $150/$400
1884 - Charles McNeil, captain steamer Roberts Island, residing 98 Main
1895 - Frame dwelling (1½ story), 312-314 W. Main (privy)
Charles McNeil, $270/$150
1901 - Charles McNeil, $270/$150
1917 - Same as above, 312 W. Main
1946 - No longer extant

Lot 11

1870 - Building
1872 - Daniel Kelly, clerk, E.L. Hauche & Co. residing 106 Main
1880 - Daniel Kelly, 46, laborer
Ellen, 42, keeps house
Mary, 8 (Census, pg. 10, #63, Market Street)
1881 - Daniel Kelly, $200/$200
1884 - Daniel Kelly, laborer, residing west side Elk between Main and Market
1893 - Daniel Kelly, contractor, residing 367 Elk
1895 - Frame dwelling, 23-25 Elk/Monroe (privy)
Daniel Kelly, $360/$100
1901 - Daniel Kelly, $360/$100
1917 - Same as above, 23 Elk/Monroe
1945 - Same as above/dormitory
1946 - No longer extant
1972 - Lot vacant

Lot 15 (see Lot 16 also)

1870 - Residence
1872 - Daniel Kelly, clerk, E.L. Hauche & Co. residing 106 Main
1880 - Daniel Kelly, 46, laborer
Ellen, 42, keeps house
Mary, 8 (Census, pg. 10, #63, Market Street)
1881 - Daniel Kelly, $200/$200
1884 - Daniel Kelly, laborer, residing west side Elk between Main and Market
1893 - Daniel Kelly, contractor, residing 367 Elk
1895 - Frame dwelling, 23-25 Elk/Monroe (privy)
Daniel Kelly, $360/$100
1901 - Daniel Kelly, $360/$100
1917 - Same as above, 23 Elk/Monroe
1945 - Same as above/dormitory
1946 - No longer extant
1972 - Lot vacant

Lot 16

1881 - Daniel Kelly, $200, no imps.
1895 - Vacant
1901 - Daniel Kelly, $360
1917 - Vacant
1946 - Dwelling, 27 Monroe
1972 - Lot vacant
Lot 12
1872 - William Jackson, carpenter, residing 213 Elk
1881 - Anna Jackson, $200/$1300, 2 houses
1884 - William Jackson, ship carpenter with S.H. Davis, residing 377 Elk
1893 - William Jackson, carpenter, 377 Elk
1895 - Frame dwelling (1½ story), 33-39 Elk/Monroe; frame dwelling (2 story), 43 Elk/Monroe
Anna Jackson, $315 and $360/$1200, 2 houses
1901 - Anna Jackson, $315 and $360/$1200, 2 houses
1917 - Same as 1895, 37 Elk/Monroe
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 10
1881-1972 - Same as above, rear lots with sheds

Lot 8
(1872 - James Boyle, laborer, O’Neil Township, info only)
1881 - James Boyle, $100/$300
1883 - Frame dwelling, square, front of lot
1884 - James Boyle, laborer, residing 87 Market
1893 - James Boyle, carpenter P.A. Buell & Co.; Patrick Boyle, brakeman, Copperopolis Railroad; both
residing 87 Market
1895 - New frame dwelling, 317 W. Market (privy)
James Boyle, $315/$375
1901 - James Boyle, $315/$375
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 6
1881 - Habe & Wehie, $150
1895 - Frame dwelling, 331 W. Market (privy)
James Boyle, $250/$250
1901 - James Boyle, $315/$450
1917 - Same as above, new bay on front, 321 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 4
(1872 - Louis Beysser, forwarding and commission merchant, 191 Hunter, info only)
1881 - Louis Beysser, $200/$1000, 2 houses (with Lot 2)
1893 - Mrs. Mervin I. Bachman, groceries and provisions 73 Market, residing same
1895 - Vacant lot
Minerva J. Bachman, $275/$325 (with Lot 2)
1901 - Minerva J. Bachman, $315 “burned”
1917 - Frame duplex (1½ story), 335 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 2
1881 - Louis Beysser, $200/$1000, two houses (with Lot 4)
1893 - Mrs. Mervin I. Bachman, groceries and provisions 73 Market, residing same
1895 - Frame dwelling, 341-347 W. Market (privy)
Minerva J. Bachman, $315/? (with Lot 4)
1901 - $315/$50 “burned”
1917 - Housekeeping rooms in above, 343 W. Market; 2 story frame store on southwest corner, 347 W.
Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 14
1881 - Charles Watts, $150, no imps.
1893 - John G. Tierney, laborer, residing 372 Bear
1895 - Frame dwelling, 26-32 Bear/Van Buren (privy)
J. G. Tierney, $225/$300
1901 - J. G. Tierney, $225/$300
1917 - Same as above, 28-32 Bear/Van Buren
1946 - Same as above, 28 Van Buren
1972 - No longer extant
Lot 13
(1872 - Charles Watts, machinist [Keep & Bargion], residing Market, same location?)
1881 - Charles Watts, $150/$400
1884 - Charles Watts, machinist Globe Iron Works, residing 415 Beaver, 15½ acres
1893 - Charles Watts, machinist Matteson & Williamson Mfg. Co., residing 415 Beaver; Misses Eliza and Cecilia Watts
1895 - Vacant
John Milan, $225
1901 - John Milan, $225
1917 - Vacant
1946 - Vacant
1972 - Oil and grease warehouse

Block I (Sanborn 176)
Lot 1
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $75/$800
1895 - Frame dwelling (1½ story, wrap porch), 448 W. Main
Weber Estate, $225/$300
1901 - J. W. F. Muhs, $250/$200
1917 - Same as above “vacant”
1946 - No longer extant, Star Lumber Yard on Lots 1, 3, 5, 4, 2, 13, 14
Lot 3
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $75
1895 - Vacant lot
Weber Estate, $180
1917 - R. F. Wilson’s Lumber Yard on Lots 1, 3, 5, 4, 2, 13, 14
1946 - Star Lumber Yard, same as above
Lot 5
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $75
1895 - Weber Estate, $180
1901 - J. W. F. Muhs, $180
1901-1946 - Same as above
Lot 7
1870 - Residence
1881 - Mrs. M. Hurey, $100/$900
1893 - John E. Gofield, roof painter, 51 Main, residing same
1895 - Frame dwelling, 428 W. Main
J. E. Gofield, $180/$300
1901 - D. M. and Julia Freitas, $180/$300
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant
Lot 9
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $100
1895 - Frame dwelling
J. H. Tam, $200/$300
1901 - Sidney Newell, $200/$300
1917 - Frame duplex, 410/412/414 W. Main
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above
Lot 11
1870 - Residence
1872 - John H. Barry, carpet maker and fitter, residing Main
1881 - J. H. Barry, $125/$180
1888 - John H. Barry, janitor Franklin School
1893 - John H. Barry, janitor; Miss Katie Barry; both residing 72 Main
1895 - Frame dwelling, 402 W. Main
J. H. Barry, $225/$100
1901 - J. G. Gifford, $225/$100
1917 - No longer extant
1946 - Frame dwelling “vacant,” 402 W. Main
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 15
1870 - Residence
1881 - Rosa Robertson, $125/$200
1884 - Mrs. Rosa Robertson, Miss Sarah J. Robertson, residing 361 Bear
1888 - Rosa Robertson (widow Andrew T.), residing 361 Bear
1893 - Mrs. Rose Robertson, Sarah Robertson, residing 361 Bear
1895 - Frame dwelling, 29 Bear/Van Buren
Rosa Robertson, $275/$200
1901 - Rosa Robertson, $270/$175
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant, “lumber piles”

Lot 16
1881 - Charles Lyons, $125
1893 - Peter Delesanto, residing Bear near Main
1895 - Frame dwelling, 27 Bear/Van Buren
P. Dalesandro, $270/$450
1901 - P. Dalesandro, $270/$700
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant, “lumber piles”

Lot 12 (see Lot 10, below)
1870 - Residence or Lot 10?
1872 - Charles Lyons, laborer, residing 215 Bear
1881 - Charles Lyons, $100
1884 - Mrs. Lillie Lyons, residing 379 Bear
1888 - Lilian Lyons (widow), residing 379 Bear (not this lot?)
1893 - Mrs. Lillie Lyons, residing 151 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling, tankhouse in rear, 47? Bear/Van Buren
Lillie Lyons, $315/$325; Lot 10 $270
1901 - Sarah E. Jackson, $315/$325; Lot 10 $270 "outhouse"
1917 - No longer extant, frame dwelling 45 Bear/Van Buren; store (2 story) 401 W. Market
1946 - Same as above, but boarding at 401 Market
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 10 (see Lot 12, above)
1881 - Charles Lyons, $125/$200
1893 - Frame “outhouse”
1893 - Mrs. Lillie Lyons, residing 151 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling (same as above)
1917 - No longer extant, new frame dwelling, 415/417 W. Market
1946 - Same as above, 417 W. Market
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 8
1870 - Residence
1881 - W. H. Miller, $100/$100
1884 - Willard H. Miller, carriage trimmer, 29 Weber, residing 378 Weber (non-resident)
1895 - Frame dwelling, 421/425 W. Market
Miss Flora Lonigan, $270/$250
1901 - Miss Flora Lonigan, $270/$150
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - No longer extant

Lot 6
1870 - Residence
1881 - Thomas Harter, $100/$100
1895 - Frame dwelling, 427 W. Market
Mrs. Marion Horton, $270/$200
1901 - Mrs. Marion Horton, $270/$200
1917 - No longer extant, frame dwelling (with bay) “auto” in rear, 427 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 4
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $100
1893 - Peter McCabe, removed to San Francisco
1895 - small frame dwelling, 437? W. Market
      Peter McCabe, $275/$25
1901 - Peter McCabe, $275/$25
1917 - No longer extant, part of Wilson Lumber Yard
1946 - Star Lumber Yard
1972 - Same as above

Lot 2
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $100
1895 - Vacant
      A. D. Moore, $270
1901 - J. F. Hart, $270
1917 - Wilson Lumber Yard
1946 - Star Lumber Yard, sheds
1972 - Same as above

Lots 13, 14
1881 - Capt. C. M. Weber, $70 each
1895 - J.F. Hoerl Planing Mill (frame bldg. with brick walls, brick boiler and tank on east side), 18-??
      Otter/Lincoln
      A. D. Moore, $270/$3800 and $270
1901 - Joseph F. Hoerl, $270 and $270
1917 - R. F. Wilson Lumber Yard (planing mill sw corner Block E)
1946 - Star Lumber Yard
1972 - Same as above

Block K (Sanborn 513)
1881 - Entire Block, Capt. C. M. Weber, no imps., $350

Lots 1, 3
North half
1884 - Mrs. Rosa Robertson, Miss Sarah J. Robertson, residing 361 Bear (non-resident)
1895 - Frame dwelling, 2 Raccoon/Harrison
      Rosa Robertson, $180/$750
1901 - Rosa Robertson, $150/$500
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - No longer extant
1972 - Vacant lot

South half
1895 - Frame dwelling, 8-14 Raccoon/Harrison
      Rosa Robertson, $180/$750 (with above)
1901 - Same as above
1917 - Same as above
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lots 5-11
1895 - 1946 vacant lots
      H.C. Shaw Co., $180 and $225
1901 - Same as above
1972 - Store, paint warehouse, storage yard, 1/7 Lincoln

Lots 15-16
1893 - William Blair, carpenter, Blair and Hebb, residing 232 Bear
1895-1946 - Vacant lots
William Blair, $225 and $225
1901 - Same as above
1917 - “Swamp”
1972 - Paint Factory, 29 Lincoln

Lot 12
North half
1893 - Noble and Reid, Abstract and Real Estate, 363 Hunter, residing Flora
1895 - Frame dwelling, 33-35 Otter/Lincoln (with below)
A. M. Noble and R. A. Reed, $225/$1000 (attorneys)
1901 - A. M. Noble, $113/$350; R. A. Reed, $113/$350
1917 - Same as 1895, 33 Otter/Lincoln
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

South half
1895 - Frame dwelling (bay), 511 W. Market (see above)
1917 - Same as above
1946 - Two small frame dwellings, 511 and 515 W. Market
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 10
1895 - Vacant lot
Ada Hall, $225
1901 - Mortimer L. Hall, $225
1917 - Vacant lot
1946 - Two small frame dwellings, 511 and 515 W. Market
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 8
1895 - Frame dwelling (center of lot), 521? W. Market
Mrs. Maud Horton, $225/$50
1901 - Mrs. Maud Horton, $225/$50
1917 - Frame dwelling (different bldg.), 523 W. Market
1946 - Same as above, but also small dwelling at 521 W. Market
1972 - Same as above

Lot 6
1895 - Frame duplex, 527/529 W. Market
Alonzo Rhodes, $225/$300
1901 - J. W. F. Muhs, $225/$300
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 4
1895 - Frame dwelling (bay), 539 W. Market
Mary Bagnetti, $225/$550
1901 - Primo Bagnetti, $225/$450
1917 - Same as 1895, 335 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 2
1893 - Patrick Scally, foreman Warehouse # 1, Farmers Union and Milling Co., residing Market and Raccoon
1895 - Frame dwelling (bay), 40-48 Raccoon/Harrison (house turned around?)
P. Scally, $225/$800
1901 - P. Scally, $225/$700
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - No longer extant, new frame dwelling 537/547 W. Market
1972 - Same as above

Lot 14
1893 - Leo Marchant, laborer, residing 372 Raccoon
1895 - Frame dwelling, barn in rear, 30/32 Raccoon/Harrison
   Leo Marchant, $150/$275
1901 - Leo Marchant, $150/$350
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above, no barn
1972 - Same as above

Lot 13
1895 - Vacant lot
   Leo Marchant, $150
1901 - Leo Marchant, $150
1917 - Frame dwelling (bay), 22 Raccoon/Harrison
1945 - Frame dwelling (bay), 22 Harrison
1972 - Same as above

Block M (Sanborn 178) (north half of block)
Lot 1
1881 - Antonio Rossi, $150/$200 (non-resident)
1884 - Antonio Rossi, mfr. California wines and brandies, 150 Main, 350 acres; Alex Rossi, clerk, same
1895 - Frame duplex, 346/348 W. Market (privy)
   A. Rossi, $315/$200
1901 - Maria Rossi, $315/$275
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above “mission”
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 3
1881 - Antonio Rossi, $150/$800 (non-resident)
1888 - Antonio Rossi, winery 150 Main, residing same
1895 - Frame duplex
   A. Rossi, $315/$600
1901 - Maria Rossi, $315/$600
1917 - Frame duplex (½ story), 336/338 W. Market
1946 - Same as above, “vacant”
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 5
1881 - Alonzo Rhodes, $200
1895 - Frame dwelling, 326-332 W. Market
   Mrs. Mary Nye, $315/$300
1901 - Luigi Nave, $315/$200
1917 - Same as 1895, 326 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 7
1881 - Isabella Garwood, $200
1895 - Vacant lot
   Mary Shea, $315
1901 - Mary Shea, $315
1917 - Frame dwelling, front bay, 316/320 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lots 9 and 11, north half
1881 - Unknown owners
1895 - Frame dwelling, 312-316 W. Market (privy)
   James Tuite, 310 W. Market, $400/$900 (north half of lot, with Lot 11)
1901 - Anna Tuite, $400/$900, same as above
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - No longer extant

Lot 11
1881 - Unknown owners
1895 - North half of lot, frame dwelling, 103 Elk/Monroe (privy); south half frame dwelling, 105 Elk/Monroe
James Tuite, 103 Elk/Monroe, $400/$900 (north half of lot, with Lot 9)
1901 - Anna Tuite, $400/$900, same as above
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - 103 Monroe no longer extant; 105 same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lots 9 and 11, south half
1880 - Patrick Garwood, 29, works farm, Arkansas
   Isabella, 27, keeps house
   Alonzo, 6
   Walter, 5 (Census pg. 15, Elk Street)
1881 - Isabella Garwood, $200/$800
1893 - Rees Williams, master mariner, residing 381 Elk
1895 - Frame dwelling with tankhouse, 123 Elk/Monroe
   Rees Williams, $270/$450
1901 - Rees Y. Williams, $270/450
1917 - Same as 1895, second dwelling behind tankhouse
1946 - No longer extant (part of Monroe School lot)

Lot 15
1881 - Aaron Eller, $200/$900
1884 - Aaron Eller, private mail carrier, residing Elk between Market and Washington
1888 - Aaron Eller, letter carrier No. 1 City Post Office, residing 391 Elk
1893 - Aaron Eller, residing 391 Elk
1895 - Frame dwelling, with tankhouse, 123 Elk/Monroe
   Aaron Eller, $260/$650
1901 - Aaron Eller, $360/$750
1917 - Same as 1895
1950 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 13
1881 - Aaron Eller, $200/$300
1895 - Frame house, shed, hay barn
   Aaron Eller, $315/$200
1901 - Aaron Eller,
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above “kindergarten”
1972 - No longer extant

South Half of Block (outside of Site 2 South)
Lots 12, 10, 8
1868 - Elk Street/Colored School completed
1879 - School closed
1881 - Colored School (plat)
1883 - Colored School
1895 - Vacant
1904 - Monroe School

Lot 6
1881 - J. H. Olive, $350 (no improvements)
1895 - J. H. Olive, $540

Lot
1881 - N. A. Gardner, $350 (no improvements)
1895 - N. A. Gardner, $540

Lot 14
1895 - Frame dwelling, 120 Bear/Van Buren (privy)
1917 - Same as above
1946 - Same as above, “kindergarten”
1972 - No longer extant

A - 20
Block N (Sanborn 177)
1881 - Entire Block, Dr. Elias A. Stockton, $500/$100 (resided NW corner Miner and El Dorado, 283 El Dorado [stereo view])

Lot 1
North half
1893 - Joseph Adams, driver Inglis & Son, 156 Market?
1895 - Vacant lot
W. J. Adams, $180/$1400, two houses
1917 - Frame dwelling, 434 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

South half
1895 - Frame duplex, 110/116 Otter/Lincoln
W. J. Adams, $180/$1400, two houses
1901 - San Francisco Lumber Company, $180/$1400
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 3
1895 - Vacant lot
L. M. Kuhn, $80 (with Lot 5)
1901 - Mrs. Josie Diez, $90, same as above
1917 - Frame dwelling, 432 W. Market
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 5
1893 - Laurence M. Kuhn, employee Farmers Union and Milling Co., residing 53 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling, 428 W. Market
L. M. Kuhn, frame dwelling, $180/$300 (with Lot 3)
1901 - Mrs. Josie Diez, $180/$300
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 7
1895-1946 - Vacant lot

Lots 9, 11
1895 - Vacant lots
1895 - See Lot 15
1901 - See Lot 15
1917 - Vacant lots
1946 - Store, Furniture Mfg. & Upholstery (brick, with below), 103 Van Buren
1972 - Bldg. and Hdw. Supply Warehouse

Lot 15
1884 - Stockton Iron Works/Farrington, Hyatt & Co. 341-347 California
1895 - Farrington, Hyatt & Co, 3/4, $950; Jerome Haas, 1/4, $315
1901 - Stockton Iron Works, 3/4, $950; Jerome Haas, 1/4, $315
1946 - National Biscuit Company (brick, with above), 115/119 Van Buren
1972 - Bldg. and Hdw. Supply Warehouse

Lot 2
1893 - Benjamin C. Benson, captain steamer Mary Garrett; Benjamin J. Benson, wheelman, Mary Garrett, residing 51 Washington
1895 - Frame dwelling, ?? Washington St.
B. C. Benson, $270/$750
1901 - Campagni Italiano de Bersaglier, $270/$750
1917 - Frame dwelling, 443 Washington St.
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 4
1895 - Margaret Houghton, $270/$500
1901 - Emil Farrant, $270/$350

Lot 6
1895 - James Reilly, $270/$375
1901 - J. Nasher, $270/$300

Lot 14
1895 - Frame dwelling, 132 Otter/Lincoln;
      W. L. Campbell, $135/$400
1901 - W. L. Campbell, $135/$400
1917 - Same as 1895 Sanborn
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 14½?
1895 - Frame dwelling (bay) 126 Otter/Lincoln
      Rosa Etta Campbell, $135/$400
1901 - Rosa Etta Campbell, $135/$400

Lot 16
1893 - John C. Ferguson, tailor; Willard Ferguson; William Ferguson, tailor; Emily Ferguson, laundress; all
       residing 151 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling, 120 Otter/Lincoln
      John C. Ferguson, $135/$400
1901 - John C. Ferguson, $135/$400
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Block O (Sanborn 516)
1881 - Entire Block, Bank of Stockton, $800/$200

Lots 1, 3
1895 - Vacant lots
      Richard D. Beyer, $180 and $180
1901 - Richard D. Beyer, 180 and $180
1917 - Vacant lots
1946 - Seaside Oil Co. warehouse, storage tanks
1972 - Mormon Channel realignment

Lot 5
1893 - Josiah W. Holmes, Holmes & Finley Saloon, residing 38 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling, 532 W. Market
      Eliza Holmes, $270/$850
1901 - Eliza Holmes, $270/$650
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 7
1895 - Frame dwelling, 522 W. Market
      A. Rossi, $270/$275
1901 - M. Rossi, $270/$850
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 9
1893 - Mrs. Mary Cassiday, John Cassiday, employee Lane’s Warehouse, residing 44 Market
       (James Cassiday, Cassiday and Crawford, residing 390 Elk)
1895 - Frame dwelling, 512 W. Market
Mary Cassiday, $270/$425
1901 - James and Catherine Cassiday, $270/$350
1917 - Same as 1895 (new front bay)
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 11
1895 - Frame dwelling, 103 Otter/Lincoln; frame dwelling 113 Otter/Lincoln
Eliza Holmes, $250/$950, 2 houses
1901 - Anna Thompson, $270, $800
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above

Lot 15
1884 - George Lonigan, employee, Sperry’s Mills; Louisa, dressmaker, residing 140 Market
1895 - Frame dwelling, with tankhouse, 121 Otter/Lincoln
G. W. Lonigan, $270/$600
1901 - G. W. Lonigan, $270/$650
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above, but additional dwelling to rear
1972 - Front dwelling no longer extant, rear only

Lot 16
1884 - Thomas P. Lonigan, engineer Campbell & Lang, residing 119 Lafayette
1895 - Frame dwelling, 125 Otter/Lincoln
Thomas P. Lonigan, $270/$600
1901 - Thomas P. Lonigan, $270/$600
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lot 12
North half
1895 - Frame dwelling, 133 Otter/Lincoln
J. Shephard, $270/$875
1901 - J. Shephard, $270/$875
1917 - Same as 1895
1946 - Same as above
1972 - Same as above
South half
1895 - Frame dwelling (bay), 503 W. Washington
1917 - Same as above
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant, Mormon Channel

Lot 10
1895 - Frame dwelling, ?? W. Washington
Gannon and Bumb, $205
1901 - Gannon and Bumb, $205/$300
1917 - Same as above, 511 W. Washington
1946 - Same as above
1972 - No longer extant

Lots 13 and 14
1895 - One-story frame dwelling
P. Cahill Estate, $290/$100
Site 2 South Summary Information

**History** - Important historic resources include Colored School (1868-1879), Monroe School (1904-1960); Wilson Wind Mill & Tank Manufactory (?-1910s+); Simpson & Gray Lumber Yard (1890s-1910s+); remainder of resources appear to have been single-family and duplex dwellings, constructed 1880s-1910s. Working class families in 1880s, primarily tenants in 1900.

**Archaeology** - 1880s/1890s privies in rear of dwellings, possible ethnicity or class data.