On Tuesday, August 7, I traveled to Fort Ross with the intention of finding out where utility lines, (called for in the reconstruction effort that started recently) were going to be placed, and to check on reports that the archeological site located in the old archeologist camp had been damaged by construction activities. When I arrived, however, I found that the grading of the Official's Quarters building site had exposed a number of archeological features. In order to record these, I changed my plans and stayed at Fort Ross through Wednesday afternoon.

YCC Cabins - About six or eight weeks ago, two small cabins (about 12 foot square) were built for the use of YCC kids in the camping area used by previous archeological crews, located just over the first ridge from Fort Ross. These have continuous concrete footings with wooden superstructures. Last week, Claudine Young had reported to me that on a previous visit to the unit she had observed heavy equipment (a backhoe with a front end loader?) doing site preparation work for these cabins. This included leveling of an area approximately 50 feet long and 25 feet wide, located just to the north and west of the existing shower and sink. The cabins sit with their front doors facing out into the clearing; the backs of the cabins are near the tree line along Fort Ross Creek. Additional construction at the site included a roof over the sink area. It appears that the area under this canopy may have been dug up and filled with gravel.
To the best of my knowledge, the plans to build these cabins and do the grading were never reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Section. Had the plans been submitted for review, no grading would have been permitted, as we have long been aware that this area is a Native American archeological site. I talked to Glenn Burch regarding this problem after I had learned of it. He indicated that the work was done by Operations staff (possibly the Area Maintenance Supervisor, I have since learned), but indicated that a Coastal Commission permit to build the cabins had been attained. Glenn also indicated that he had been told that environmental clearance had been received for the project over the telephone from Mike Doyle. I questioned Doyle on this point, however, and he had no recollection of such a phone call.

While it is frustrating that this project wasn’t properly reviewed beforehand, the situation becomes even more ludicrous in light of the fact that it would appear (to me, at least) that much of the work (that is, the grading) didn’t have to be done in the first place. As I have indicated, the cabins are built on continuous perimeter foundations, and are not sitting directly on the ground. For this reason, I cannot understand why it was necessary to attempt to “level” the cabin sites. It does not appear to me that drainage has been improved by this work. It looks rather like the person operating the machine simply got carried away moving dirt around when simply digging the trenches for the foundations themselves would have sufficed. The work certainly hasn’t made the camp a bit more pleasant of a place to stay, as it simply turned the place into a dust bowl.

To the north-west in front of the cabins, there is a sort of mound or low hill behind the cabins. Most of this material was simply pushed into a
the bank towards the creek. In walking the area, I picked up a number of chipped flakes, as well as an olivella shell with a hole in the end (possibly a bead). It was also reported that the YCC kids using the camp have picked up a number of artifacts, supposedly including a couple of projectile points. It was reported that these had, however, disappeared by the time Operations staff requested them.

The Officers' Barracks Site - The area which is to house the reconstructed Officers' quarters was graded on July 16. The purpose of this grading was to level the site prior to the excavation of trenches for the continuous concrete perimeter foundation on which it is to set. Last week, I talked to Bill Collinsworth, the construction supervisor, regarding the subsurface work on the site. He had previously assured me that we would be notified before the foundation trenches were to be dug. On Monday morning, however, I received a call from Joe Hood, the supervising ranger, informing me that the backhoe was being unloaded as we talked in preparation for this foundation work. This work was completed on Monday, August 6. I have requested of Joe that he observe this work to watch for any archeological features that might be encountered. I also requested of Joe that he ask Tom Jewett, the reconstruction worker, to also watch for archeological material. Tom has worked previously at Sonoma Barracks and had been sensitized to archeological values by the crews monitoring the construction work there. I had spoken to Tom last week, and he indicated that he had salvaged some artifactual material already during the site grading in July. Tom gave me a lot of help this trip, helping me reestablish the archeological grid across the Officers' quarters to investigate the various features that had been found.
As just mentioned, we projected the archaeological base grid across the
construction site in order to facilitate mapping in the various intrusive
features that had been encountered in the grading and trenching for
foundations. This consisted of projecting the east-west baseline through the
benchmark on the southwest side of the fort and using that line to set up a
string line running across the site at 5 meters north. The second line
perpendicular to this at 22 meters west was also set up. Using these lines as
points of reference, the string lines set up by the construction crew which
marked the outside of the concrete perimeter foundations were recorded, as
were the horizontal locations of various archaeological features. I intend to
draw a map using these recorded dimensions when I return to Sacramento.

Two archaeological features that did not appear to have been excavated
previously were the most notable finds recorded during this trip to the fort.
These appear to be large post holes and post casts located along the north
(grid north) building line. Previous work appears to have concentrated on the
southern wall. Several other smaller features, including what appear to be
several smaller post holes and as yet unidentified intrusions, were also
recorded.

Feature X - This feature is large, squarish pit which contains evidence of at
least three posts. The feature was first noted by Tom Jewett as the backhoe
excavated a pit which is to house the foundation of the fireplace that is to
be reconstructed within the Officials' Quarters. When Tom noted large
quantities of artifacts coming from the excavation, he halted work in order to
record the feature. Subsequently, it seems that the feature consists of a large pit in
holes excavated into the yellow sandstone-subsoil of the site. These are 3 feet square and were positioned side-by-side, if they were, in fact, two separate post holes. Near the center of each of these excavations exposed post casts filled with a very dark friable midden-like material containing some charcoal and very small, very decomposed fragments of what appear to be redwood. No artifacts were recovered from these two post casts. Although it was difficult to tell, it appears that the posts may have been round timbers that were squared slightly. These are approximately 1 foot square. The material around the post casts is a mixture of topsoil and the sandy yellow subsoil removed from the hole. No artifacts were found in this packing, either.

The artifacts that alerted Tom to halt the backhoe work were located in the upper portion of the feature in what appeared to be a third post cast located between the two just discussed. On first examination, these artifacts appear to be turn of the century objects, including numbers of fragmentary glass and stoneware bottles, and iron hardware, including stove parts. Fill material that had been removed from the feature prior to my arrival and which lay in the backhoe pit included a number of fragmentary common red brick, as well as cut sandstone building stone. Excavation of the remainder of the feature suggested that the rock, and possibly the brick, were in the fill surrounding the center post.

My strategy in handling this feature was to clean up its south face in order to try to get a view of the profile, while recording the work as it progressed with color slide film. At first, I thought that this was simply a trash pit, but the post hole character of it soon became evident. (See slides ________ -
As of now (Wednesday evening), the feature has not been entirely excavated, although all of the artifactual material has been removed and enough excavation done to reveal the general character of the feature.

This feature appears typical of the Russian post holes previously excavated in the area in that the holes are rather large and are generally square. I suggest that the feature may represent at least two, and possibly three, phases of construction and repair. One or both of the posts in the large, square post holes probably date to the original construction of the building and served as supports for the northern cell of the Officials' Quarters. Perhaps one of the square post holes represents initial construction and the second a Russian period repair after the first post had rotted off. I further suggest that the third post hole, located between the two and containing the 19th century artifacts, may represent even later replacement of the underpinnings for this northern cell and that the artifacts contained in this third post hole may have been debris deposited in this depression by Division of Beaches and Parks personnel when the building was disassembled and the site "cleaned up" in about 1915. If I remember correctly, similar artifact deposits were found in other post holes by Bryn Thomas along this north building line.

Feature Y - This feature is another post hole located near the northwest corner of the building site. This feature was cut by the backhoe trench for the foundation of the western end of the building. It is a large, deep intrusion in which both post cast and rock fill that surrounded the post is visible. (See slides.) In this case, the wall of the trench was cleaned up to expose the profile, which was then
photographed. The fill in the post cast, which is 1.2 feet wide, was red. Although few artifacts were recovered, it was interesting to note that these would be compatible with a Russian date for the feature. These included two fragments of creamware, a small white glass seed bead, and several pieces of very thin window glass. These were located near the bottom of the post cast, which also contained a fair number of fist-size sandstone cobbles. Although it is possible that these artifacts fell into the feature after the post had rotten away or was removed, it is possible that they were deposited among stones placed in the bottom of the hole for drainage prior to the installation of the post.

It was interesting to note that a second post hole, similar in size and depth to the one discussed above, was located immediately across the trench (grid E-1) from Feature Y. This post hole had, however, been excavated previously, as was indicated by the presence of plastic flagging tape in the bottom of the feature. Thus, again we have a situation similar to that of Feature X in that there are large posts that presumably supported the sill of the building located in pairs along its north side. I believe that a similar pair of holes were also recorded along this side of the building during previous (1970) excavations. One possible interpretation of Feature Y is that it pertains to the additions that were located west of the Officials' Quarters (as shown on the 1817 Fedorova map) rather than the Officials' Quarters itself. Any further interpretations of these features will have to await mapping and comparison of their locations with those previously recorded.

The photographs of Features X and Y seem to suggest that the placement of the Officers' Quarters reconstruction is approximately 3 feet too far to the
If the assumption that these represent the northern building line is correct. Although the overall dimensions of the building, as it is to be reconstructed, seem to correspond quite well with the archeologically demonstrated dimensions, it appears that its placement may not be exactly accurate. Another factor that seems to confirm this statement is the fact that the southern foundation trench did not seem to intrude into the series of large post holes that are documented along the southern building line. If it were placed precisely on its original location, the 1 foot plus wide foundation trench should have cut through that series of post holes, as well. No such indications are present, however, in the side walls of the southern foundation trench. (Note - South Trench is close to actual edge, and does intersect several postholes.)

Several other features were exposed in the trench and in the leveled area, but I was not able to excavate or really examine in any detail due to lack of time. We did attempt, however, to record their locations and I will plot these on a site map. These include a large intrusion near the northeast corner of the building, which appears to be on a line with Features X and Y. (Feature W)

One other very small post was located slightly north of the north line of the building near the center of the site. In the south wall, south foundation trench, several very large intrusions were exposed in the side walls. I presume that these represent the outhouses that were recorded in 1976 and previously, as seems to be confirmed by the presence of string, flagging tape, plastic, etc., in these intrusions (although one does not contain clear evidence of such recent material; there are no historic artifacts in either, however.) (See map ...). Another previously excavated post hole was noted in the south foundation trench, near at the south edge of the building. Another large shallow intrusion was noted along the west foundation...
This does not appear to have been a post hole, although no artifacts were encountered in it. The fill in this intrusion was of a strange color and texture, suggesting that it may contain large quantities of rust. Hopefully, the area west of the building will be more carefully investigated in the future prior to any further reconstruction attempts.

The next order of business as far as the construction crew is concerned is to build the forms and pour the foundations for the building. Because of this, the primary emphasis today and yesterday was to examine the trenches in order to clear them for construction of the concrete forms. Bill Collinsworth indicated that when they have hired more crew members he intends to clear the surface of the graded area within the perimeter of the building, which should give us a better look at the site and assist us in identifying any other intrusive features that might be located within the perimeter of the building. It appears that the sandstone substrata is higher on the east and dips to the west. Thus, while the east end of the building site has been cleared entirely to this deposit, making intrusions filled with darker top soil fairly obvious, the western end of the building site still contains a considerable amount of dark, loamy, midden-like material. Thus, this makes it difficult to discern the outlines of any intrusions that may be located in this area. Tom Jewett did recover a number of artifacts from a single location in the western end of the building in a hole that he reported went to a depth of about 30 inches below the ground surface. This area is still uncleared, however, making it impossible to determine the precise location from which this material came. He did indicate that this pocket of artifacts was located about 32 feet grid south and slightly west of the flagpole that is just to the north of the building site. This would put this deposit
about on line with the other features believed to represent the historic north
routing line. This material appears to be very similar in character to that
recovered from the center portion of Feature X, that is, turn of the century
glass and stoneware. It seems likely to me that what Tom encountered in this
area was, again, fill in the hole left by the rotting and/or removal of these
timbers during the circa 1915 cleanup of the site. Again, hopefully, clearing
of this end of the building site will indicate the locations of any other
features previously excavated or as yet undetected in this area.

I felt it was quite fruitful to talk to the construction crew and indicate
some of the sorts of archeological resources that we should be aware of and
record. I discussed the upcoming utility trenching locations with Bill
Collinsworth in general terms; he plans to stake these out next week, in order
that we can investigate them prior to their excavation by backhoe. He
indicated that the interior of the Officials' Quarters building will be left
exposed for some time, so it will be possible for us to do some further
investigations here at such time as we come to do testing along the utility
line routes. Bill also indicated that much of the loose fill material that
was removed from the Officers' Quarters site will be removed shortly. At
present, much of this is scattered to the south and west of the building
site. I specifically requested that, in picking this material up for
transportation, they were careful not to cut through the previous ground
surface (which is fairly clearly indicated by the sod) in order that no
further disturbance is done to any archeological evidence of the buildings
located in this corner of the fort. I also asked Bill to inform me as soon
as he could as possible when the moskow house foundation work is to begin
in order that I might schedule time to get up to observe this work in progress.
and possibly avoid some of the problems we have in trying to deal with features uncovered on the Officials' Quarters site.
On Thursday and Friday, Bob Docken and I travelled to Fort Ross to continue the archaeological cleanup work that I had begun last week. Work at that time had indicated a series of previously unrecorded post hole features along the north line of the building. This new evidence appeared to indicate that the reconstruction as planned would result in the building being slightly off of its historical location and approximately three feet wider than it should be. Last weekend I completed a map of the site, incorporating the newly-found features as well as all of the previous work that had been done (1956, 1970, 1971, 1975, and 1976). On Monday, August 13, I showed copies of this drawing to Fritz Riddell, who told me to pass this information to Earl Carlson, the project architect. Additionally, I briefly discussed our alternatives with Earl: (1) Continue with reconstruction of the building as laid out; (2) Do slight adjustment to the location of the foundation trench in order to bring the building into closer alignment with its historic location; and (3) Redesign the building in order to make it the proper dimensions, as indicated by the archeological data). The latter sounded like quite an expensive proposition, and as the wrong information upon which the existing plans were based had been provided by our editor, did not seem the better.
We discussed other possible explanations for the newly encountered features; by that point it had become apparent that more field work would be needed to verify or refute this new interpretation.

On Wednesday, Bill Pritchard, Mike Tucker, Glenn Burch, and I briefly discussed the new findings at lunch time. We, again, discussed other possible explanations for the new features, although none seemed more plausible than the likelihood that they represented the north side of the building. As I understood it, Bill, Mike, and Glenn preferred to have the project go ahead as planned in fear that a major reevaluation of the building design might well result in a prohibitive increase in project costs that might in turn radically delay or even cancel the project. At the time, given that drastic scenario (possible death of the project), I agreed with them.

Later Wednesday afternoon I had a long discussion with Jerry Stanley, OSA, regarding building placement, dimensions, and subsurface work for utility lines. I, at this time, was still assuming that redesign of the project to make the building reflect the archeological realities was unfeasible. Jerry and I discussed the various options on the placement of utility lines in some depth during this conversation. I had discussed these previously with Earl, and he agreed to prepare a drawing reflecting these possibilities to which we could respond as far as the cultural resource mitigation needs.

By Thursday morning, the day we were to leave for Fort Ross, it had become clear that the new information and the question of the actual size and placement of the building compared with that of the reconstructed version, had
become an issue rather than simply an interesting set of archeological data. I returned the call to Dale Buschke, Assistant District 2 Superintendent. I agreed to stop by the district headquarters in Santa Rosa on our way to Fort Ross and deliver a copy of our map to him and discuss the possible interpretations. Dale, Bob Docking, Lloyd Geissinger, and I attended this meeting. Lloyd, the Russian River Area Manager, was very concerned about the situation, and was adamant about wanting to bring the question into the open, get all of the facts and possible alternatives on the table, and get input from all involved parties within the Department as well as the Fort Ross Advisory Committee. We all agreed it was appropriate to ask Earl to halt any further work on the official's corridors until such a meeting could take place and a decision that was mutually satisfactory reached. By this time, it was obvious that this was the only acceptable course of action; I regret that I had not perceived the situation for the sensitive issue it was, but had rather taken a defeatist attitude that nothing could be done, that it was too late to make any changes. Lloyd's rhetorical question, "How are we going to explain to park visitors for the next 200 years why the building is the wrong size and is in the wrong place", really seemed to put the short-term expediencies and long-term realities into perspective.

After the meeting, Bob and I had lunch, bought groceries, and proceeded to Fort Ross. By this time it was mid-afternoon. We worked late and then went to the old archeologist camp and had a fine dinner with Joe Hood, Tom Juit, and Rosalee. We worked through the following day (Friday) until about 6:00 and returned to Sacramento, arriving about 9:30.
Descriptions of the archeological features (post holes) found, cleaned up, and recorded, follows below. These are shown on the accompanying map, which is an updated version of the drawing prepared last week. Bob Dockyn, a historian who generally works on mining-related research, was of great assistance in this venture. Our strategy was to clean up the upper surfaces of the intrusive features, exposed by grading of the building site, and vertical faces of those features which had been cut by the foundation trenching. We depended heavily on the vacuum cleaner for this cleanup work. In most cases, some excavation was involved in order to get a clear horizontal section of each feature. This was done with pick, shovel, and trowel. Because of lack of time, detail plans were completed for some but not all of the new features. We did take a number of color slides of each feature. Toward the end of the day, Bob outlined the post hole intrusions with red flagging tape, and the post casts within the post holes with white string in order that the composition and location of features would be clearly shown in the photographs. I climbed up on piles of lumber in the porch railings of the new commandants house just before we left and took overall photographs of the building site; the flagging tape made the location and alignment of the features very obvious for these photographs.

Newly recorded features along the north building line are described below (from east to west):

(Area of figures follows which have now been completed - Sept 6, 1975)
FEATURE W: (see map for grid coordinates)

This large post hole, which was cut by the east foundation trench, appears to have supported the northeast corner of the building. The post was approximately 40 cms wide, as indicated by the post casts. The post hole itself is about 90 cms wide; rocks were packed in the hole around the post (see slides nos. ___ - ___). The post hole was about 92 cms in depth below the present graded ground surface. A portion of the fill in the post casts was removed from the trench side wall. Several artifacts were recovered including a rectangular piece of patinated iron, which was recovered near the center of the post casts about halfway down. The lower portion of the post hole itself is about 52 cms wide. A shallower intrusion adjoins the deeper post hole on the north.

FEATURE Z:

This large post hole is about 80 cms wide and 90 cms long (east to west). The cast of a rectangular post is clearly visible in the western side of the hole (see slides __-___). The post itself appears to have been 40 cms wide and 53 cms long. Two small upright redwood post remnants stand in the east end of the post casts, which is filled with the typical dark brown-gray top soil that covers the surrounding area. Of particular interest in Feature Z are several fired red brick fragments that are embedded in the packing material surrounding the post casts. One of these appears to exhibit a complete, measurable width (about 5-7/8 inches). The bricks manufactured in the area by the Russians are or have appeared to have been wider than the ___
common American red brick (4 inches). As the brick has not been removed, we are not sure if the length dimension will be obtainable. Presently of the brick in the packing around the post to the interpretation of this as being a Russian feature. It would appear that the area containing this feature was excavated in 1971. Apparently it was not identified as such at that time.

FEATURE X:

A series of three adjoining post casts. (See last week’s notes).

FEATURE U:

This feature is a series of poorly defined intrusions into the underlying yellowish decomposing sandstone. I was still working on these late Friday afternoon so have not fully delineated them. One almost circular intrusion (20-25 cm in diameter) does contain fragments of redwood and may be post casts. This feature may consist of a small post casts and/or a series of rodent burrowings. This feature could additional examination.

FEATURE V:

This is a large oval-shaped post hole about 125 cm long (east to west) and 60 cm wide. The post casts, which is filled with the typical dark top soil,
contains a substantial amount of wood including fairly well preserved but knot in the upper surface. (See photo nos. ___ - ___.) The post casts is about 36 cms wide and 70 cms long. The eastern side of the post casts was poorly defined, however, making it difficult to estimate the original width (east-west) of the post. Location of the wood in the casts suggests that the posts was at least 46 cms wide in this dimension. The fill in the hole surrounding the post casts contains a typical of decomposed sandstone and sandstone rocks. Several glass, ceramic, and metal artifacts were encountered in the eastern side of the post casts. On first examination, these appear to be late 19th or early 20th century objects. Feature V and the next two features to the west were dug, at least in part, into the underlying sandstone bedrock, which uplifts towards the surface in this area within the western foundation trench itself; however, the stratigraphy appears to be made up of stratified layers of decomposing sandstone "gravel".

FEATURE 3:

This feature was first encountered in the 1970 excavations, and is shown on maps of those findings as two posts placed slightly more than a meter apart. Only the upper surface of the feature was exposed in 1979, in order to verify its location with respect to the other features. There has always been considerable problem in attempting to precisely correlate the maps from the pre-1975 project with the findings recorded according to the metric grid established in 1975. One reason for this problem was the fact that several different grid axis alignments had been used previously. This is an intrusion about 175 cms in length and 85 cms in width. Little of the interior fill was
removed, and no distinct post casts were noted. In black and white photograph of this feature, apparently dating from its original excavation, is including in the first report by Bryan Thomas. This seems to confirm that the feature described and Feature III are one and the same. It shows that the eastern end of the feature had been dug out at that time. The 1979 location does not correspond precisely with that of Feature III as interpolated onto the 1975 grid map (see attached map).

FEATURE 126:

Work this week indicates that Feature 125, first recorded in 1976, is larger than initially thought. The feature, which was only partially uncovered in 1976, was found to contain three rather than one post casts, and was considerably longer than first thought. The entire feature is about 150 cm long east-west but is of fairly irregular width, as it is in part dug into solid sandstone. No clearly-defined post casts is visible in the eastern portion of the feature, which was uncovered in 1976. I believe that a fair amount of late 19th early 20th century trash was recovered from the fill of this feature, although I will have to check the field notes from that project. The two newly recorded post casts are generally rectangular, but are oriented irregularly with respect to the south, which is paralleled by other rectangular posts. These post casts are generally smaller and closer to square than the other rectangular posts along the north building line. Central cast measures approximately 27 x 32 cm. The westernmost cast is approximately 40 x 40 cm. This post appears to have been placed against the exterior of the post hole.
FEATURE T:

This small redwood post is located north of the sill line of the official's corridors. Its general location was determined last week. The hole contains wood (a knot), which may have been a post about 4 x 4 inch in size. We have not taken into detail measurements or drawings of this feature.

FEATURE S:

This intrusion along the west foundation trench was again looked at, although it was not cleaned up or recorded in detail. Brief examination shows it to be a fairly square bottomed hole, is as typical of many of the post holes located on the site. We still have to clean this feature up and record it. This post and any others located at the ends or on the interior of the building have now become of considerable interest. In reference to the question of the location of the interior partitions and corridors, if the building is to be redesigned, now that the north building line has been clearly defined, it is important to do similar cleanup of other previously unexcavated areas within the interior of the building.
FEATURE Y:

Post hole, probably one of a pair with Feature 121, which is presumed to be the northwest corner of the official's barracks. The related Feature Y, Feature 113, and other as yet unexcavated post holes to the west of Feature Y probably supported the north side of the two north-south trending rooms that were attached to the west end of the official's corridors building, as drawn on the 1817 map. (See last week's notes for further description of Feature Y).
Last Thursday, after meeting with Dale and Lloyd in Santa Rosa, I called Beth to arrange a meeting with Mr. Tryner in order that I could go over the new archeological evidence and discuss our next moves. She set this meeting up for 1:30 on Monday. During the morning, I added the features recorded on Thursday and Friday of last week to the site plan and made several copies showing the proposed reconstruction location versus the actual historic location. In the afternoon, I met with Tryner and Fritz Rydell. We discussed the evidence, and the reasons why the previous archeological work on the site had not yielded a more complete picture of the building. Tryner commented that this situation appeared to be an indictment of "percentage archeology", wherein only a portion of the site is sampled, rather than the entire location being thoroughly examined. In this case, even though a fairly large percentage of the site had been sampled, it was done in several different phases; no single investigator ever had a major portion of the site exposed at one time. In the case of the 1976 work, the problems with a sampling strategy are apparent. Looking at the map, it appears that units were placed in an attempt to locate the north wall, although the assumptions about the building granted prior to designing the sampling procedures were such that the test units were generally placed too far to the north to catch the north side of the building. This is always a problem with a sampling procedure, and can be avoided with certainty only by complete excavation of the sites in question.
Tryner’s decision was that RP&I division’s stand would be to request that the building plans be modified to make the reconstructed building correspond with the dimensions and placement of the historic building as indicated by the new archeological data. He indicated that if a decision were made to ignore our recommendation and reconstruct the building as drawn (that is, inaccurately), that such a decision would have to come from the Director’s office.

After finishing my meeting with Fritz and Jim Tryner, I delivered a copy of the updated site plan to Earl Carlson and discussed the matter in some detail with him. We reexamined a number of historic photographs of the east end of the building as it appeared during the American period and attempted to scale out the width of the building on those photographs, using the dimensions of the window pains, visible in the photographs, as a point of reference.

John McKenzie, in his notes, had compared the windows shown in these photographs with those still present in the new commandant’s house at that time (late 1950s-early 1960s), and had determined that they were of the same type and size. He listed the dimensions of the window pains in the new commandant’s house at that time as being 9 x 12 inches, with a total width of 30 inches. Using this standard on the available historic photos of the east end of the official’s corridors, the width of that building scaled out to from 21 to 23 feet. Thus, this appears to correspond quite well with the archeology-determined width of the building (just slightly less than 23 feet), as well as the 1841 Inventories dimensions of 21 feet, and 7 meters (about 22 feet 9 inches). In fact, about the only historic source indicated a 25-foot dimension for the building is the Veasey map, drawn in the 1890s. This map, which is dimensioned, shows the building correctly as 70 feet long but as being 25 feet wide. Perhaps the map maker was including the eaves and/or an undocumented porch or walkway.
I conveyed Tryner's decision to Earl, and we discussed the changes that would actually have to be made to correct the existing plans. It appears that most of the detail drawings can remain the same. Those that will certainly have to be redrawn include the foundation plan, the floor plan, and the end elevations. In reality, the side elevations will be modified somewhat as the ridge of the roof will be lowered somewhat if the pitch is kept the same but the building made somewhat narrower. Earl did mention, however, that a series of "as-built" drawings should be made of the structure once it is completed, and that some of the needed changes might possibly be adequately reflected in these drawings without having to entirely redo the existing plans prior to construction of the building. Although no commitments were made during this conversation, I did come away from it feeling that changing the plan to accurately reflect the historic realities may not be as difficult, unfeasible, or expensive as I had originally imagined. I have been very impressed with Earl's attitude and cooperation throughout this entire process.

Although I had intended to leave for Columbia and the Fallon Hotel project on Tuesday morning, I spent about two-thirds of the day in the office tying up loose ends. This included getting copies of the updated Official's Corridors map in the mail to Lloyd Geissinger, Dale Buschke, Bill Collinsworth, and Joe Hood. I called Collinsworth to let him know Tryner's stand on this issue. It appears that no final decision will be made on how to proceed until next week, as Bill Pritchard and Mike Tucker are in Sitka this week for a conference on Russian American settlement. I understand they will be returning to California accompanied by a number of Russian scholars and dignitaries, including Svetlana Fedorova, and with them will visit Fort
Ross. The timing of this event seems rather ironic as Ms. Federova is the lady who first published the 1817 map of Fort Ross. If the decision is made to modify the plans of the Office's Corridor to concur with the available archeological/historical information, it will be a feather in the Department's cap; I understand that much of the historic preservation work, currently being done in Russia, is top notch.

I finally left for Columbia SHP about 2:30.
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I returned from Columbia State Historic Park last night and spent the day in the office and the lab. This afternoon I took a copy of the Fort Ross officials quarters map to Mike Tucker and discussed the possible interpretations of the new-found features in some detail with him. Mike doesn’t seem to have any trouble with the interpretation I propose, i.e., that the new-found features represent the north side of the officials quarters building, and that the structure is somewhat narrower than previously assumed (about 23 feet rather than the 25 feet 10 inches shown on the plans). I also discussed the various problems with contradictions between the archeological evidence for the location of the Kuskov House and the various documentary sources, especially the 1817 map. I did state however, that the available evidence is such that it is not possible to resolve the apparent contradictions between these various sources of evidence. Possibilities remain that (1) the 1817 map is wrong in showing the approximately three meter gap between the rear of the Kuskov House and the stockade; (2) the south side of the building may have been built on a sill and/or archeological evidence for that side of the structure may have been destroyed in the past; or (3) the stockade may have originally been placed somewhat farther to the north than the present reconstruction. I gave Tucker a copy of Bryn Thomas’s report on the Kuskov House, as well as a copy of my 1975 field notes discussing the contradictions between the archeological and documentary evidence. Mike said he was going to see Bill Pritchard over the weekend and would discuss this matter with him.
This morning I met with Mike Tucker and Bill Pritchard of the Interpretive Services Section and again discussed the new archeological evidence for the size and placement of the capital officials Quarters Building at Fort Ross. We did discuss the possibilities that these features might represent an earlier structure; no other evidence exists that would point to this interpretation, however. The archeological evidence gives no indication that an undocumented structure is represented. I conveyed to them (as I had to Tucker on Friday) that the archeologically determined dimensions based on the new finds seem to correspond more closely with the available photographic and archival evidence than did the dimension given in the drawings (25 feet 10 inches). This is based on a reexamination of three historic photographs showing the east end of the structure. The scale from which the building's width was determined on these photographs was derived from the windows, which John McKenzie in unpublished notes on the building indicated measured 9 x 12 inches per pane, with a total width of about 30 inches. This was based on comparison with other American windows present in the New Commandant's House. The new dimension also seems to correspond more closely with those listed in the 1841 inventories (seven meters, or 22.96 feet; and 21 feet). We also discussed the fact that two sources giving a dimension of 25 feet are also known. One of these is the 1892 Veasey map which indicates the dimension of 25 feet, and a statement by E. Rufus (1845 I believe) which also gives it 25 foot dimension. In the end, however, we all agreed that the evidence for a width of somewhat less than 23 feet seems the most probable, and that the archeological features present are believably explained by the officials quarters building shown in the historic photographs and the American period
shed addition to the south side of that building, without resorting to an explanation based on a hypothesized earlier structure.

In the afternoon Bill, Mike, and myself went to the Resources Building to meet with Neil Johannsen, Jim Tryner, and Fritz Riddell. There was considerable confusion over the time and place of this meeting; when we arrived we found that Earl Carlson was not available and that the meeting had been put off until 8:30 tomorrow morning. It would have been futile to try to hold this meeting without Carlson or another knowledgeable representative of the Development Division, as the real question at this time is whether it will be feasible for the architecture unit to redo the necessary drawings without a great time delay. I had, from my meetings with Earl last week, sensed that this alternative would be feasible and that the size and placement of the building could be modified without undue delay. I had conveyed this to Tucker and Pritchard in my meetings with them, which seemed to be a comfort to them, as they are both very concerned that any delay or rescoping of the project might result in its cancellation.
This morning at 8:30 a.m. I attended a meeting with Neil Johannsen, Bob Uhte of the architecture unit, F. A. Riddell, Mike Tucker, and Bill Pritchard. I took a copy of the site plan showing the newly located archeological features and discussed their interpretations and implications as far as the accuracy of the officials quarters reconstructed. Johannsen expressed his desire to (1) see the building reconstructed accurately and (2) not to delay the reconstruction project. Bob Uhte, who had been present at the meetings I held with Earl Carlson a week ago, indicated that the architecture unit could redraw the foundation plans within a few days, if we could provide the needed dimensions. He indicated that Ron Vaughn would be doing this work. I indicated that we could have accurate dimensions and placement measurements available within a few days, probably at least by Friday. Johannsen set a date of September 4 for providing these measurements, and a deadline of September 7 for a new foundation plan, which is what the OSA crew needs to proceed with the construction work. I also discussed the probable cost of completing our work on the officials quarters site and doing field work needed in conjunction with the excavation of utility line trenches. I presented a budget figure of $8,750.00 for one month of field time and accompanying month of laboratory and report preparation time for myself and archeological specialists. This figure included travel costs. Johannsen instructed Uhte to try to find $5,000.00 to assist in this work. Although the archeology of the officials quarter site itself, have been completed previously, the plans which showed utility lines has not come through our office for review previously, and thus is work we did not anticipate or budget for. I discussed the amount of work needed to obtain the measurements Johannsen wanted by September 4.
Johannsen volunteered to come up and work over the Labor Day weekend if this was necessary. I indicated that this was a possibility if it looked like we could not complete the work before that time, but also indicated I did not think this would be necessary.

Following the meeting I went to the architectural units offices to talk to Ron Vaughn. Ron Vaughn indicated that he would meet us at Fort Ross on Friday morning in order to obtain the measurements needed to redraw the foundation plan. On Tuesday afternoon I prepared for the upcoming trip to Fort Ross. Bob Docken will again accompany me to help with this work. This afternoon I returned to Sears and purchased another large shop vacuum for use at Fort Ross. The one purchased previously is now being used on the Columbia Fallon Hotel Project.
Fort Ross Official's Quarters Reconstruction

August 29-31, 1979

On Wednesday morning, Bob Docken and I returned to Fort Ross to continue the excavation and recording of the archeological features construction site preparation work. We had begun this work the week before last. Last week I worked in Columbia, awaiting decisions as to the course of work at the official's quarters. Our first job was to determine with as much certainty and precision as possible the exact location of the perimeter of the historic building. The architect, Ron Vaughn, is to be here Friday to get the dimensions he needs to draw the new foundation plans for the reconstruction.
Our strategy for establishing the locations of the south, east, and west building lines was to uncover the corner posts and determine the precise location of the two adjoining exterior sides of the post casts within those features. This was made somewhat more difficult by the fact that three of these features (101, 119, and 121) had been entirely (or mostly) cleaned out during the 1976 work, which obliterated the post casts themselves. Excellent records in the form of description and detailed drawings are available, however, which made it possible to relocate the outsides of the post casts with reference to the outline of the post hole itself, which were still
visible in the foundation transidewalls. The precise location of the exterior
of the post cast in Feature W was also difficult to determine, as much as that
feature had been removed by the backhoe excavation of the foundation trench.

In order to establish the original building lines, the corner post features
which had previously been excavated were cleaned out. Bob excavated the loose
fill from a large portion of Feature 101, at the southeast corner of the
building. A large stone shown in the 1976 drawing was present in the hole,
although it appeared that it had been moved somewhat from its previous
position. Here the precise location of the corner was derived using the 1976
sketch. When he had completed this work, Bob began work on Feature W, at the
northeast corner of the building. In this instance, the post cast location
was generally defined by an absence of small stones within the fill. In this
case the fill around the post cast differs little in color from the material
within the cast itself (see slides____ - ____ ). There did seez to
generally be fewer rocks within the presumed post cast area in the lower portion of feature. Another aspect of the feature that seems to confirm the location of the post itself is the smooth hard packed thin layer of clay at the bottom of the hole. A similar phenomenon was noted in several other features, and was mentioned to me by Gary Reinhoel when I saw him last week.

He had worked on the 1976 project, and commented on the presence of a distinct grayish clay deposit at the bottom of a number of the presumed Russian postal features excavated at that time.

While Bob worked on Features 101 and W, I began to clean up Features 119 (southwest corner) and 121 (northwest corner). Both of these had also been
excavated in 1976. Because the location of the foundation trench was closest
to the actual historic location at the southwest corner, the foundation trench
had removed most of the upper portion of the feature. The large, generally
rounded outline of the post hole did extend 15 or 20 centimeters into the
bottom of the foundation trench. The center of the feature was filled with loose
loam and sandstone cobbles, some of which had slumped in from the southside
wall of the trench. A piece of cotton string was buried in the stones
embedded in the south side wall of the trench within about 20 centimeters at
the bottom of the trench, indicating that most of the upper material had been
excavated and backfilled. A fairly hard packed smooth surface that I
interpret to be the bottom of the post cast was still evident below this loose
fill in the center of the feature. The grayish color mentioned by Gary was
evident here although was fairly thin. It appears to me to be a discoloration
of the subsoil material into which the post hole was dug. Several dark brown
hard packed patches were also visible. A number of sandstone cobbles were
packed around the edges of the features. It was very difficult, however, to
determine whether these were backfill or were the stones that had originally
been packed around the post. The rock shown in the 1976 drawing do not
correspond precisely to those present in the bottom of the hole, this might be
because the plan of the feature was drawn at a somewhat higher level.

Feature 121 is the northwest corner post of the official's quarters. This was
also excavated in 1976. As was the case with Feature 119, most of the post
hole appeared to have been cleaned out by the earlier excavation, although a
number of rocks that might have originated been present as packing around the
post remained after I had cleaned the loose fill out of the feature.
Determination of the exact location of the post cast within Feature 121 was made somewhat difficult by the fact that the western half of the feature had been removed by the trenching for foundations.

Feature 5 is a post hole feature that was exposed by the excavation of the western foundation trench. When work on the corner post was completed I began the clean up and excavation of Feature 5, as it appeared that the post it represented would give us another point on which to base the west building line. This feature is located approximately halfway between Feature 121 and Feature 119, although it is slightly closer to Feature 119 (___ foot to Feature 119; ___ foot to Feature 121, center to center). Thus, Feature 5 seems to be a center support for the Sill running between those two corner posts. Its presence was rather unexpected, as no compatible post hole was found along the east end of the building, nor within the interior of the structure. This feature appeared to be a fairly typical squarish post hole
about 85 centimeters across, with an irregularly shaped but well defined post
cast about 38 centimeters wide. The east-west thickness of the post cast is
unknown, as the western extreme of the feature was removed by the backhoe. It
does not appear to exceed about 30 centimeters, however. (See feature record
for description and drawings). A number of nails, some of which may be of the
wrought variety, were recovered from the post cast. A large fragment of
Chinese export porcelain was recovered embedded securely in post hole fill
initially packed in the hole around the post. Presence of this ceramics seems
very compatible with a Russian period origin. A small fragment of Pearlware
and a tiny fragment of a light blue transfer printed or stamped earthenware
were also recovered. While the upper portion of the post hole fill consisted
of decomposing sandstone and small sandstone fragments, large cobbles to small boulders were packed around the base of the post, particularly on the northeast side. A few brick fragments were present in the upper portion of the post hole fill.

The post cast of Feature S seems to lie somewhat inside the western building line as indicated by Features 119 and 121. If the Sills that rested on top of the posts and supported the building were approximately 40 centimeters wide, as is suggested by some of the post cast along the north building line, the post in Feature S would have supported the inside rather than the center of the western Sill. I have taken grid coordinates which I still have to plot to determine the exact location of the Feature S post cast with reference to the western Sill.

By Thursday evening we had pretty well defined the perimeter of the building,
using a plumb bob and nylon string attached to the framework put up by the reconstruction crew to mark the initial foundation locations. Along the north wall the location was determined primarily by stretching the line and adjusting it to intersect with the north side of the post casts present across this area. This location corresponded fairly well with the most probable location of the post cast in Feature 121, as well as the north side of Feature Y. Feature Y, which is presumed to represent an earlier western extension of the building shown on the 1817 map. This would be expected if these structures were part of one continuous construction. As discussed, the west line was based on Features 121, 5, and 119. The east line is based on
two points only. Feature W, the northeast corner, is probably the most
uncertain point along the entire perimeter. I would still estimate, however,
that the margin of error here is limited to a couple of inches.

Although the south building line was initially established based on the corner
post features, posts, Features 119 and 107, its relation to the post casts of
Features 108 and 112 were also taken into consideration. This entailed
determining the good coordinate for the exterior of the post cast of each of
those features and taping this distance back from the five meter north grid
line, as only the northern portions of these features were excavated. By
adjusting the string line to minimize the differences between the string and
these tapped post locations, the south building line was estimated within
about two inches. We completed these minor adjustments Friday morning.

Ron showed up early Friday and with Bill and John measured the dimensions of
the building and recorded its location. They found that the dimensions of the
building, as we had plotted them from the archeological features were very
nearly equal sided, but were about 8-1/2 inches out of square. The width of
the building from one end to the other varied only about two inches. As this
would have complicated construction of the building, and is well within our
margin of error it was decided to construct the north and south sides of the
building parallel. (See plan for dimensions).

Ron mentioned that Mike Tucker had asked him to ask us to examine the area
east of the building for evidence of a porch in this area. The historic
photographs clearly show a long, relatively narrow porch along this end of the
building. I think Tucker suspects that there may have been a somewhat smaller
porch during the Russian period, and thinks we might be able to find post
holes indicating its size and location. Ron also seemed interested in this
data, as it would be possible to modify the porch design, since the
reconstructed porch shown on the drawings is to be built on a concrete
foundation at grade, and would be relatively easy to modify. Because of the
interest in the porch, and the fact that a water line will probably run
through the foundation in this area, we decided that some investigation of
this section of the site was warranted. As Jay, the Russian River Area
equipment operator was here with a backhoe, we asked him to move the loose
back dirt piled on this area. When this was completed, we had him lightly
rake a wedge shaped area (see plan) to loosen the compacted loam. He made two
passes across the area, each of which consisted of drawing the backhoe buckets
tooth ladenly across the ground. He made two such passes over the area. One
large stone was encountered the bucket was dragged over top of them, leaving
them in place. This disturbance reached a maximum depth of three to four inches. A fairly large amount of broken glass and ceramics was exposed in this fashion, apparently scattered in the upper few inches across the area. A single unit dug in this area in 1975 indicated a heavy, though seemingly random scatter of such artifacts. Our strategy will be to clean up the loose overburden in this east porch area, and continue the excavations if necessary in order to expose the upper surface of any post holes or other intrusive features that extend into the subsoil in this area. Bob and I spent part of Friday afternoon screening the material that Jay had loosened with his backhoe.
Bob and I left for Sacramento at about 5:15. We stopped in Petaluma for
supper, and arrived in Sacramento about 9:30.
Phil Hines and I left for Fort Ross at about 3:00 on September 3 (Labor Day) we wanted to be there to begin work early on Tuesday morning, as just getting to Fort Ross usually uses up half of a work day. We returned in order to complete the excavation of the archeological features located previously, as these will be destroyed by the construction of the new, more accurately placed foundation trench.

Phil began working on Feature V, a post hole near the center of the building which contains a substantial quantity of wood. Here, as was the case with a number of other features, the post cast seemed at the surface to be rectangular, although the lower portion of the cast was more irregular and
rounded. I wonder if the Russians constructing this building may have left the bottom of the posts irregular but dressed the upper portions which projected above the ground and might have been visible. An important find in Feature V is a large, fired red brick that appears to be complete or almost complete. This brick measures approximately 10 inches by 5-1/4 inches by 3 inches, and is presumed to be of Russian origin. It was located in the upper portion of the post hole fill, but was partially surrounded by the loam in the post cast. Perhaps the brick was originally placed right next to the post itself. The excavation of this feature indicated that the post hole itself was not quite as large as shown on the maps I initially prepared for this project.
While Phil worked on Feature V, I excavated Feature Z, another post hole that also contained some wood in the post cast as well as a fragment of an oversized Russian brick. Relatively little of the post itself was preserved, although several knots, which are harder and therefore last longer than other wood fragments, were found within the post cast, orientated toward the center of the post (see drawing). Again in Feature Z as in Feature V, the oversized brick was located along the south side of the post cast, and was partially surrounded by the typical loam that filled the post cast (see slide number 11). Also recovered in Feature Z, also on the south side of the post cast, was a single piece of dressed sandstone, which was heavily encrusted with soot on one side. This was located in the top of the fill adjacent to the brick.

The presence of these oversized bricks in Features V and Z is of some importance and interest. For one thing, few complete or even partially
complete bricks from this time period have been recovered at the fort. Most of those recovered in the past have been fragmentary, as the brick is very soft. There presence is compatible with the Russian date of construction, although Bryn Thorsaas had noted the presence of large brick and cut stone in the Feature 124-150 series of post holes and interpreted them as representing disposal of the remnants of a Russian stove during the early American period.

I have to review the records from the 1976 work more carefully and compare the contents of the various series of post holes in some detail with the 1979 data. Perhaps these items (brick and cut stone) were placed in the upper portion of the post holes during replacement of the posts. I will deal with this topic at greater length after I have had a chance to review all of the
old field records. The lower portion of Feature Z contained considerable number of large cobbles packed around post cast especially on the south and east sides. Few artifacts were recovered, although we have been screening the contents of the post casts and post hole fill separately through a 1/4 inch mesh.

After completing the excavation Feature Z, I began recording an excavation of the western portion of Feature 125. The eastern portion of this feature had been in part dug in 1976. This is also the area from which Tom Jewett had recovered a large number of early 20th Century artifacts during the grading of the site (27-30 feet southwest of the flag pole). What had initially seemed to be a post cast near the center of the feature turned out to be an irregular, shallow depression filled with loam of no apparent architectural purpose. The eastern post cast did however, prove to be a typical, irregularly shaped post outline, much of the western half of Feature 125 has
been dug into solid sandstone. The post cast contained a fairly large number of artifacts, mostly window and small fragments of bottle glass. The eastern half of the feature was not dug as much as it had been excavated during 1976.

I do not know if the material recovered by Tom came from the upper portion of the eastern or western halves of the feature. As only the north half of the eastern half was excavated in 1976, the artifacts Tom recovered might have come from the southern, unexcavated portion of the eastern half of Feature 125. On the other hand, they may also have been located in the fill above the western post cast. The 1976 records indicate that eastern portion of Feature 125 did contain a heavy concentration of recent artifacts, and that
those seem to have been deposited on top of an older post hole feature. I will have to try to cross mend the artifacts recovered in 1976 with those recovered during grading in 1979 and those from the western post cast.

When the excavation of these major features had been completed, Phil and I still had a number of loose ends to tie-up. This fill cleaned out Feature U, which also turned out to be a shallow irregularly shaped depression, rather than the post hole we had initially thought. It appears the Feature U and the associated irregular streaks of loam in the upper surface of the subsoil may simply represent rodent burrows. Phil also cleaned out the remaining lower portion of the eastern post cast in Feature X, and we drew another plan of the feature showing the shape of the post cast here. Previous drawings show the outline of the post cast fill before the fill material was removed. We shot a large number of elevations, using Bill Collinsworth's levels and staffs. These included surface elevations, the elevation of the upper surface of the
subsoil, the graded surface, and the tops and bottoms of various archaeological
features uncovered by this work. I will take these figures back to Sacramento
and prepare cross sections along the major wall lines using them. The stadia
Bill lent us is of the direct reading variety, which eliminated a lot of
calculations; our readings are directly convertible into feet above sea
level. During the afternoon, Phil continued to screen some of the material
loosened up last week in the east porch area, while I completed a section
drawing of Feature Y.

Friday morning I talked to Ron Vaughn regarding utility lines. It appears
that he wants to bring the telephone, electrical, and CB lines along the
outside if the stockade wall to a point along the west end of the building and
than cut across the yard (east-west into the building). I told him that we
considered all of the area west of the structure to be extremely sensitive
archaeologically and that we would have to dig part or all of it. He wants to
try to run the line across as much of the area dug in 1971 and 1976 as
possible to minimize the amount of work we have to do here. As this area was
the location of several additions during the Russian period, and has not been
damaged or excavated, we must be exceedingly careful in doing anything
in this area. Ron wants to run the line to the septic tank through
Feature One, south side of the building, under the stockade to a septic tank
located six to eight feet south of the stockade. The 50-foot lease line could
run in any direction from the septic tank, although there is some question
about the appropriateness of putting it directly under the road. Ron also has
a drawing that shows a four-inch water main running north-south along the old
highway through the fort. He mentioned turning into that line and running a
water line into the official's quarters from the east, probably slightly north
of the stairs to be reconstructed on the east end of the building. We are
awaiting drawings showing these plans, which Ron said would probably be ready
early next week.

Phil and I headed back for Sacramento at about 5:00. We stopped in Petaluma
for supper, and arrived in Sacramento about 9:30 p.m.
FORT ROSS SHP

OFFICIAL'S QUARTERS RECONSTRUCTION

AUGUST 8, 1979

Features, dimensions recorded after grading, foundation trenching.

1/2 " = 1 METER

1 = 10 FEET INCLUSIVE INTO UNDERLYING SOIL/ROCK
See feature details, slides.
Fort Ross SHP
Officials Quarters Reconstruction
August 17, 1979
Metric Grid Coordinates, features exposed by grading, trenching

See Aug. 8, 1979 Plan for previously recorded features

D.L. Felton
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
ARCHEOLOGICAL FEATURE RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature No.</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Excavation Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>OFFICIALS GIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Location:
   a. Horizontal: WEST OF FEATURE 3, EAST OF FEATURE 125, IN LINE WITH OTHER POST HOLE FEATURES FORMING A FOUNDATION OR STRUCTURE.
   b. Vertical: From Surface ___________ From Datum ___________.

6. Dimensions:
   a. Maximum Length ___________ Direction ___________.
   b. Maximum Width 100 CM ___________ Direction N.

7. In Post Cast and Shovel Center Intrusion - Dark, Gray-Black Soil Typical of Site, Post Hole Filled (Packing around Posts)
   - Mottled Yellow Sandstone Gravel, Fragments, Coarse, Some Clay.

8. Preservation: SOME RUBBAGE IN CAST, NO DECEIVING POST REMAINT.

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials):
   - INSIDE AMOUNT OF WOOD, GLASS, SOME BOTTLE GLASS, FEW CERAMIC SHERDS IN POST CAST ONE SMALL RIM SHERD CHINESE EXTRUCTION IN POST CAST.
   * NOTE: THE RECENT ARTIFACTS REQUESTED BY DR. JEWETT DURING GRADING AT 27-30'S SW. OF TWIN POLE PROBABLY COME FROM WEST YARD, FEATURES OF FEAT., SEE REMARKS.

10. Stratigraphic Position: TOP OF FEATURE EXPOSED AT GRADED SURFACE.

11. Remarks: 1976 EXCAVATION RECORD CAST SATE AS DUG, HOW UNDERLYING AN ARTIFACT-BASE DEPOSIT AND POST-HOLE ARTEFACTS INDICATE A MILLER-AMERICAN DISPOSAL SITE OVERLYING AN MORE ANCESTRAL POST-HOLE FEATURE (RUSSIAN) - EAST AND WEST SIDES OF FEATURE SIMILAR IN THAT BOTH YIELDED QUANTITIES OF RECENT ARTIFACTS IN THESE RELIGIOUS DURING GRADING.

12. Photo: 8X10
13. Drawing: 8X10
14. Recorded by: [Signature]
15. Date: 05-01-79

**Note:** IN FACT REPRESENT THE WEST SIDE OF THE FEATURE. IN 1976, ONLY 1/2 OF EAST 1/2 OF FEATURE WAS DUG IN 1976. ARTIFACTS MAY BE FROM UNEXCAVATED FILL ABOVE SOUTH SIDE OF EASTERN 1/2 - TEST ASSOCIATION BY INTERESTING TO CROSS-RECORD GRADING ARTIFACT IN 1976/79 CAST MATERIAL.
NORTH END OF
FEATURE CUT LARGELY
INTO SOLID SANDSTONE

POST CAST
OUTLINE 8 X 10 FT.
YELLOW MOTTLED
POST HOLE FILL

DARK GREY-BROWN
LOAM - EXCAVATED 1976
- NOT RE-EXCAVATED IN
1970, PRIOR TO EXCAVATION
OF NEW FOUNDATION
TRENCHES

SHALLOW, IRREGULARLY SHAPED DEPRESSION FILLED WITH LOAM - PURPOSE UNKNOWN; FEW ARTIFACTS RECOVERED
1. Feature No. 5

2. Site No. Fort Ross

3. Excavation Unit

4. Definition: Post Hole and Cast near the center of the west end wall of Officials' quarters. The west edge of the feature was exposed by excavation of the east wall foundation trench

5. Location
   a. Horizontal
   b. Vertical: From Surface

6. Dimensions
   a. Maximum Length
   b. Maximum Width

7. Fill: Cast - dark loam, nails (some appear worn?), 2 fragments post hole fill - mixture of loam and subsoil - no other appearance - rock used as packing in bottom of post hole

8. Preservation: Iron - badly decomposed; few wood, charcoal, frags - no identifiable post remnants

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials):
   - Large sherds blue/white Chinese export porcelain in post hole fill - suggest pre-1830s construction. Also frag cream earthenware.
   - Light blue print earware in P.H. Fill - 2 pieces.
   - Hand made blue/white English earware in post cast

10. Stratigraphic Position: Appeared as intrusion into fill of trench - seems to have been dug from a surface at or above the existing graded surface - yellow subsoil visible in graded surface forming general outline of hole - see photo

11. Remarks: Seems to be located somewhat inside the line of the west wall as suggested by corner posts (119.121)

12. Photos:

13. Drawing:

14. Recorded by Larry Fitzgerald Date 8/14/76

File No. 545

DPR 253 (Rev. 9/73)
A' - GRADED SURFACE

DARK LOAM, ROCKS

SECTION

YELLOW SUBSOIL
SAND, SLIGHTLY GREY (0.7), AT BASE OF CAST
MIX, SUBSOIL & FORM, HARD PACKED

PLATE

35.13W
35.66N

FORT ROSS SHP
OFFICIALS QTS. RECONST.
"FEATURE 'S"
AUGUST 30, 1978

WEST FOUNDATION TRENCH

24" DEEP

0 - 10 CM
State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
ARCHEOLOGICAL FEATURE RECORD

File No. 545

1. Feature No. __________ 2. Site No. FORT ROSS 3. Excavating Unit OFFICIALS
4. Definition: SMALL POST HOLE, JUST TO NORTH OF THE SERIES OF LARGE POST HOLE FEATURES, FORMING THE NORTH FOUNDATION OF THE BUILDING. THIS APPEARS TO BE A SQUARE, 4' X 4', POST. RECORDED ONLY AT GRADED SURFACE; NOT EXAMINED FURTHER.

5. Location
a. Horizontal
b. Vertical: From Surface
From Datum

6. Dimensions
a. Maximum Length
b. Maximum Width

7. Fill

8. Preservation
WELL PRESERVED, NOT VISIBLE AT GRADED SURFACE

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials)

10. Stratigraphic Position

11. Remarks: PERHAPS THIS POST SERVED AS A SUPPORT FOR A SPOUT OR WALKWAY ALONG NORTH EDGE OF THE BUILDING. THE POSTS IN A SQUARE 4' X 4' FOUNDATION, MENTIONED ABOVE, HELD A SMALL POST HOLE (1973) RECORDED JUST NORTH OF FEATURE.

12. Photo(s) 13. Drawing(s) 14. Recorded by __________ 15. Date: __________
1. Feature No. ... U...
2. Site No. Fort Ross
3. Excavation Unit OFFICIAL OSB
4. Definition UNIDENTIFIED INTRUSION INITIALLY BELIEVED TO BE SMALL. NO HOLE, ALSO ASSOCIATED WERE SEVERAL CURVING LINES... OF DARK LOAM VISIBLE... TOP OF GRADED SURFACE. FEATURE. U TURNED OUT TO BE ONLY 0.20 CMS. DEEP; IF ANY ASSOCIATED SMALL INTRUSIONS MAY REPRESENT ROIDENT BURROWS.
5. Location
   a. Horizontal: JUST NORTH OF FEATURE
   b. Vertical: From Surface
6. Dimensions
   a. Maximum Length
   b. Maximum Width
7. Fill TYPICAL DARK GREY-BROWN LOAM
8. Preservation
9. Associations (Features, Specimen, Burials)
   NO ARTIFACTS EXCAVATED - SEVERAL SMALL RED WOODEN FRAGMENTS NOTED
10. Stratigraphic Position VISIBLE AT GRADED SURFACE. SEE RADIOPHOTOGRAPHS SHALLOW RE-GRADED INTRUSIONS INTO UNDERLYING SANDSTONE/SOIL.
11. Remarks PROBABLY ROIDENT BURROWS
12. Map... 13. Drawing... 14. Recorded by... 15. Date...
I. Feature No. V

2. Site No. Fort Ross

3. Excavation Unit 7.70N/25.87W

4. Definition: Redwood post, post cast and post hole fill. The post cast is a dark brown loam, while the post hole fill is predominately orange-yellow gravelly loam. There is some intermixing of the post cast and post hole fill.

5. Location
   a. Horizontal: 7.70N / 25.87W
   b. Vertical: From Surface 1.25 m, from Datum below the ground surface

6. Dimensions
   a. Maximum Length Posthole fill 1.25 m Direction NW-SE
   b. Maximum Width Posthole fill 0.50 m Direction N-S

7. Fill: Orange-yellow loam with rock and gravel

8. Preservation: Poor. The post and 2 red bricks are in very bad condition.

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials)
   a. Small bones in the fill of the posthole fill
   b. Several pieces of broken red bricks
   c. Several pieces of broken glass
   d. A red brick fragment with black iron oxide on a posthole fill

10. Stratigraphic Position: Top of feature, exposed at grade

11. Remarks: The line between the postcast and the post hole fill became very distinct with the deeper shoveling. A red posthole fill became clearly visible.

12. Photo:

13. Drawing:

14. Recorded by:

15. Date:
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Surface Map

Scale 1" : 20cm

dark brown soil similar to soil in post cast area

Key:
1. Base remnants of post
2. Rusty piece of metal
3. Porcelain frag
4. Green glass bottle frag
5. Amber bottle glass frag
6. Metal fitting

Dark soil similar to post cast

Excavation

Trench 95cm

Backhoe 95cm

N 25.87m
This plan shows features from graded surface to a floor of the post cast which is 30cm below the graded surface.
This plan shows feature between 25 and 58 cm below the graded cut.

All measurements are metric.

Key:
1. Rock
2. Brick
3. Post Cast
4. [x]

90 cm / 3 ft trench from center of post.

Scale:
0 - 20 cm

Fort Ross
Officials Quarters
Feature V
9/5/79
P. Hines
1. Feature No. | 2. Site No. | 3. Excavation Unit Officials QTB
5. Location
   a. Horizontal: AT EAST END OF LINE OF POST HOLES, REPRESENTING THE NORTH FOUNDATION...
   b. Vertical: From Surface... From Datum...
6. Dimensions
   a. Maximum Length... Direction...
   b. Maximum Width... Direction...
7. Fill CAST: TYPICAL DARK GREY BROWN DRY CAST... DIFFICULT TO DIFFERENTIATE FROM POST HOLE PACKING... SIMILAR TO FEATURE V. IN THIS RESPECT... HARD BAKED... GREY BROWN... DEPOSIT AT BASE OF POST CAST.
8. Preservation...
9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials)
   SOME IRON... GLASS... CERAMICS... IN POST... HOLE... CAST... AND/OR FILL... FEW ARTIFACTS... MOST OF FEATURE REMOVED... BY BACKhoe...
10. Stratigraphic Position
    ROCKS IN POST HOLE PACKING AROUND POST... CAST... VISIBLE SLIGHTLY BELOW NATURAL GROUND SURFACE... A SMALL PORTION OF A SHALLOWER INTRUSION VISIBLE IN TRENCH WALL JUST NORTH OF POST CAST... MAY REPRESENT SMALL POST HOLE RECORDED BY RICHARD?
11. Remarks
    POST... CAST... POST HOLE... FILL REMOVED...
12. Photo...
13. Drawing...
14. Recorded by P. DEVLIN...
15. Date 8-7-79
   L. FELTON 9-6-79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature No.</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Excavation Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>FORT. ROSS</td>
<td>OFFICIALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Definition: LARGE POST HOLE (OR, VERY LIKELY, Z-APOMINING POST HOLES) WITH THREE DISTINCT POST CASTS. THIS FEATURE WAS EXPOSED BY EXCAVATION OF FOUNDATION PIT FOR INTERPRETIVE BRICK-STONE LARGE QUANTITIES OF EARLY 20TH CENTURY ARTIFACTS, RECOVERED FROM UPPER PART OF CENTRAL, SHALLOWER POST CAST.

5. Location:
   a. Horizontal: BETWEEN FEATURES V AND Z, ALONG NORTH BUILDING LINE.
   b. Vertical: From Surface: ________ From Datum: ________

6. Dimensions:
   a. Maximum Length: ________ Direction: ________
   b. Maximum Width: ________ Direction: ________

7. Fill: ________

8. Preservation: ________

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials):
   LARGE NUMBERS OF EARLY 20TH CENTURY ARTIFACTS IN UPPER POSTION OF CENTER POST CAST (SEE PHOTOS). MATERIAL NOT SCREENED (REMOVED AUG 14/15). LOWER PART OF CAST POST CAST FILL REMOVED BY P. HINES AUS 12. SCREENING YIELDED ONLY 2 FRAGMENTS WINDOW GLASS.

10. Stratigraphic Position: STRATIGRAPHY OF TOP OF FEATURE OBSCURED BY BASE HOLE AT FIRST BELIEVED TO BE A TRASH PIT (SEE SLIDE __)

11. Remarks:
   REMAINS OF BIRD BRICHES (SIXty AND LIFEN S) AND A PIECE OF SAND STONE WITH BASE OF BRICKS RECOVERED. BRICKS WERE PROBABLY LOOSE IN ROOM THAT HAD FALLEN FROM FEATURE DURING BIRCHES. WORK CUT STONE MAY HAVE BEEN PACKED IN POST HOLE AROUND EASTERN POST CAST. COMPARISON GENERAL CONFIGURATION; PRESENCE OF RECENT ARTIFACTS.

12. No. 125 - __
13. Drawings: __
14. Recorded by: ____________ 15. Date: ____________

WITH FEATURE 125; COMPARE PRESENCE OF CUT STONE WITH FEATURE Z.
1. Feature No. Y
2. Site No. DFAQ751
3. Excavation Unit

4. Definition: Post hole cast by excavation of west end foundation trench. The post cast is visible in the west side wall of the trench, the fill around the cast contains large cobbles. (See cross section, 6482 E). East side of feature removed by backhoe.

5. Location:
   a. Horizontal: West of feature 121 (976 ft. N.H.)
   b. Vertical: From surface __________ From datum________

6. Dimensions:
   a. Maximum Length ______________ Direction
   b. Maximum Width ______________ Direction

7. Fill cast: post, gravel, loam, removed from trench. One post hole was not excavated. A number of rocks have fallen from base by Sept 5. These were removed to contain more loam than other similar features.

8. Preservation: Only small, low, posts noted. No post remaining.

9. Associations (Features, Specimens, Burials):
   Small list blue, blue head, 2. pipe, cream ware, glass, parfleches, buckets, the cream ware and blue were possibly in the lower to mid. of the post cast.


11. Remarks: Clear, flat, sometimes called "muscovy", used in windows at one time and still in some stoys, etc. There was Iowa clay.

12. Photo
13. Drawing
14. Recorded by
15. Date
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CROSS-SECTION, WEST TRENCH.
WALL.
FEATURE Y

VIEW OF WEST SIDEWALL OF FOUNDATION TRENCH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature No.</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Excavation Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Ft Ross</td>
<td>OFF, CATS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Definition

**LARGE POST HOLE AND POST CAST**
APPEARS RECTANGULAR, AT SURF. OF GRADED AREA, MORE IRREGULAR, BELOW (SEE DRAWING 2)
- 25 CM BELOW GRADED SURF.

5. Location
   a. Horizontal
   b. Vertical: From Surface 50-55 AMS. From Datum

6. Dimensions
   a. Maximum Length: 93 CM
   b. Maximum Width: 83 CM

7. Fill: CAST - DARK, LOOSE, LOAM KIBBS, SOME WOOD, REDWOOD.
   PICK, SOME WOOD, IN FILL, SOME SMOKED, REDWOOD.
   SOME LOAM, LOWER 30 CM, CONTAIN MANY SEDIMENTARY CALIBERS

8. Preservation

9. Association (Features, Specimens, Bundles)
   LARGE POST CAST, PICK (5 3/8" WIDE), AND
   CAST CAST OF CAST OF CAST.
   SOME SMOKED REDWOOD, SOME SMOKE, IN FILL, PICK,
   SOME SMOKED REDWOOD.

10. Stratigraphic Position
    **LOCATED AT TOP OF POST CAST, FILL BUT IS SPECIALLY SURROUNDED BY LOAM (SEE SLIDE)**

11. Remarks

12. Photo: 14
13. Drawing: 15
14. Recorded by: 16
15. Date: 17
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The Chapel of Peace is one of the outstanding wooden buildings in the United States. It was built on the site where the original Fort Laramie stood. The original fort was constructed of wood and sod in 1843 by the U.S. Army to protect travelers on the Oregon Trail. The fort served as a landmark for travelers for many years.

In its prominent position, the chapel stands as a testament to the historic significance of this site. The chapel was erected in 1884 near the old fort site, and its construction was funded by the United States government. The chapel's design reflects the Gothic Revival style of that time period, with its pointed arches and ribbed vaults. The materials used in its construction include local wood, stone, and brick, all carefully chosen to reflect the spiritual and cultural heritage of the region.

The chapel is a place of quiet reflection and reverence, where visitors can take a moment to appreciate the beauty of the architecture and the history it represents. It serves as a reminder of the importance of preserving our cultural and historical heritage for future generations. The chapel is an enduring symbol of the rich history and significance of this site, and it continues to be a cherished landmark for those who visit.
The chapel in the village of Ross -- the
Resurrection of Jesus (Voskresenskoe Khrisovo), known later of
the (Voskressenoe Khrisovo), a small country and Alexei Carasov,
with our Lady's Church (I 무 *) and a later one, are not unusual
inscription of Jesus (Voskresenskoe Khrisovo) with 1804,
the year 1804, in the bark of Jesus (Voskresenskoe Khrisovo) on Ross
encounter (1804) and.

It is not clear if there is a mention of the Chapel at Ross.

So far no more evidence has been found to indicate a sacred building at
art deck. However, it is recorded that a visit to the Chapel of the holy men of Ross. This is more than the third bast
Leontevskaya which is installed at the time of the first visit by a bishop.

The Nicholas returned to St. in 1804 his final record that chapel sta
have a visit in the year 1804, in the same way as the "Cathedral is a name."
"the Forhach or the chapel was installed in 1804. The official record of 1804 was not found for this
in the old records. The church is still standing in 1804.

As far as the letter of the 1804, the Village of Ross, the late 19th of the 19th, the
will be "vocation in 1804." (3)

The town gives a brief description of the location of the chapel and
the life of the village.

In the corner of the house, there is a small country and a small town.
The only mention of "Ross" is the name of a small town.
united with a small town, the name of the small town "Ross.

It is not clear if there is a mention of the Chapel at Ross.

(1) The village of Ross in 1804, in the bark of Jesus (Voskresenskoe Khrisovo) 1804.
(2)Nicholas Carasov, 1804.

(3) The village of Ross in 1804, in the bark of Jesus (Voskresenskoe Khrisovo) 1804.
The exterior measurements or dimensions of the Chapel as indicated by the original drawings of the roof in 1915, were a building consisting of no less than 12 feet in length and 10 feet in width. The roof was 6 feet and 6 inches above the ground. The roof was 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees. The walls were 12 feet high.

The interior dimensions of the Chapel, as indicated by the original drawings, were as follows: The length of the building was 12 feet, the width was 10 feet, and the height was 12 feet. The roof was 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees.

In 1903, Mrs. G. H. C. and Mrs. G. H. C. purchased the property for the purpose of building a chapel. The building was constructed of wood and was completed in 1905. The building was 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the height was 12 feet. The roof was 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees.

In 1906, the building was enlarged by the addition of a wing on the north side. The total length of the building became 45 feet, and the width remained 20 feet. The height was still 12 feet. The roof was extended 15 feet to the north, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees.

In 1907, the building was further enlarged by the addition of a tower on the west end. The total length of the building became 60 feet, and the width remained 20 feet. The height was still 12 feet. The roof was extended 20 feet to the west, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees.

The building was constructed of wood and was completed in 1907. The building was 60 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the height was 12 feet. The roof was 60 feet long and 20 feet wide, and the corners were cut at an angle of 45 degrees.
Fort Hays State University
North Campus
601 East Campus Drive
620-235-3798

To:  Mr. Robert P. Hatfield, Jr.
From:  John C. Loesch

Subject:  Recording of Archaeological Data

I believe a firm policy or procedure should be adopted concerning the recording of information gathered by archaeological excavations in any State Park. At present there is no assurance that when a dig has been completed that any significant information will return to the park or area in the way of a report. Therefore I urge that a policy be adopted and a procedure requiring that the leader of any archaeological dig, recordings of its purposes or location be required to send a daily log of progress with the basic information on the progress of the dig, or at least a weekly log. This should include such location charts and information that is recorded on the record. If interpreted from it, it will aid in making the final report or record also be available at the end of a year in the event a final report is not written. This log report should be left at the last or an office when the dig has been completed.

My reason for urging such a policy has been the result of several unfortunate experiences with archaeological digs in our State Parks. In each case the work was started with a great deal of enthusiasm, but in one case the leader of the dig left the site due to an accident at the end of the dig. He did not write a report and appeared to have taken notes with him. In the other case the leader of the dig told us he had been transferred to a different department and his notes were left in the office. By the time of the next dig, the site had been regraded and it was impossible to locate traces of the previous dig.

I have just had a two-man team on a week-long dig on the Mariscal building site trying to establish the foundations of the structure. I fear this was an exercise in futility for several reasons. (1) The ground water and changes in soil make it almost impossible to determine. (2) The State, in its attempt to put an open trench on the site to locate traces of the original building foundations found on the original building. (3) In 1971 or 72, a crew of archaeologists "dig" the site to locate the original walls. These were not found. Any notes were available are to be found in our park files only.

Yours truly,

John C. Loesch
Archivist
M closed are copies of my daily log, maps, and feature records. As yet, no formal report has been completed, as the project is not funded. I want there to be at least a copy of the raw data available in the field in lieu of a real report, as urged by McKenzie in 1975 (attached). We are trying to get funding approved to finish this work (see attached memo). Would you please forward the second copy of these records to Joe Hood?

RETURN TO

P.O. 2390, Sacramento 95811  916-322-8578
The Resources Agency of California

Memorandum

To: Mr. Neil C. Johannsen
   Deputy Director

From: Department of Parks and Recreation

Subject: Fort Ross Officials' Quarters
         Reconstruction Completion of
         Archeological Work

In August, it was found that grading and foundation work on the
Officials' Quarters site at Fort Ross SHP had exposed archeological
features not previously recorded during planning research conducted
on the site between 1970 and present. These were recorded and excavated,
and provided evidence upon which modifications of the building plan
and location were based. The Fort Ross archeological work is not
complete, however, even though construction is proceeding. The
following tasks still remain:

1. Excavation and recording of areas to be impacted by utility
   placement.

2. Processing (cleaning, cataloging, and recording) of
   the artifacts recovered.

3. Preparation of a final report summarizing all archeological
   research conducted to date, including the recent grading,
site and utilities work. Much of this report was compiled
under the Title II program, but it is now essential to
incorporate the new data and artifacts recovered, and reinterpret
the findings in light of the new architectural evidence.
This report can be an important planning tool. It should
be made available to the Interpretive Services Section for
assistance in designing exhibits and to the public as a
means of interpreting the reconstruction and new building
effort that has gone into its preparation.

The work on this project to date has been charged to the Cultural Heritage
Section's General Fund. We now plan to spend $15,000 from the Title II Bond.
Statewide History and Archeology Fund to finance the needed work to complete the reconstruction, and to prepare a report on the work as being a part of the planning process, and upon your approval, we shall proceed with the work.

James P. Tryner, Chief
Resource Preservation and Interpretation Division

APPROVED:

Neil C. Johannsen
Deputy Director