



# RECONSTRUCTING HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF AN ORPHANED COLLECTION

REPORT ON ARCHIVAL RESEARCH AND FEATURE SUMMARIES  
FOR THE MARKET STREET CHINATOWN ARCHAEOLOGY  
PROJECT

Megan S. Kane

with contributions by

Barbara L. Voss

MSCAP Technical Report 1  
Submitted in August 2011 to History San José, 1650 Senter Rd., San Jose, CA, 95112  
Prepared at the Historical Archaeology Laboratory, Stanford Archaeology Center  
Stanford University, Stanford CA 94305

# PREFACE

CONTRIBUTED BY BARBARA L. VOSS

---

“Reconstructing Historical and Archaeological Context of an Orphaned Collection” is the first Technical Report prepared by the Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project (MSCAP). This document’s release marks the completion of a concentrated research initiative – dubbed the “Context Project” – to reconstruct the historical and archaeological context of the Market Street Chinatown collection. Megan Kane developed and implemented the Context Project during the 2010-2011 academic year under my guidance as Principal Investigator of MSCAP.

The need for a systematic assessment of historical and archaeological context has been apparent since the beginning years of MSCAP. In the decades since the archaeological materials were excavated in 1985-1988, a substantial gap has developed between the original context of discovery and the artifacts’ current situation. The hurried schedule of the original archaeological excavations, which occurred in the midst of construction activity, and the many transfers of the collection that followed, exacerbated the problem. By the time the collection arrived at Stanford in 2002, connecting individual artifacts with their historical and archaeological context seemed, at times, insurmountable.

Simply reconstructing the archival record of the Market Street Chinatown collection involved the cooperation and goodwill of literally dozens of California archaeologists, especially the proprietors of Archaeological Resource Services (ARS), which conducted the original excavations. Ms. Kane’s thorough analysis of this complex archival record not only involved organizing and indexing the archival materials themselves, but synthesizing their contents to develop a historic and archaeological context for the collection. Most notably, Ms. Kane produced a “Feature Summary” for each of the 63 archaeological features represented in the collection, which are printed as Appendix D of this Technical Report. The Feature Summaries now allow us to quickly and accurately reference the archaeological and historical context of every single item in the archaeological collection. They provide an invaluable starting point for researchers and collection managers in their engagement with the collection.

The completion of this initiative is an important benchmark in research on the Market Street Chinatown archaeological collection. It also comes during preparation for celebration of another important benchmark in the ongoing efforts to commemorate and interpret the legacy of San Jose’s early Chinese residents: the upcoming 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Ng Shing Gung and the Chinese American Historical Museum on October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

The history of the Chinese American Historical Museum is deeply intertwined with the Market Street Chinatown collection. Concern about the 1985-1988 destruction of the archaeological remains of the Market Street Chinatown inspired descendants of San Jose's historic Chinatowns to form the Chinese Historical and Cultural Project (CHCP), a non-profit organization whose mission is to promote and preserve Chinese American and Chinese history and culture. The first major project undertaken by CHCP was to reconstruct the Ng Shing Gung at History Park. In 1991, CHCP donated the Ng Shing Gung to the City of San Jose. The lower floor of the building serves as the Chinese American Historical Museum, telling the stories of the early Chinese pioneers in Santa Clara Valley. The second floor showcases the original 1888 gold-gilded altar once housed in the original Ng Shing Gung.

As we prepare to celebrate the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Ng Shing Gung and the Chinese American Historical Museum, we are honored to be offering this Technical Report as a contribution to the ongoing project of commemorating the lives and contributions of Santa Clara County's first Overseas Chinese community. We gratefully acknowledge our ongoing partnership with Chinese Historical and Cultural Project, History San José, and Past Forward, Inc. in the Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project, and look forward to our continued work together on future research and public interpretation initiatives.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Section 1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
 <b>Section 2.0 Background of the MSCAP Collection .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 History of Block 1 of San Jose .....	5
2.2 History of Archaeological Excavations .....	9
2.3 ARS Project 85-31.....	10
2.4 ARS Project 86-36.....	12
2.5 ARS Project 88-91.....	14
2.6 ARS post-field analyses .....	15
2.7 Other post-field analyses conducted on the collection.....	16
2.8 Stanford work with the collection .....	18
 <b>Section 3.0 Project Archive Organization and Inventory.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Methods.....	21
3.2 Project Archive database .....	24
3.3 Directions for future research.....	28
 <b>Section 4.0 Feature Summaries .....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Methods.....	29
4.2 Information included in summaries.....	30
4.2.1 Feature description and assessment .....	30
4.2.2 Feature attributes .....	30
4.2.3 Available documentation, before 2002 .....	34
4.2.4 Excerpts from field and lab records and project reports .....	34
4.2.5 Stanford documentation.....	34
4.2.6 Summary of Stanford work on feature .....	34
4.2.7 Other relevant observations or information.....	35
4.2.8 Images of feature .....	35
4.3 How to use the Feature Summaries .....	35

**Section 5.0 Research Potential Assessment..... 37**

5.1 General Assessment..... 37

5.2 Assessment of Specific Features ..... 38

5.3 Conclusion..... 42

**References Cited ..... 44**

APPENDICES

**Appendix A. Maps .....A-1**

**Appendix B. Documents in the Project Archive .....B-1**

**Appendix C. Feature Attribute Tables ..... C-1**

**Appendix D. Feature Summaries ..... D-1**

## SECTION 1.0

### INTRODUCTION

---

At the time of its excavation in the 1980s, the Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project collection was heralded as one of the most important collections of Overseas Chinese material in the continental United States. At the height of its existence, the Market Street Chinatown, located on Block 1 of downtown San Jose, was the largest Chinese community anywhere in the U.S. outside of San Francisco. As such, the excavated materials from this site hold enormous research potential for illuminating the Chinese immigrant experience in 19<sup>th</sup> century California. Despite the obvious importance of the Market Street Chinatown collection, it did not initially fulfill the research potential assigned to it at the time. The original excavations were carried out in a hasty manner, in advance of redevelopment construction in downtown San Jose. Shortly after excavation, the collection was packed up and placed in storage for almost 20 years.

It was not until 2002, when the Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project (MSCAP) was formed, that the opportunity presented itself for serious analysis of the collection. The MSCAP is a collaborative project among the Stanford Archaeology Center, the Stanford University Department of Anthropology, History San José, Past Forward Inc., the Chinese Historical and Cultural Project, and the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose. Dr. Barbara Voss, Associate Professor of Anthropology, serves as Principal Investigator of this joint effort. Through this partnership Stanford researchers and students have endeavored to shed light on the Market Street Chinatown and its inhabitants. Given the history of the collection, it was assumed that this collection would have to be analyzed without information of the original excavation context. For the first several years of Stanford's participation in the project, that was exactly how research on the artifact collection progressed. The material remains were considered without reference to their context. Originally, the hope was that some research value could be found in this "orphaned collection," without needing to rely on contextual information.

However, as research on the MSCAP collection progressed and interest in the collection was reawakened, far more documentation turned up regarding the collection and its excavation than originally expected. MSCAP researchers visited Archaeological Resource Service's Petaluma offices several times during 2002-2005, where ARS principals William Roop and Katherine Flynn allowed us to photocopy or scan any documents associated with the Market Street Chinatown excavations. Roop and Flynn also recounted their recollections of the excavation to researchers, providing information not readily available in the documents themselves. History San José also searched the records they

had received from the City of San Jose and provided additional documents. Other materials were sent to Dr. Voss by colleagues who had participated in the excavations and laboratory analysis in the 1980s and 1990s. In total, some nine linear feet of documentation was gathered documenting the excavations and analysis of Block 1 in San Jose. These documents, together with all of the documentation generated during Stanford's analysis of the collection, are referred to as the Project Archive and are currently housed in Dr. Voss's lab in the Stanford Archaeology Center. The Project Archive will be transferred back to History San José, along with the artifact collection, upon completion of Stanford's analysis of the MSCAP collection. With the (re)discovery of the documents in the Project Archive, it became possible to consider the artifacts within their archaeological context, and not separate from it. However, before the artifacts could be reunited with their contextual information, a massive archival project was necessary to organize and to assess the documentation, a project we refer to as the "Context Project".

During the 2010-2011 academic year, Stanford research assistant Megan Kane, with guidance from Dr. Voss, undertook a concerted effort designed to organize and to summarize the archival collection. This report is the result. The analysis of the Project Archive occurred in four phases. The first phase involved sorting the documentation and developing categories for the documents based on the source of the document and the information contained in it. The documents were then filed to preserve the organization and the documents themselves. The second phase entailed scanning the documents and developing a Microsoft Access database to manage digital (PDF) versions of the documents as well as meta-information about the documents. The third phase, and perhaps the most important for future research, was to analyze the document archive to reconstruct archaeological and historical context. To this end, Feature Summaries were generated for each archaeological feature. These summaries are provided in Appendix D of this report. The Feature Summaries are designed to recapitulate the important information about a feature, its excavation, its artifact assemblage, and the research conducted on the feature to date. These Feature Summaries are designed to be the first source of contextual information for researchers working with the Market Street Chinatown collection, providing them with basic information about each feature, including which archival sources might provide more in-depth information. Together the archive database and the Feature Summaries will allow researchers to examine the artifact assemblage of the Market Street Chinatown in conjunction with its archaeological context. The fourth and final phase of the project was to assess the research potential of the MSCAP collection and the individual features within the collection and to begin to set priorities for future cataloging efforts and research.

This report is organized into five sections. Section 1, this section, is an introduction to the Context Project and the purpose of this report. Section 2 provides background for the MSCAP collection. It includes a history of the Market Street Chinatown and of Block 1 of San Jose. It also describes the excavations and research conducted by ARS and

other CRM teams on the block and on the collection excavated by ARS. Section 2 concludes with a description of the work done by Stanford University on and with the collection. Section 3 describes the Context Project and the work performed on the Project Archive, including the methods used for organizing and documenting the archive. Section 4 describes the Feature Summaries created as a result of the Context Project, including the information provided in each Feature Summary and the methods employed in creating them. The final section of this report, Section 5, is a research potential assessment of the collection based on the information garnered from the Feature Summaries. It evaluates the potential of the entire collection as well as that of individual features.

The citation practices utilized in this report are unusual and must be addressed upfront. Many of the works and documents referenced in this report are part of the Project Archive and have been assigned document numbers and entered into the database. A complete bibliography of these documents, organized by document number, is provided in Appendix B of this report. When such documents are first referenced in this report, the document number is provided in addition to the bibliographic citation so the reader may correlate the citation with the document in the Project Archive. While the document number is provided for all documents in the Project Archive that are referenced in this report, only the Project Reports and Stanford Project Reports are included in the Referenced Cited section of the report. This decision was made because unlike Field Records or Lab Records that are created as a result of the everyday activities of archaeological analysis, reports inherently synthesize information for the purpose of distribution.



## SECTION 2.0

### BACKGROUND OF THE MSCAP COLLECTION

---

The Market Street Chinatown archaeological collection is currently curated by History San José. Since 2002, it has been on loan to Dr. Voss's laboratory at the Stanford Archaeology Center, where the collection is used for research and teaching. The collection was excavated by a cultural resource management company called Archaeological Resource Service (ARS) between 1985 and 1988. These excavations took place as a part of the redevelopment of downtown San Jose as overseen by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose. The archaeological work did not take place constantly over this four year period; three distinct projects occurred as construction began in different areas of the site. These projects were referred to as ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36, and 88-91; each project will be described in greater detail below.

In 1987, initial laboratory analyses were conducted on the artifacts recovered from both ARS Projects 85-31 and 86-36. These analyses included cleaning and sorting the artifacts and the completion of an initial catalog of the collection. In 1991-1992, the collection was transferred back to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose and was put in storage at the Stockton-Julian Street Warehouse. In the 1990s, two firms – Archaeological Resource Management and Basin Research Associates, Inc. – were contracted by the City of San Jose and the San Jose Historical Museum to inventory the Market Street Chinatown collection along with other archaeological collections produced during the redevelopment projects of the mid 1980s (Voss 2003 [7006-STR]).

Interest in the Market Street Chinatown collection was re-awakened in 1999 when Mark Hylkema and Rebecca Allen, who were undertaking excavations of the Woolen Mills Chinatown site under sponsorship of the California Department of Transportation, attempted to relocate the Market Street Chinatown collection as a potential source of comparative data for analysis of the Woolen Mills Chinatown. Their efforts brought them into contact with Alida Bray at History San José, which had recently assumed responsibility for daily management of the City of San Jose's historic, archival, and archaeological collections, including those generated through the downtown redevelopment projects. Allen and Bray were able to locate the Market Street Chinatown materials within the City's larger collections at the municipal warehouse. In 2002, Allen and Bray asked Barbara Voss if Stanford University would like to "adopt" the collection for use in teaching and research. After several planning meetings, the Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project (MSCAP) was formed as a partnership of Stanford University, Past Forward, Inc., History San José, and Chinese Historical and Cultural Project. In fall of 2002, the artifact collection from ARS Project 85-31 was transferred to

Dr. Voss's laboratory Stanford University, and research on the collection began immediately. After a pilot study during the 2002-2003 academic year, it was determined that the collection had the potential for both research and public interpretive values. The remainder of the collection excavated from Block 1 of San Jose was transferred to Stanford in Fall 2003, and the MSCAP scope was expanded to include all of the materials excavated during ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36 and 88-91.

Like the artifact collection, the documentation for the Market Street Chinatown collection (including the excavation records, laboratory records, project reports and miscellaneous administrative documents) came to Stanford in multiple batches. A portion of the documentation was held by History San José and copies of the documents related to the ARS Project 85-31 were transferred to Stanford in fall of 2002. These documents included the reports by Glory Anne Laffey from 1993 (3011-RPT) and 1994 (3004-RPT), and handwritten artifact catalogs produced by ARS for ARS Projects 85-31 (2009-LAB), 86-36 (2010-LAB) and 88-91 (2011-LAB). Copies of additional ARS Project 85-31 documents were obtained from ARS during a visit by Stanford personnel to the ARS offices in 2003. The project documents for ARS Projects 86-36 and 88-91 came to Stanford the following year when these projects were added to the scope of MSCAP (Camp et al. 2004 [7018-STR]). Other materials were sent to Dr. Voss by various colleagues who had participated in the excavations and laboratory in the 1980s and 1990s.

When the project documentation arrived at Stanford, it came in much the same condition as the artifact collection, rather unorganized and only roughly inventoried. Liz Clevenger (Camp et al. 2004) began to organize and to inventory the documents related to the Market Street Chinatown collection in spring 2004. However, only a portion of the document collection was inventoried at this time. Thus, when the current Context Project began, a small portion of the documents were organized in file folders with accompanying attribute sheets describing the documents. But most of the documentation was found jumbled together in file boxes and file cabinets with no apparent order. In order that future researchers could better understand the context of the Market Street Chinatown collection, it was necessary to organize the documents, to create a detailed inventory of the existing records, and to evaluate the information contained in the documents.

## **2.1 History of Block 1 of San Jose**

Extensive archival research on the history of the Market Street Chinatown, on the history of Block 1, and on the early Chinese residents of San Jose was performed by Glory Anne Laffey in the 1970s and 1980s. This research resulted in several reports about the early Chinatowns in San Jose and about Block 1 (Laffey 1979 [6005-HST], 1993 and 1994). Her research on Block 1 achieved an extraordinary level of detail regarding the individual businesses and residents that occupied Block 1 from its earliest

beginnings up to its destruction in the 1960s. The history of Block 1 of San Jose provided here is very abbreviated and condensed in comparison. For additional or more specific information, please see Laffey's reports (Laffey 1979, 1993, and 1994), and Connie Young Yu's book *Chinatown, San Jose, USA* (1991). Unless otherwise noted, all information presented here is abstracted from two of Laffey's reports (1993 and 1994).

Block 1 of downtown San Jose was delimited in 1848 by Chester S. Lyman's city block survey (see Appendix A, Map A.2). This block, bounded by San Fernando Street, San Antonio Plaza, Market Street and South First Street, was originally divided into eight, equal sized lots. A ninth lot was added to Block 1 in 1853 when Market Plaza was redesigned.

Block 1, and all of the City of San Jose, is within the traditional territory of the Tamien Ohlone tribe of Native Californians (Milliken 1995). No prehistoric deposits were reported during archaeological research by either Theodoratus Cultural Research, Inc. or Archaeological Resource Service, and we have not yet identified any oral history or written accounts that discuss pre-colonial Tamien Ohlone use of the Block 1 vicinity.

Historical records indicate that Block 1 was continually occupied from the time of the Spanish colonial period to the present day. During the Spanish-colonial (1776-1821) and Mexican (1821-1848) periods, what would become Block 1 was part of the Pueblo de San José. Block 1 was immediately adjacent to Market Plaza, an area used for public markets and community gatherings. Beginning in the early 1780s, Block 1 was occupied by a series of adobe residences built by various colonial families. These families included that of prominent community member Antonio María Pico, and the colonial San Jose branch of the large Bernal family. Some of the adobe structures were quite elaborate and elegantly decorated, particularly that of Pico who was known for entertaining guests in his home (Field 1887). Documentary records also show that substantial numbers of Native Californians, not only Tamien Ohlone but also from other tribes in the region, lived and worked on Block 1 as laborers and as servants for colonial households during this time (Milliken 1995). Several adobe buildings came and went before 1848. In fact the only adobe dwellings remaining on Block 1 in 1848 when Lyman surveyed the block were the Pico adobe on Lot 1, Juan Bernal's adobe on Lots 3 and 6, and Zachariah Jones's adobe on Lot 7. An *acequia*, or drainage ditch, was also located on this block to serve the residences.

Following the 1848 discovery of gold in California, the population of San Jose virtually exploded. Portions of Block 1 were owned by various businessmen and landholders, some of whom leased out the land for business and residential use. Block 1 saw the construction of several hotels, designed to house the large numbers of miners passing through the city. The Eagle Hotel, owned by Augustin Châtellet, was located on Lot 3, but was short lived, only appearing in the 1852 and 1853 assessments. Châtellet was a prominent hotel owner in 1850s San Jose, and the Eagle Hotel was only one of his

holdings in the city. A second hotel, known first as the Half Moon Hotel and then as the Washington Inn, was owned by Zachariah Jones. This hotel was located in the old Alviso adobe, which was purchased by Jones in 1847. The hotel changed hands several times, but was recorded in an 1884 assessment.

Another building, located on Lot 6 and originally built as a hotel, became the first home of the California state legislature upon conferral of statehood, and was used for this purpose from 1849 to 1851. This building was built originally by Sainsevain and Rochon, two Frenchmen who intended it as a hotel. As the largest available structure in San Jose at the time, the unfinished building was purchased by a group of citizens, and converted into the state house building until 1851 when the state capital was moved from San Jose to Vallejo. After 1851 this building served as a community hall and then a courthouse, until it was destroyed by fire in 1853.

The Market Street Chinatown began to form in 1866, when three Chinese men leased areas of Block 1 and constructed improvements on the block. Shortly afterwards several of the members of the Chinese community leased areas of Block 1, constructed buildings, and started businesses in the area. This first Market Street Chinatown was located primarily in Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1, with some buildings in Lots 3 and 4. Roughly several hundred Chinese immigrants were housed in the first Market Street Chinatown by the end of 1869. The rest of Block 1 was occupied by families with Spanish surnames during this period. This first iteration of the Market Street Chinatown was destroyed by an accidental fire in 1870. The Chinese living on Block 1 relocated to several temporary camps in the city, including what would become known as the Vine Street Chinatown.

Almost immediately after the fire that destroyed the first Market Street Chinatown in 1870, Chinese tenants began rebuilding on Block 1. As early as late 1870, Chinese residents began moving back to Market Street from the Vine Street Chinatown. When Vine Street was destroyed by a flood in 1871, they returned to Block 1 in large numbers. Over time the second Market Street Chinatown grew from the site of the first Chinatown in Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1 to include Lots 3, 5, 6, 7 and what would eventually be named Lot 9. It was internally subdivided into the Brick Chinatown, located on Lots 1, 2, and parts of 9, and Wood Chinatown, located on Lots 3, 5, 6, and 7.

In 1870, a large portion of the block between the southeast corner of Market and San Fernando Streets and Lot 2 was leased to Ah Fook (also spelled Ung Fook), acting for Li Po Tai, and Louis Rothermel for 10 years. On this land, Li Po Tai and Ah Fook constructed four brick buildings, which came to be known as Brick Chinatown. Brick Chinatown expanded into Lot 2 over time. In 1884 construction began on the Ah Fook Building on Lot 2, which included a Chinese theater. The brick construction on Block 1 was designed to prevent a fire from destroying all of Chinatown a second time.

Wood Chinatown began to be constructed in 1875, when portions of Lots 5 and 6 were leased by Wy Kee & Co. A brick store and wooden tenements were built in this area, with other wooden buildings springing up afterwards. Also included in Wood Chinatown was the Bernal adobe, which survived the 1870 fire and became home to several Chinese-owned/run businesses.

Estimates for the population of the second Market Street Chinatown at its height vary a great deal. One official in an 1876 congressional committee estimated the population of the Chinatown to be 1300 to 1400 at the time. However, an 1880 census in San Jose only counted 116 households, including 294 men, 48 women, and 8 children, likely a gross underestimate of the true population. Estimates of the population made by modern researchers range from 2,000 to 3,000 at the height of the Market Street Chinatown (Roop 1988 [3002-RPT]).

One of the most important sources of information about the Market Street Chinatown is the 1884 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (see Appendix A, Map A.4). This map was created for insurance purposes at the roughly the height of the second Market Street Chinatown. It records the location of the buildings on Block 1 and some of the businesses and residences present in 1884. This map was a primary source used heavily by Laffey in her 1993 and 1994 reports, and in this report. The 1884 Sanborn map is vital to our understanding of the Market Street Chinatown at its greatest extent.

Shortly after the creation of the 1884 Sanborn map, the second Market Street Chinatown was destroyed by a fire in 1887. The fire was likely arson and was described as a fire “of suspicious origin” (Roop 1988: 3) at the time. All of the Chinese-occupied structures on Block 1 were destroyed, but the Dexter Livery and the businesses along South First Street, which were mostly owned by non-Chinese, were saved by the fire department. This came after years of harassment from the surrounding community and from the City Council of San Jose. Multiple ordinances were passed between 1870 and 1887 targeting the Chinese community, including bans on fireworks and kites, a ban on carrying baskets or bags suspended from poles on the shoulders, a ban on games of chance, and several others. In fact, after the 1870 fire in the first Chinatown, Block 1 was excluded from the fire limits in San Jose, meaning that the fire department was not responsible for fighting fires within the Chinatown on Block 1. This left the Chinese population to organize their own fire brigade. On the night of the 1887 fire, the water tank located in the center of the Market Street Chinatown was almost empty, the first time that it was not filled in the history of the community (*San Jose Mercury News*, 18 February 1986). This suggested that not only was an arson fire started within the Chinatown, but that any efforts of the Chinatown fire brigade to save the community were thwarted.

In the weeks after the fire, the city council and the citizens of San Jose voted to place the new city hall building in the plaza adjacent to Block 1, effectively displacing all of the

former residents of the Market Street Chinatown. The burned out areas of Block 1 were leveled and cleared, making way for new construction on the block. With the destruction of their community, the Chinese of San Jose were forced into temporary camps, one located along the Guadalupe River, and another on the opposite side of the Market Plaza near Guadalupe Street. Within weeks of the destruction of the Market Street Chinatown, the Chinese community was already making plans for two new Chinatowns, which would become known as the Woolen Mills Chinatown and Heintlerville.

In the years and decades after the destruction of the Market Street Chinatown, Block 1 saw many changes and was transformed by the growth of downtown businesses. The first federal post office in San Jose was built on the area once known as Brick Chinatown (Lot 1 and 2) in 1895. The Sunset Telephone company moved into a new building built on Lot 3 in 1899. Several businesses moved into the block between 1890 and the 1920s, including a three-story retail/apartment building that housed several business, a wood yard, and a nursery. The Dexter Livery (Lots 7 and 8), which had survived the 1887 fire, continued to operate until the 1920s when the building was converted into an automobile dealership and garage. Also in the 1920s the Rainbow Ballroom occupied the corner of Market and San Antonio Street.

After the 1920s, very little changed on Block 1 for 40 years. By the 1960s, downtown San Jose had declined and plans were made to redevelop large segments of San Jose, including Block 1. In 1968 the buildings on Block 1 were razed and the area was converted into a parking lot, which occupied the whole of Block 1 until construction began on the Fairmont Hotel in 1985 and on the Silicon Valley Financial Center in 1986.

## **2.2 History of Archaeological Excavations**

With the economic downturn in downtown San Jose in the mid-twentieth century and the availability of urban renewal funds, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose began a major urban renewal project of downtown San Jose in the 1980s. Block 1 was selected for the construction of two key complexes: the Fairmont Hotel and the Silicon Valley Financial Center. In 1985 and 1986, the San Jose Redevelopment Agency sponsored archaeological excavation on Block 1 during the early stages of these two major construction projects. A third round of excavations occurred in 1988 when a project to install a statue in the adjacent plaza uncovered additional archaeological material related to the occupations of Block 1. All three rounds of excavation were conducted by a cultural resource management company called Archaeological Resource Service (ARS). To this day the excavations are referred to by the internal project numbers assigned to them by ARS, ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36, and 88-91.

Prior to ARS's work, intensive historical research and archaeological sampling was undertaken on Block 1 by Theodoratus Cultural Research, Inc. (TCR) as a part of the Redevelopment Agency's assessment of the archaeological potential of the area. TCR conducted two phases of archaeological testing on Block 1, the first in June 1981 and the second in July of the same year. These excavations focused on evaluating the archaeological evidence of the Spanish colonial and Mexican periods of San Jose's history. No adobe architectural remnants were found, although TCR focused on the areas of the Bernal and Alviso adobes in their initial testing of Block 1. During the second round of excavations, a large deposit of cultural material, 15 feet in diameter and 15 inches thick, was found and designated Feature 1. The initial exploration of this feature recovered a wide variety of ceramics ranging from unglazed "Mission" ware to British whitewares and even Chinese or Asian porcelains, as well as glass, flint and a concentration of animal remains. In January 1983, the entirety of Feature 1 was excavated by TCR. Their analysis of Feature 1 concluded that this was most likely a trash or debris pit associated with a common kitchen, perhaps that of the Bernal and/or Alviso adobes (Johnson 1985 [3022-RPT]). This prior work on the site confirmed the archaeological potential of Block 1.

ARS's archaeological excavations of Block 1 in downtown San Jose were largely performed alongside the heavy equipment used to excavate the foundations of the buildings. The specific methodologies utilized by the ARS excavators will be discussed in more detail below, but their methods can best be described as "salvage archaeology." Working alongside the construction equipment, ARS employees monitored the activities of the construction crews, looking for evidence of archaeological deposits. When deposits were encountered, they were removed from the ground as quickly as possible and processed off-site at the ARS laboratory. Each archaeological deposit was assigned a feature number. Often a feature was completely excavated in under a day, allowing the construction crews to proceed with their work as rapidly as possible. This general methodology was employed during all three projects undertaken on Block 1, ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36, and 88-91. The specific details of each of these projects are discussed below.

### **2.3 ARS Project 85-31**

ARS Project 85-31 was the 31<sup>st</sup> project undertaken by ARS in 1985. This project was located on Block 1, primarily on Lots 5, 6, 7 and 8. ARS Project 85-31 was conducted due to the construction of the Fairmont Hotel in downtown San Jose. ARS excavations on this location began on 7/22/1985 and concluded on 11/22/1985. A total of 37 features were excavated as part of ARS Project 85-31, as well as a general surface survey of the excavation area. ARS recorded 9,806 catalog entries for the cultural material recovered from ARS Project 85-31.

ARS Project 85-31 was excavated as a salvage archaeology project. As the construction equipment excavated for the foundations of the hotel building, a team of archaeologists from ARS monitored the excavation work of the heavy equipment. Any artifacts found on the surface or scattered by construction equipment were collected by ARS personnel and assigned to Feature 85-31/0, general surface collections. These artifacts have effectively no provenience information. When cultural material was uncovered by the construction equipment, the archaeologists came in and excavated the deposit. The deposits of cultural materials were referred to as “features” by ARS, and assigned a consecutive feature number. In many cases the entire feature – matrix, artifacts and all – was excavated, bagged, and removed to the ARS offsite lab for screening and analysis. It should be noted that the discovery process utilized by ARS often resulted in partial, and sometimes complete destruction of the feature by the heavy construction equipment. This is noted in the Feature Summaries wherever possible. The speed at which ARS excavated the features, and the wholesale removal of the feature, resulted in a lack of stratigraphic excavation in many cases. When stratigraphic excavation did occur, it is noted and described in the Feature Summaries. The methods employed by ARS in the ARS Project 85-31 excavations were not recorded in great detail. However, their monitoring and excavation methods were thoroughly described in the ARS report for ARS Project 86-36 (Roop 1988), and it is deemed likely that these methods were similar to those employed during ARS Project 85-31.

A variety of features were excavated during ARS Project 85-31, including wood-lined trash pits, unlined trash pits and bone pits. In the field the features were each assigned an ethnic association (American, Chinese, Spanish or mixed), presumably based on the artifacts recovered from the feature, their origin, and their relative proportions in each feature. These designations are reported in the Feature Summaries for the sake of recording ARS’s original interpretations, but these “ethnic” designations should not be relied upon. Stanford’s analysis of artifacts indicates that in most cases, the ethnic descriptions do not reflect the actual content of the features.

One of the most important documents for ARS Project 85-31 is the 1993 ARS report, “Archaeological Features in the Fairmont Hotel Parcel, San Jose, California” by William Roop and Katherine Flynn (3001-RPT). This report was compiled eight years after the excavations from the field and laboratory notes kept by ARS personnel. This report is rudimentary in places, probably because of the length of time between the excavations and the authorship of the report, but it provides the only available synthesis of the features excavated.

Only a few types of primary documents exist for ARS Project 85-31. The first type is field Summary Observation Forms (1001-FLD). These were the only formal forms utilized on a daily basis in the field during ARS Project 85-31. Unfortunately, these forms are exceptionally rudimentary. Very little information was recorded regarding the process of excavation, and drawings are rarely included. Often these Summary Observation Forms



only record the discovery of a feature on a particular date, with little to no information about the feature itself or the process of excavation. The formal records that were maintained by ARS during this project appear to be more like internal business records rather than true excavation records. The forms employed by ARS during ARS Project 85-31 ask for the names of the excavators monitoring the site that day, how many hours they worked, and what the weather was like, leaving very little room for details about the excavations conducted and no room for sketches or maps of the excavated area. Often times these documents will only make a brief mention of the various features that were discovered and/or excavated on that day. Overall the formal documents kept during ARS Project 85-31 seem to have been designed more to keep track of who was working where on the site and for how long rather than to record the necessary details of the excavation process.

Far more information was typically recorded in the second category of primary documents from ARS Project 85-31, the field notes (document numbers 1016-FLD to 1045-FLD). As a general document category, field notes are the informal notes kept by the excavators throughout the project. In the case of ARS Project 85-31, nearly a full set of field notes have been preserved, and they record the features in far more detail than the Summary Observation Forms. The field notes also provide the only profile and sketch drawings for the ARS Project 85-31 features. Other field records produced by ARS Project 85-31 include records of the soil samples taken and the number of bags of materials removed from each feature, but these are embedded in the field notes for each feature.

## **2.4 ARS Project 86-36**

ARS Project 86-36 was the 36<sup>th</sup> project undertaken by ARS in 1986. The project area included Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and portions of Lot 9 of Block 1, the future site of the Silicon Valley Financial Center. ARS began excavating on 12/11/1986 and concluded their fieldwork on 4/1/1987. Twenty-one features were excavated in the field, with an additional four features assigned in the lab and one feature assigned in the field for general surface collections (Feature 86-36/0). ARS recorded 5,491 catalog entries from the materials excavated in the field.

One of the key documents for understanding the excavations conducted during ARS Project 86-36 is the 1988 report compiled by William Roop, "Monitoring and Recovery of Archaeological Features within the Silicon Valley Financial Center." This report summarizes each of the features individually, including the excavation methods, the artifacts recovered and some limited interpretations about the feature and its context. Unlike the ARS Project 85-31 report, which was compiled eight years after the excavations, the report for ARS Project 86-36 was written almost immediately after the completion of the laboratory processes. The result is a more detailed report that expands upon the field and lab records rather than just summarizing them.

The excavation methodology for ARS Project 86-36 was similar to that of ARS Project 85-31. Archaeological methods were better documented and stated in both the project agreement (4002-REC) and the project report (Roop 1988). The project was monitored by an archaeological technician at all times while grading, drilling or other excavation activities were carried out by the construction crews. The ARS Project 86-36 monitoring process can be summarized in the following steps: one, the area was directly watched during the excavation process, throughout the construction work day; two, when cultural deposits were encountered, all work was halted in the immediate vicinity of the find and the area inspected; three, a mitigation plan was developed and the affected construction equipment was redirected temporarily; and four, archaeologists undertook any necessary tasks to remove or to evaluate the deposit as rapidly as possible. A complete description of the monitoring process is provided in the Roop's report on ARS Project 86-36 (Roop 1988: 12-14).

The monitoring process transitioned to excavation when deposits of cultural material were uncovered by construction equipment. Once features of potential or interest were identified, they were flagged off with survey tape and stakes. Archaeological crews then undertook an excavation method referred to by ARS as "Rapid Recovery." This method was considered by ARS to be particularly successful with single component or contained deposits, such as trash pits or privy pits. The Rapid Recovery method defers all of the screening and processing of recovered materials from the field to the laboratory. According to ARS, this allowed the field personnel to concentrate on the recovery and recording steps of the excavation. The report for ARS Project 86-36 (Roop 1988) provides a detailed description of the excavation methods utilized by ARS during their excavations of ARS Project 86-36.

For Project 86-36, ARS expanded the number and quality of their forms used during excavation. Summary Observation Forms continued to be used for ARS Project 86-36 (1003-FLD), but were expanded to include space to record details of the excavation process and a sketch map of the excavation area. A new form, the Feature Form, was also added by ARS. Feature Forms were only completed for 11 of the 21 features identified in the field (1005-FLD to 1015-FLD), suggesting that their use was not completely integrated into the excavation. The completed Feature Forms provide a more detailed and formal description and assessment than was possible with the Summary Observation Form. Other forms used sporadically in the field during ARS Project 86-36 include a form to record the Soil Samples (1050-FLD) and a Photo Log (1051-FLD). Field Notes were also kept during the 86-36 excavations (see 1052-FLD to 1070-FLD). However, it appears that only a partial set of field notes was transmitted to the Stanford. As with the ARS Project 85-31 field notes, the ARS Project 86-36 field notes record information in a more free-form manner than the excavation forms and at times provide additional details about the feature not recorded in other forms.

In comparison with ARS Project 85-31, ARS Project 86-36 has more documentation recording the excavation process overall. It is unclear whether this is a function of the documentation that has survived or been transferred to the Stanford Project Archive, or whether it was the result of increased record-keeping in the first place. One thing that is clear is that documentation became more formalized between ARS Projects 85-31 and 86-36. ARS added additional forms and expanded the ones that already existed. Drawings were now required on the excavation forms rather than relegated to field notes. While the use of these new forms does not appear to be universal, at least an attempt was made to record the features in greater detail before they were destroyed.

## **2.5 ARS Project 88-91**

ARS Project 88-91 was the 91<sup>st</sup> project undertaken by ARS in 1988. It was located approximately 10 meters from the front steps of the San Jose Art Museum. This project consisted of a single feature, Feature 26, which was discovered when construction crews were excavating in preparation for a statue to be placed in the plaza. ARS's excavation of this feature began on 8/31/1988 and concluded on 9/12/1988. Some 1005 catalog entries were recorded for ARS Project 88-91. Based on the material recovered from this project, this feature was determined to be associated with the Market Street Chinatown occupation of Block 1, and hence has become a part of the Market Street Chinatown collection.

Unlike ARS Projects 85-31 and 86-36, ARS Project 88-91 was not a part of a large-scale monitoring project. The single feature was uncovered by construction equipment during the excavation of a trench dug to wire the new statue for electric lighting. Like the previous ARS excavations, following discovery the cultural material and matrix was recovered as quickly as possible and transferred to the lab for washing, sorting, and cataloging. However, those parts of the feature directly in the way of the excavations were removed by the ARS team. Approximately half of the total deposit was left unexcavated.

Very few documents from ARS Project 88-91 exist in the Project Archive. Whether this is because the documents were not transferred to Stanford, or because they did not survive, or because the documents were never produced in the first place, is unknown. As of 2011, the only field records for the ARS Project 88-91 are the Summary Observation Forms for 8/31/1988 and 9/12/1988 (1004-FLD). These Summary Observation Forms are the expanded version utilized in ARS Project 86-36, and include drawings. No other forms, field notes, or sketches could be found for ARS Project 88-91, nor did ARS produce a report on this project.

## 2.6 ARS post-field analyses

ARS completed a variety of post-field analyses on the materials excavated from Block 1. A first set of initial analyses were completed for all of the materials collected for ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36, and 88-91. More in-depth analyses were completed on individual segments of the collection, on certain features, and on some material categories. These analyses are described below, as well as the documents produced during the analyses.

After the deposits were removed during the ARS excavations, the post-field processing completed by ARS began almost immediately. Since the excavation process only consisted of removing the feature soils wholesale, artifacts and matrix together, the initial processing of the materials took place in the ARS lab located in Novato. The processing activities took place for ARS Project 85-31 from 9/22/1987 to 11/4/1987 (see Summary Observation Forms [2001-LAB] and Catalog [2009-LAB]); for ARS Project 86-36 from 3/9/1987 to 4/14/1987 ( see Summary Observation Forms [2002-LAB] and Catalog [2010-LAB]); and for ARS Project 88-91 from 9/26/1988 to 12/20/1988 (see Summary Observation Forms [2004-LAB] and Catalog [2011-LAB]).

The initial processing included wet screening the recovered matrix through a 1/16 or 1/32 inch screen, and separating any artifacts from the remaining soil and gravel. The ARS records indicate that 1/16 and/or 1/32 inch screens were used, but to date, only a few artifacts smaller than 1/2 inch have been observed in the MSCAP collection. The artifacts were then allowed to dry completely and were sorted by material category and counted in preparation for an inventory. The final stage consisted of cataloging the collection and labeling the specimens with their catalog number. It should be noted that not all classes of materials were cataloged by ARS during the initial artifact processing. Most ceramics, glass, and metal artifacts were cataloged by ARS, while most animal bone, shell, botanicals, soil samples, and constituent samples were bagged and boxed without cataloging.

These basic laboratory analyses were completed for ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36, and 88-91. The initial lab analyses were recorded on Summary Observation Forms, very similar to the version used in the field during ARS Project 85-31. These forms recorded the various activities performed in the lab each day and the features that were processed on those days. When problems or questions were encountered during the laboratory work, they were recorded as well. Additionally, a handwritten catalog of all the artifacts was produced for each project. In many cases these ARS catalogs are the only documents to record contextual or stratigraphic data associated with individual objects.

ARS also performed additional laboratory analyses on specific classes of material. Ceramics, glass and coinage were the primary materials that saw additional analysis. ARS used a Ceramic Artifact Analysis Form to record specific attributes about several

individual ceramic specimens from ARS Project 85-31 (2014-LAB) and ARS Project 86-36 (2015-LAB). Only a very small portion of the ceramic specimens were analyzed in this manner. It is not clear why some specimens were chosen for this analysis, or what ARS's goals may have been for these ceramic analyses. A very similar form was also used for the Glass Container Analysis, recording specific attributes about the individual glass specimens from ARS Project 88-91 (2018-LAB). Again it is unclear why some specimens were chosen for analysis over others, or whether ARS intended to carry out these analyses on all of the glass collected but was unable to complete the analysis. A list of the coins recovered during ARS Projects 85-31 and 86-36 was also made by ARS during the lab analysis, flagging these objects for conservation attention in the future (2017-LAB).

During their laboratory analysis of the artifact collections from Block 1, ARS only scratched the surface of the collection and its research potential. ARS called for "analysis and restoration" of the collection, prior to a large-scale public display (Roop 1988: 16). In 1991 ARS applied to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose for funding to continue their analysis of the Market Street Chinatown collection, but funding was denied.

## **2.7 Other post-field analyses conducted on the collection**

In 1991, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose hired Archaeological Resource Management (ARM) to assess the artifact collections excavated by ARS. ARM completed an inventory of all of the collections excavated by ARS during the redevelopment project in downtown San Jose. This included ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36 and 88-91, as well as 11 other projects located in San Jose. Their work is summarized in a report submitted to the Redevelopment Agency (ARM 1991 [3005-RPT]). The inventory performed by ARM was rudimentary at best. A box count was performed for each project to get an idea of the volume of the collection. Then every tenth box was examined in more detail, by removing and examining each object individually. Artifact types were noted (ceramics and their ware type, bottles and fragments, pipes, bone, etc.), as well as the origin of the materials (American, European or Chinese). Once this initial pass through the collection was completed, ARM described the contents of each box, for every project in the collection (2032-LAB). The form used for this description included a check list for the contents of the box (artifact types and their origin); a checklist for ceramic ware types present in the box; the presence of diagnostic artifacts; and the level of cleaning of the objects. This rough inventory of the ARS collections was concluded with an assessment of the research potential and historical significance of the various projects included within the collection. ARM emphasized the importance of the collections excavated from ARS Projects 85-31 and 86-36 (the Fairmont Hotel project and the Silicon Valley Financial Center project, respectively). The ARM inventory served to re-emphasize the significance of the Market Street Chinatown collection, but added very little to the knowledge of the project and the site.

In 1993 and 1994 the Redevelopment Agency contracted another CRM company, Basin Research Associates (Basin), to conduct further analyses on all of the ARS collections excavated during the redevelopment in San Jose, of which the Block 1 collection was only a small portion. The contracts/agreements between Basin and the Redevelopment Agency (4005-REC and 4006-REC) provide additional information regarding the scope of Basin's services.

In preparation for their analysis of the collection, Basin completed a detailed review of all of the documentation related to the ARS excavations. During this review Basin made a detailed list of questions for ARS regarding missing documentation and unclear or conflicting information (Basin 1993a [3032-RPT] and Basin 1993b [3032-RPT]). Basin's document review also prompted the authoring of several additional reports to be submitted to Basin as background for their assessment of the Block 1 collection, including Roop's report of the ARS Project 85-31 excavations (Roop and Flynn 1993), Laffey's "The Early Chinatowns of San Jose" (Laffey 1993) and Laffey's "Lot Histories for the Block 1 Chinatown San Jose, California" (Laffey 1994). Ultimately, this review of the documentation was a very beneficial step for future research, both for Basin and for all future researchers.

We have not been able to locate documents that provide details on the assessment performed by Basin on the artifact collection. What is clear is that Basin's work helped organize the artifact collection from Block 1, as well as the associated documentation.

A second analysis, of a very different nature, occurred at roughly the same time as Basin's inventory of the Market Street Chinatown. Glory Ann Laffey, the historian who conducted a great deal of archival research on Block 1 and on the 19<sup>th</sup> century Chinese immigrant population in San Jose, distributed "Lot Histories for the Block 1 Chinatown San Jose, California" in 1994 to Basin as part of their background research (Laffey 1994). Laffey brought together her prior archival research with the archaeological evidence of ARS to attempt to tie the features excavated on Block 1 with the various occupations of the block. She summarized the various occupations, buildings and their uses for each of the lots on Block 1. Then Laffey examined the archaeological features excavated by ARS on each lot and compared their location with the location of known buildings and the character of the features. This was the first attempt to link the archaeological data with specific historical periods and thus is invaluable to future researchers working with the Market Street Chinatown collection. In particular Laffey's "Lot Histories" was vital to creating the Feature Summaries contained in this report.

While Laffey's "Lot Histories" was an important step forward in the analysis of the Market Street Chinatown collection, there are methodological concerns that affect its usefulness. Laffey's spatial analysis relied primarily on a series of maps created by overlaying the location of ARS's features over the Sanborn maps from 1884, 1891 and 1929 (Laffey 1994: Fig. 5, 6 and 7; see Appendix A: Maps A.10, A.11 and A.12). She used

these maps to directly compare the location of the features against the location of the buildings that existed at various points in the history of Block 1, including during the second Market Street Chinatown. However, Laffey acknowledges that the coordinates of the features provided by ARS were not always reliable, as evidenced by several contradictions between ARS's conclusions and the relative location of buildings at the time. Thus these maps, and the resulting analysis, are not as straightforward as would seem. Another potential problem with Laffey's methodology is her acceptance of ARS's ethnic designations for the various features. As previously discussed, ARS's methodology for assigning these ethnic designations was flawed, and has been shown to be inconsistent with the actual contents of several features. Additionally, it appears that she equates these "ethnic" designations with time periods in her analysis, which may or not be a valid assumption. While these methodological issues mean that Laffey's interpretations should be read with care, her historical work is an extraordinarily important resource for ongoing research on the Market Street Chinatown collection.

## **2.8 Stanford work with the collection**

The research undertaken by Stanford personnel from 2002 to 2011 has been described in detail in the progress reports produced by the MSCAP (see Voss 2003 [7006-STR]; Camp et al. 2004 [7018-STR]; Voss et al. 2005 [7019-STR]; Voss and Williams 2006 [7022-STR]; Voss and Williams 2007 [7029-STR]; Voss and Kozakavich 2008 [7030-STR]; Voss 2011 [7034-STR]) and on the project website (<http://marketstreet.stanford.edu/>). The following is a brief summary of that research.

The primary focus of Stanford's research on the MSCAP collection to date has been cataloging the artifact collection. The process for cataloging the artifacts in the collection was developed with the aid of project partner Past Forward, Inc. so that the resulting artifact database would be compatible with that of other California archaeological sites, particularly with other Overseas Chinese sites. Cataloging the MSCAP collection is a laborious process requiring the cataloger to sort through the tightly-packed boxes housing a wide variety of artifacts, samples, residues, and notes, all in a wide range of conditions. The cataloging process employed by the MSCAP requires that most artifacts be cataloged individually, including all ceramics, glass, identifiable metal objects, etc. However, some classes of the material are cataloged in batches, such as faunal remains. As of the writing of this report, only approximately 27% of the collection by volume has been cataloged.

One of the most important results of the cataloging activities performed on the MSCAP collection is the research conducted by student catalogers. To date the majority of the research conducted by Stanford students has focused on individual classes or categories of artifacts. Such research is often inspired by the cataloging activities, as students explore and work with the collection. A wide variety of artifact types have been the subject of student research papers, including porcelain tableware, medicine bottles,

opium pipe tops, gaming tokens, drinking cups, stoneware storage vessels, toothbrushes, hair tonic bottles, ceramic dolls, and candlesticks. Most of these papers have gone beyond simple descriptions of the artifacts and spatial analyses, attempting to address wider issues within Overseas Chinese archaeology. Topics covered range from the challenges faced by Chinese immigrants navigating crowded living conditions to separation from home to racial stereotypes and intra-ethnic class hierarchies. These student research projects have served to demonstrate the great range of artifacts within the MSCAP collection, as well as the research potential of the collection as a whole. All of the research papers produced by Stanford students are included in the Project Archive (the 7000-STR series).

Alongside this artifact-specific research, other Stanford researchers began to analyze materials in the Project Archive to develop contextual data for broader interpretation of the collection. Dr. Voss's initial work with the Project Archive focused on general research to situate the Market Street Chinatown collection within the broader context of Overseas Chinese archaeology (Voss 2005 [7021-STR] and Voss and Allen 2008 [7031-STR]) and to develop models for understanding patterns of artifact disposal in the Market Street Chinatown (Voss 2008 [7032-STR]). Concurrently, Michaels (2003 [7006-STR]) began the process of reconnecting specific features with their historic context. Michaels layered excavation maps from ARS Project 85-31 onto historic maps showing the locations of buildings and facilities of the former Market Street Chinatown. Michaels noted that because the features' locations were not precisely recorded, the features could not be related to specific buildings, although they could be connected with general "zones" or "districts" within the community, such as a row of stores or a group of tenement buildings.

The following year, Clevenger (2004 [7017-STR]) undertook the first substantive attempt to systematically evaluate the research potential of a specific feature, Feature 85-31/20. Feature 85-31/20 was a wood-lined pit measuring 2.6 by 1.8 meters with historic cultural deposits extending about 0.9 meters below the modern asphalt and gravel parking lot surface. In order to evaluate the impact of rapid recovery excavation and "orphaning" on the collection, Clevenger compared the Feature 85-31/20 assemblage with three archaeological collections generated through controlled excavation of Overseas Chinese communities: Woolen Mills (Allen 2002), Los Angeles (Greenwood 1996), Riverside (Great Basin Foundation for Anthropological Research 1987). Clevenger found that the Feature 85-31/20 assemblage "demonstrates patterns of material culture and other archaeological remains that are very similar to other Chinese sites [...]" Although this seems like a relatively unexciting conclusion, it allows us to make some important inferences about the impact of the excavation and earlier processing on artifact recovery: namely that recovery practices, despite the problems that plagued excavation and processing, did not greatly alter or skew the general profile of the assemblage" (Clevenger 2004: 72-75).



Several research projects on the MSCAP collection are currently underway or are in the planning stages. Shea Henry, of the University of Idaho, is currently analyzing the faunal material from Feature 86-36/5 (Henry 2011 [7034-STR]). Ryan Kennedy, a doctoral student at the University of Indiana, is collaborating with the MSCAP to examine all of the faunal material from the collection for his doctoral dissertation. While this project is currently only in the planning stages, his participation in the project will certainly add volumes to our understanding of the faunal remains of the MSCAP collection. Another project set to begin in the Fall of 2011 will examine the soil samples taken by ARS during their excavations on Block 1. A portion of these soil samples will be sent off for testing in a pilot program designed to evaluate the potential for residue and pollen analysis of the soils from the Market Street Chinatown.

In addition to these planned research projects, general cataloging activities on the MSCAP collection are continuing, and in fact will intensify during the 2011-2012 academic year. After a pilot program in Spring 2011, a student internship program with the MSCAP collection is planned, a portion of which will be devoted to training undergraduate and graduate students in the practices of cataloging an archaeological collection. It is our hope that increasing student contact with the collection, through cataloging, will inspire more students to research the Market Street Chinatown and its collection.

## SECTION 3.0

### PROJECT ARCHIVE ORGANIZATION AND INVENTORY

The Context Project was undertaken in four stages, each with its own goal. The first stage was to organize the documents associated with the MSCAP collection. This organization was no small feat, given that the documents were a jumble of originals and copies from a variety of sources, some with accompanying metadata but most lacking any sort of context. The objective of this phase was merely to get a sense of the documentation available, the types of documents we have for the collection, the information that they provide, and how these documents can inform our understanding of the collection.

The second stage of the project was to inventory and to develop a cataloging system for the documents associated with the MSCAP. This involved the creation of a Microsoft Access database designed to manage the Project Archive, and a physical space in which to house the original documents themselves. These first two stages of the Context Project are described in this section (Section 3.0) of the report.

#### **3.1 Methods**

The first step for the archive project was to sort through all of the documents currently in Stanford's possession and to organize that information into categories. All of the documentation, including the documents initially processed by Liz Clevenger in 2004, was sorted by document type. At this point it was discovered that some of the documents were not associated with the Market Street Chinatown excavations, but were related to other ARS excavations during the redevelopment project in San Jose. These documents were returned to History San José and were not included in the Context Project. The documents were then sorted according to several document categories. These documentation categories were designed to classify documents according to their potential to contribute to future research as well as the type of information contained in them. The six categories of documents for the pre-Stanford documentation are Field Records, Lab Records, Project Reports, Project Records, Maps and Images, and Historical References. A further three categories were added for the post-2002 Stanford documentation, Stanford Project Reports, Stanford Project Data, and Stanford Maps and Images. Each of these document categories is described further below.

Once all of the documents were sorted according to category, a unique, two-part document number was assigned to each document. The document number is internal shorthand for referring to the documents of the MSCAP. The first part is a four digit

number corresponding to a number series assigned to each document category. The second part is a three letter code for the document category. For instance, the Summary Observation Forms from the ARS Project 86-36 field work were assigned document number 1003-FLD, which means that this document was the third document to be assigned a number in the Field Records series. This two part number can be extended to include a page number as well, in order to refer to individual pages within documents. For example 1003-FLD-086 refers to page 86 of document 1003-FLD, the Summary Observation Forms for the field from ARS Project 86-36.

The Field Records category of documents was assigned the 1000 series and the code FLD. This class includes all documents related to the original excavations conducted by ARS. The Field Records category includes a range of document subtypes, including formal excavation forms (Summary Observation Forms and Feature Forms), field notes, and field drawings.

Lab Records were assigned the 2000 series and the code LAB. The documents included in this category are the formal lab forms (Summary Observation Forms), various artifact analysis forms (ceramics, glass, and coins), artifact catalogs, inventories, and lab notes.

The Project Reports category was assigned the 3000 series and the code RPT. This category includes all reports related to the excavations on Block 1, prior to and including the ARS excavations. Reports are differentiated from other document types by their purpose of synthesizing and distributing information. Included in this category are archaeology reports, history reports, report manuscripts, and project proposals (only accepted proposals were included as Project Reports).

The Project Records category was assigned the 4000 series and the code REC. Project Records are all those documents related to the administration of archaeological investigations on Block 1. This includes legal documents (such as project agreements and contracts), proposals that were not accepted or approved, correspondence, museum display materials, newspaper articles, and financial documents. Most Project Record documents were each assigned an individual document number. However, the financial documents and miscellaneous business related notes were grouped by year and assigned a number as a group.

The Maps and Images category was created to include maps, drawings, and photographs. This class was assigned the 5000 series; however, the maps and images were not inventoried during 2010-2011 due to time constraints. All of the documents in this category have been set aside for inventory at a later date.

The Historical References category was assigned the 6000 series and the code HST. This category was designed to include reference materials included with the rest of the

documentation. Included in this category are newspaper articles, journal articles, and various artifact reference materials.

Separate document categories were created for the documents generated since 2002, when Stanford researchers began working with the collection. The first of the Stanford document categories is Stanford Reports, which was assigned the 7000 series and the code STR. This category includes all student papers, MA and honors theses, journal articles, and progress reports produced by Stanford's research since 2002. These documents were assigned numbers in chronological order.

The second Stanford document category is Stanford Project Data, which was assigned the 8000 series. The category was designed to house data produced by Stanford research on the MSCAP collection. This category was envisioned for data sets produced by researchers, such as spreadsheets of ceramic data or glass container attributes. As work progresses on the collection, the data produced can be inventoried within this category for quick reference by fellow researchers.

The final document category is Stanford Maps and Images, which was assigned the 9000 series. Like the Stanford Project Data category, the number series has been reserved, but not yet utilized. This category can be employed to inventory the photographs, maps, and images produced by Stanford research.

When all of the documents were sorted into the document categories and assigned document numbers, the original copies of the documents were filed in manila file folders and organized by document category and then by document number. The file folders were each labeled with the document number and a shortened version of the title. These files were placed in hanging folders, and organized by document category in a file cabinet in Dr. Voss's lab in the Stanford Archaeology Center. These files are available to all researchers working with the Market Street Chinatown collection.

Once the documents were organized and filed, a selection of the documents were scanned and saved as PDFs. All of the Field Records, Lab Records, Project Reports, and Stanford Reports were scanned into PDFs. The Project Records were not scanned, as they hold the lowest interest for archaeological research. These documents were scanned using the Fujitsu *fi-6130* batch scanner. The purpose of creating PDF versions of the documents was twofold. The first purpose was to produce a digital copy which could be referenced without disturbing the original copies of these documents. This was to preserve the original documents as best as possible according to archival practices. The second purpose was to create a digital copy of the documents so that they could be emailed to other researchers working away from the Stanford Archaeology Center.

At this point it is important to consider some unusual cases encountered during the organization of the Project Archive, and how they were handled. The first special case is that of duplicate copies of documents. Duplicate documents, in whole or in part, were assigned the same numbers as the original document and filed with the original.

The second unusual circumstance is that of document drafts. Drafts of documents, and sometimes multiple versions of a document at different stages, were quite common in the archive. When a draft was virtually identical to the final document, it was included with the final version as a partial duplicate. In several cases, a draft with hand-written notes and corrections was given its own separate number and labeled as a draft of the final document, because such drafts contain additional information not duplicated in the final document. Drafts are labeled distinctly from the final document, to prevent confusion.

### **3.2 Project Archive Database**

It was apparent early on in the archival project that some sort of database was needed to manage the Project Archive. As of June 2011, the Project Archive contains 282 documents; the size and complexity of the document assemblage necessitates some external organization. A database was designed in Microsoft Access to inventory the documents. The documents and their metadata have been entered into a digital format that can be manipulated and adapted as the needs of the collection and its researchers change. The current format of the database should allow the archive to grow and to develop along with the needs of the researchers who use it.

The database was designed with a separate table for each of the document categories. This allowed for different fields in each table designed to meet the traits of the various document types. The unique document number was used as the primary key in all of the tables in the database design. The basic information entered for each document was included in all of the tables: title, author(s), date, and publisher or distributing organization. Additionally a list of the features directly mentioned in the document was indexed to the documents, so documents can be sorted and searched by feature. A short summary and description of the documents was also included so researchers can get an idea of each document's contents.

Perhaps the most important feature of the document database is the inclusion of a PDF of the document within the database itself. A PDF version of most of the documents is embedded within the database as an attachment. This allows the researcher to open and to view the document directly from the database, without needing to exit MS Access or to reference the hard copies of the documents. For example, a researcher will be able to search for all Lab Records mentioning Feature 86-36/5, then open and view a PDF of each of the documents directly from the database. This should reduce the

amount of time spent searching for documents and relevant passages, and will reduce wear on the original documents.

Document Database : Database (Access 2007) - Microsoft Access

Table Tools: Home, External Data, Database Tools, Acronbat, Datasheet

Navigation Pane: Field Records

Document ID	Document Type	Document Summary	Project #	Author/Rec	Date	Title	Publisher/O	Location of Publication	Submitted to/Repository
1001-FLD	Field Record	Summary Observation Forms	85-31	Parsons, Jeff &	1985	Summary Observation Forms	Archaeological	Novato, CA	MSCAP archive
1002-FLD	Field Record	Table	85-31			Table: Archaeological Features of the Fa			
1003-FLD	Field Record	Summary Observation Forms	86-36	Parsons, Jeff, F	1986	Summary Observation Forms	Archaeological	Novato, CA	MSCAP archive
1004-FLD	Field Record	Summary Observation Forms	86-36, 88-91	Gosser, P. & Fly	1988	Summary Observation Forms	Archaeological	Novato, CA	MSCAP archive
1005-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1986	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/1	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1006-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/2	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1007-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/3	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1008-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/4	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1009-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/6	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1010-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/6A	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1011-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/7	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1012-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/8	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1013-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/17	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1014-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/20	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1015-FLD	Field Record	Feature Form	86-36	Parsons, Jeff	1987	Feature Form - Feature 86-36/21, 86-36	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1016-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/1	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1017-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/2	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1018-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/3	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1019-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/4	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1020-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/6	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1021-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/7	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1022-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/9	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1023-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/10	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1024-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/11	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1025-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/12	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1026-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/13	Archaeological		MSCAP archive
1027-FLD	Field Record	Field Notes	85-31		1985	Field Notes - Feature 85-31/14	Archaeological		MSCAP archive

Record: 1 of 78 | Unfiltered | Search

**Figure 3.1.** Screen shot of the MS Access Database for the Project Archive. This shows the table for Field Records.

Document ID	Title	Publisher/O	Location of F	Submitted to/Reposit	# of Pages	Features	Summary
3001-RPT	Archaeological Features in the Fairmo	Archaeological		Basin Research Associate	23 + figures and	85-31/0, 85-31/	This is the report compl
3002-RPT	Monitoring and Recovery of Archaeolo	Archaeological		Redevelopment Agency c	50 + figures and	86-36/0, 86-36/	This is the report compl
3003-RPT	Summary of Observations on Soils and			Archaeological Resource	9 + figures and		This is the final version
3004-RPT	Lot Histories for the Block 1 Chinatowr	Archives and A	San Jose, CA	Basin Research Associate	29 + figures and		This report, commonly r
3005-RPT	Assessment of the ARS Archaeological	Archaeological	San Jose, CA	Redevelopment Agency c	18		This report is an assessr
3006-RPT	Scope of Services Collections Prioritie	Redevelopmer	San Jose, CA		3		This report details the s
3007-RPT	Historical Resources Overview for the	Theodoratus Ci	Fair Oaks, CA	Redevelopment Agency,	111		This report by Theodora
3008-RPT	The Location of Cultural Resources on	Theodoratus Ci	Fair Oaks, CA		28 + Appendix		
3009-RPT	A summary of Previous Evaluations of	Archaeological	Novato, CA		9		This report is a summar
3010-RPT	San Jose's First Chinese	Archaeological	Petaluma, CA		2 + 1 map		This is a brief summary
3011-RPT	The Early Chinatowns of San Jose	Archives and A	San Jose, CA	Basin Research Associate	44		This is a report about th
3012-RPT	Outline for Historical Report on San Ar				4		This is an outline of the
3013-RPT	Maps and Descriptions of Earth Materi	Geo-Archaeolc	San Jose, CA	Archaeological Resource	9 + figures, lett		This is a manuscript of t
3014-RPT	Cabrillo College Archaeological Site Su	Cabrillo Colleg	Aptos, CA		4		Copies of the Archaeolc
3015-RPT	A summary of Previous Evaluations of	Archaeological	Novato, CA		9		This document is a man
3016-RPT	Comments, Queries, etc: Regarding 85	Basin Research		Archaeological Resource	7	85-31/1, 85-31/	This document details t
3017-RPT	Comments, Queries, etc: Regarding 88	Basin Research		Archaeological Resource	1	88-91/26	This document details t
3018-RPT	Archaeological Features in the Fairmo	Archaeological		Basin Research Associate	23	85-31/0, 85-31/	This is a working copy o
3019-RPT	Summary of Observations on Soils and	Geo-Archaeolc		Archaeological Resource	14		This is a working copy o
3020-RPT	An Outline for the Analysis of Artifact	Archaeological	Novato, CA	Redevelopment Agency	10		A proposal submitted to
3021-RPT	Major Misunderstandings of Current R				2		Summarizes the major r
3022-RPT	Report of Phase III Research for Block	Theodoratus Ci	Fair Oaks, CA	Redevelopment Agency,	86 + 9 appendix		Report of the excavatio
3023-RPT	Field Report for Monitoring Activities			Archaeological Resource	10		Hand-written field repc
3024-RPT	86-36 Feature List	Archaeological			12	86-36/1, 86-36/	The Project 86-36 featur
3025-RPT	86-36 Feature List - Draft with notes	Archaeological			10	86-36/1, 86-36/	A draft version of the Pr
3026-RPT	86-36 Feature List - Draft with notes	Archaeological			6	86-36/1, 86-36/	A draft version of the Pr
3027-RPT	86-36 Feature List - Draft	Archaeological			3	86-36/1, 86-36/	A draft version of the Pr

**Figure 3.2.** Screen shot of the MS Access database created for the Project Archive. This figure shows the table for Project Records, as well as the list of tables in the database.



### 3.3 Directions for Future Research

The work undertaken on the Context Project during the 2010-2011 academic year provides a foundation for future research on the MSCAP collection, both research on the artifact collection and the Project Archive. The Project Archive will need continued attention and regular updates as research on the collection continues. New papers and documents will need to be added to the archive as they are produced, and changes may need to be made to the database and the archive as researchers come to understand the collection and its context better. The majority of these activities fall under the heading of basic archive and database management.

The Maps and Images category of documents were not inventoried as part of the 2010-2011 Context Project. This is the case for both the pre-2002 Maps and Images (the 5000 series) and the Stanford Maps and Images (the 9000 series). Inventorying the maps and images will be a research project in and of itself. Numerous photographs and photographic negatives from the original excavations and laboratory processing conducted by ARS exist in the collection. Unfortunately, very few of these photographs contain any metadata regarding when, where or by whom they were taken. An in-depth research project involving the photographs themselves, the original photo logs from the excavations, and the excavation records is necessary before many of the photographs can be identified with a specific feature or even project year. While the Stanford photos and other images are generally better documented than those from before 2002, there is a lack of standardization. This is most likely the result of the many different researchers working with the collection and the individual methods that they employed. Because of this lack of standardization, the Stanford Maps and Images, like the pre-2002 Maps and Images, will require greater research and processing than was possible at this time.

## SECTION 4.0

### FEATURE SUMMARIES

---

The third stage of the Context Project was to summarize the information contained in the Project Archive and to present it in a format that would be useful for researchers on a variety of levels. The result of this effort is the Feature Summary created for each of the 63 features excavated by ARS on Block 1 (ARS Projects 85-31, 86-36 and 88-91). A description of the Feature Summary format and the methodology used to create them is provided in this section of this report (Section 4.0). A complete set of the Feature Summaries are included in Appendix D of this report.

The Feature Summaries were created to provide researchers working with the Market Street Chinatown collection with a point of entry into the Project Archive. Researchers at a variety of levels should be able to approach the Feature Summaries, find the basic information about each feature, then be directed to additional information in the Project Archive. The Feature Summaries were designed to give the researchers the basic information about each feature: its location, the context of its excavation, possible historic associations, and a summary of the previous research done on the feature and its artifacts. If more in-depth contextual information is needed, the Feature Summary also points the researcher to the original documents containing information about a specific feature.

#### 4.1 Methods

The Feature Summaries are based on a standardized template. This template was designed to present the information necessary for understanding the context of the feature, its excavation, and its artifact assemblage, as well as indicate the sources of all of this information. As such, the template includes sections for narrative summaries of the feature, a section for a bullet-point summary of specific feature attributes, and sections listing the documents in the Project Archive that provide this information about the feature. All of these sections will be discussed at length below.

Once the template for the Feature Summaries was developed, the process of collecting the information for each feature began. The process of researching and writing the Feature Summaries involved reviewing all of the documents in the Project Archive and recording information about each of the features mentioned in each document. Some of the most important documents included the Project Reports written by ARS (Roop and Flynn 1993 and Roop 1988), the Field Records from the original excavations (particularly the Summary Observation Forms, but also the Feature Forms and the field notes), Lab Records, and Laffey's 1994 "Lot Histories" report.

Often, different sources recorded contradictory information about a feature. Dealing with these contradictions was one of the more challenging aspects of writing the Feature Summaries. In most cases, information from both accounts was included, highlighting the contradiction. It is hoped that by highlighting these issues, future researchers will be aware of them and perhaps can even resolve some of them with continued study. In a few unusual cases, reviewing all of the documents related to a particular feature helped to resolve some of these initial contradictions. In such cases the evidence supporting the final interpretation of the documents is presented and summarized in the Feature Summary, allowing future researchers to follow the logic leading to the conclusion.

## **4.2 Information included in summaries**

Each of the sections included in the Feature Summaries is described here in detail, including the information included in each section, the sources of the information and any problems or issues encountered.

### **4.2.1 Feature description and assessment**

The “feature description and assessment” section summarizes the feature as a whole, from details of the excavation to artifact processing to possible interpretations of the feature. Efforts were made to include as much of the relevant information about each feature as possible in this section. A wide variety of documents were used to compile this description and assessment, the most important of which were the ARS excavation reports, any field records and field notes, and Laffey’s “Lot Histories”.

### **4.2.2 Feature attributes**

The “feature attributes” section of the Feature Summaries, and the feature attribute tables in this report (see Appendix C), was designed to provide a brief summary of the most important aspects of the features for quick comparison.

#### **4.2.2.1 Dates excavated**

The “dates excavated” field records the range of dates when ARS was actively excavating the feature. This would include the day of discovery to the final day of excavation, according to ARS’s records. This information was typically recorded in the Summary Observation Forms for the respective project years.

#### 4.2.2.2 Location

The location of the features is difficult to reconstruct. For ARS Project 85-31, the coordinates of each feature were recorded and are included in this field. It is unclear what these coordinates correspond to, and whether they refer to benchmarks generated by the City of San Jose, ARS or the construction company. The coordinates are referenced in ARS maps of the site (Appendix A, Maps A.9, A.10, A.11 and A.12). For ARS Project 86-36 and ARS Project 88-91, coordinates were not recorded by ARS, or at least could not be found in the documentation on file in the Project Archive. In this case, the lot number within Block 1 where the feature was located was given as the location. These lot numbers are those that were assigned in 1848 during the survey of San Jose by Lyman (Appendix A, Map A.2).

#### 4.2.2.3 Feature type

The “feature type” section describes the character of the feature, as described by ARS during their excavations. Several general categories are employed in this section, and each is described below. This category may describe several aspects of a feature, from its shape to its construction to its function. The following terms may be used in conjunction with each other or individually.

The first term relates to the manner of construction of the feature, whether it is **lined** or **unlined**. Some features were dug and then lined, showing a level of formality for their design and construction. Additionally, for those lined features, the material used in the construction of the lining is also recorded, i.e. brick-lined or wood-lined features. The distinction between lined and unlined is recorded in this category for almost all features, regardless of their function.

Other terms are used to describe the presumed function of the features in question, including trash pit, bone pit, oyster shell pit, cistern and *acequia*. **Trash pit** is the most general term, indicating that the feature was used for the disposal of mixed waste. Trash pits can be either lined or unlined. The lined pits are often interpreted as privies, repurposed as trash pits.

**Bone pit** and **oyster shell pit** are more specific, suggesting that these waste pits were designated for the disposal of a specific material category. These designations were made by ARS based on the predominance of one material class over all others, but the assemblage often includes other classes of the material, albeit in much small quantities.

A **cistern**, sometimes described as a circular feature, refers to a formal, lined feature with a circular cross-section. These features are always lined, top,

bottom and sides, and demonstrate careful construction. In some cases these features were repurposed as trash pits and contain deposits of mixed trash.

The classification of *acequia* is a Spanish term referring to a water ditch or storm drain. This is an unlined, shallow ditch extending through Block 1. The description as a storm drain implies a level of formality in construction, but the manner of construction is unknown.

The category of **wooden structure** is distinct from the various pits in that it refers to a building or dwelling of some sort, rather than a subterranean structure used for disposal of some sort. The construction of the wooden structure features is more formal than for many of the other features, and possibly refers to a primary context rather than a secondary context.

**Areal feature** is a term used by ARS to describe a single feature within Block 1, Feature 85-31/7. However, this term is never described or explained, and its meaning is unknown.

**General surface collections** refer to those artifacts collected from the surface of the excavation area by ARS during monitoring activities. These artifacts could not be assigned to a particular feature and so are lumped together as non-provenienced artifacts.

#### 4.2.2.4 Dimensions and estimated volume

The dimensions fields (“length,” “width” and “depth”) are the dimensions recorded and reported by ARS. These dimensions are all reported in meters. If they were originally recorded in feet or inches, they were converted to meters and rounded to the nearest centimeter. The “estimated volume” field is calculated from the reported dimensions. If a specific shape was used to describe the feature, the corresponding area and volume formulas were employed. When no specific shape was reported, a rectangular prism was assumed, and the simple “length X width X height” formula was employed. These fields were included to give researchers a rough idea of the relative size of the features and the density of the materials recovered from them. These dimension measurements and volume calculations are based on the field measurements reported by ARS. Researchers using these measurements should keep in mind that ARS did not systematically record feature dimensions and that we were not able to determine, in most cases, whether these measurements were taken before, during, or after excavation, or whether they represent maximum, minimum, or average dimensions for any particular feature.

#### 4.2.2.5 Stratigraphic excavation and number of strata

These two fields indicate whether stratigraphic levels were encountered/identified by the ARS excavators for the features, and how many levels were reported. Stratigraphic excavation was relatively rare during ARS's excavations on Block 1, so those features are which were stratigraphically excavated highlighted as indicators of research potential.

#### 4.2.2.6 Artifacts correlated with stratigraphic context

This field indicates whether the artifacts recovered from a stratigraphically excavated feature are associated with particular levels: in other words, whether the artifacts are actually correlated through clear documentation, according to the layer that they came from. This information was typically recorded in the handwritten catalog by ARS, and was later transferred to the Stanford artifact database. If artifacts were correlated with stratigraphic levels, this category was marked as "YES"; if artifacts were not, this category was marked "NO." For those features that were not excavated stratigraphically, this category was labeled "N/A". It should be noted that in several cases, only a portion of the artifacts recovered from a feature were associated with an excavation level, with the rest lacking any stratigraphic information. Such features were still categorized "YES", indicating that some artifacts were associated with stratigraphic contexts.

#### 4.2.2.7 Number of entries in ARS catalog

This field is a total count of the number of catalog entries that ARS reported in their handwritten catalog. The total number of specimens may vary as each catalog entry may contain multiple artifacts.

#### 4.2.2.8 Number of completed entries in Stanford catalog as of 3/2011

This field records the number of entries in the Stanford catalog database that have been processed and cataloged from the feature by Stanford personnel. This is a relative measure how much of a feature has been processed during the Stanford project. At times the number of completed entries in the Stanford catalog is greater than the total number of entries in the ARS catalog. This is due to several factors. For example, a group of ceramics sherds that were cataloged as a batch by ARS, but that clearly originated from separate vessels, would be assigned multiple catalog numbers by Stanford. Additionally, there are many items in the collection that were not cataloged by ARS, but which have been cataloged by Stanford.

#### **4.2.3 Available documentation, before 2002**

The “available documentation” section lists the documents that reference each feature. This includes all documents prior to 2002, before Stanford began working with the Market Street Chinatown collection. The document classes included in this section are the Field Records (1000-FLD series), the Lab Records (2000-LAB series), and the Project Reports (3000-RPT series). These document classes are those that most directly discuss the features, their excavation, and their artifact assemblage. For each document, the document number is provided, along with a brief title for the document.

#### **4.2.4 Excerpts from field and lab records and project reports**

The “excerpts” section of each Feature Summary includes particularly detailed or informative segments about the feature from the field records, lab records and/or project reports. The most common documents excerpted in this section are the final project reports for ARS Project 85-31 (3001-RPT) and ARS Project 86-36 (3002-RPT), and Laffey’s “Lot Histories” (3004-RPT). Such excerpts were included in the field summaries to allow researchers to reference directly the original wording of these important documents.

#### **4.2.5 Stanford documentation**

The “Stanford documentation” section lists those documents, generated by Stanford researchers and other researchers working with the collection since 2002, that directly discuss or mention each of the features. These documents include student papers, MA and honors theses, and journal articles. For each document, the document number, the category of the document, and the author’s last name are included.

#### **4.2.6 Summary of Stanford work on feature**

This section of the Feature Summaries endeavors to summarize the research work accomplished by Stanford researchers on the feature from 2002 to 2011. For the majority of the features, research by Stanford students and other researchers has focused on the analysis of individual objects from the features as a part of topical research papers. For such projects, the document number, the category of the document, the author’s last name and the category of objects studied are included in this section. For those features that have been the subject of more general or comparative research, a summary of this research is included in this section as well.

#### **4.2.7 Other relevant observations or information**

This section allows for the inclusion of any additional comments or information about the feature that may not have been included in any other section. In some cases, this includes ARS's account of disturbances to the feature that occurred after the completion of excavations. However, in most cases, this section is left blank as a place where future researchers can add their observations to the Feature Summaries.

#### **4.2.8 Images of feature**

The "images of feature" section includes images from Field Records and Project Reports. These images have been copied and pasted from PDF scans of the corresponding documents. Document and page numbers are included for all of the images, so they can be referenced to the original documents. The images included in this section are sketch maps of the original feature excavation, profiles of the excavated area, and any other drawings or sketches made in the field or lab. Prior to ARS Project 86-36, such drawings were not formally kept in the excavation records, but were found in Field Notes kept during the excavations. All the drawings for ARS Project 85-31 and the drawings for ARS Projects 86-36 and 88-91 from the Field Notes are only informal and not to scale. Maps of Block 1 are not included in this section of the Feature Summaries in this report. They are instead included in Appendix A of this report. The electronic versions of the Feature Summaries separate from this report (i.e. those attached to the document database) do include images of the maps.

### **4.3 How to use the Feature Summaries**

The Feature Summaries included in this report are meant to provide a point of entry into the document archive associated with the Market Street Chinatown collection. These documents should be one of the first steps for researchers looking to work with the collection. They provide a brief and succinct summary of all of the information available regarding a particular feature, everything from the context of the original excavations to possible interpretations of the feature to discussions of research potential. The Feature Summaries will most likely be the primary source of information for casual researchers exploring the collection, for students exploring a particular material type, and for researchers attempting to prioritize various contexts within the Market Street Chinatown collection. For such researchers, the Feature Summary and Assessment section, the Feature Attributes section, and the Summary of the Prior Stanford Work on the Feature will likely be the most relevant sections.

For those researchers seeking to delve into the documentation of a particular feature, the Feature Summaries can be a useful starting point. If questions arise that are unanswered by the Feature Summary or if additional information is required, each



Feature Summary includes a list of the documents that discuss the feature. A researcher can then refer to the original document(s) to attempt to answer those questions.

Perhaps the most important use of the Feature Summaries will be the role that they can play in setting priorities for future research. The Feature Summaries should help researchers assess whether excavation contexts were secure or disturbed, thereby initially allowing them to focus on cataloging and processing materials from the most secure contexts, then to focus on data from those secure contexts in more sophisticated research projects.

The Feature Summaries produced for this report will provide a foundation for all future research performed on the Market Street Chinatown collection. The greater understanding of the original context of the excavations brought through in-depth study of the documentation will allow us to ask more sophisticated questions of the collection.

## SECTION 5.0

### RESEARCH POTENTIAL ASSESSMENT

CONTRIBUTED BY BARBARA L. VOSS

---

The fourth and final stage of the Context Project was a systematic evaluation of the research potential of the collection as a whole and of each feature. Assessment of research potential was based on systematic review of the Feature Summaries (Section 4.0 and Appendix D).

#### 5.1 General Assessment

The overall finding of the Context Project is that the Market Street Chinatown collection has substantial research potential. There is great variability in the integrity and the research potential of specific features. Because of this, it was not easy to make broad generalizations. However, there are four trends that were apparent on review of the Feature Summaries.

First, as a group, the wood-lined trash pit features tended to be discovered at an earlier point during construction than unlined trash pits, undoubtedly because the wooden planks on the features' edges created a visible signature that was more readily detected by ARS archaeological monitors during construction activity. Soil stains indicating the presence of unlined pits were more subtle and were not detected as readily until artifacts began to appear as well. Consequently, as a group, the wood-lined features seem to be less damaged by construction activity than the unlined trash pit features. The artifact assemblages from the wood-lined features are therefore more likely to contain artifacts from the upper, most recent deposits. However, there are notable exceptions to this trend in both categories, so the impact of construction still needs to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

The second generalization concerns the degree of field documentation. As a group, features excavated as part of ARS Project 86-36 had the highest degree of field documentation. This can be attributed to several factors: the greater degree of advanced planning by ARS for that phase of the excavations; better coordination with construction crews that allowed more time for field recordation; and the completion of Feature Forms for 11 of the ARS Project 86-36 features. As a result, the Project Archive contains plan and profile drawings and stratigraphic descriptions for many of the features excavated during ARS Project 86-36, something that is usually absent for features excavated during ARS Projects 85-31 and 88-91.

Third, the summaries of Stanford research conducted during 2002-2011 indicates that even those features that were substantially impacted by construction or that lack adequate field documentation often contained artifacts that retained meaningful research potential when analyzed within the context of the entire site. For example, Stanford research on peck-marked vessels, gambling artifacts, opium paraphernalia and ritual objects all engaged productively with artifacts from such poorly documented features. Artifacts recovered from such features may be weak in feature-specific context, but within the context of the collection as a whole, they can contribute valuable information related to the distribution, form, and style of particular artifact classes.

Finally, the assessment of research potential had the unexpected result of foregrounding the impact of the 1887 fire on the Market Street Chinatown. When the Feature Summaries are reviewed as a group, it becomes apparent most of the features show evidence of “burn layers” or other fire-affected debris in their upper extent. Additionally, Feature 86-36/3 is an unusually large (15m x 15m) unlined trash pit that contained what appears to be burned demolition fill. Burned material in the features typically included burnt soil and fragments of burned wood and bricks intermixed with ash, and heat-affected ceramics, glass, and animal bone. It is possible that some burned materials might have been deposited as the result of smaller non-catastrophic fires that occurred at the Market Street Chinatown before 1887, but the widespread presence of burned debris and heat-affected soil in features throughout Block 1 is consistent with the magnitude of the 1887 fire.

## **5.2 Assessment of Specific Features**

The feature-by-feature assessment of research potential was more challenging than anticipated. The original expectation was that Feature Summaries would provide the information needed to develop criteria and rank each feature according to its research potential. Initially, we envisioned using a simple scale, such as ranking features on a scale of 1-5, or assessing each feature as having “high” “medium” or “low” research potential.

Developing and implementing ranking criteria proved to be quite difficult. For example, a given feature might have good documentation, but might have been substantially damaged by construction activities prior to excavation; while another feature might lack most field documentation altogether, but the artifacts retain correlation with stratigraphic context. Moreover, some features might have particular value because of unusual attributes or potential association with historic events. Additionally, as noted in the previous section, it turned out that artifacts from some features that we would have tended to rank as having extremely low research potential have actually figured prominently in research projects conducted by Stanford students during 2002-2011.

Finally, the variety of feature types made direct comparisons challenging: a trash pit has different archaeological research values than an architectural feature.

In the end, we grouped the sixty-six features by general type; and then, for trash pit features, identified several subtypes relevant to current research interests with the collection (Table 5.1). The basic feature types were cisterns (4), structures (2), *acequia* or drainage ditch (2), and trash pits (51). Four features, all from ARS Project 85-31 (85-31/5, 85-31/8, 85-31/32, and 85-31/37) were evaluated as “destroyed” because they were either demolished during construction or because the artifacts associated with that feature have not been relocated. An additional three assemblages (85-31/0, 86-36/0, and 86-36/28) were categorized as “unprovenienced” because they were used to refer to isolated artifacts collected by ARS during construction monitoring and bore hole drilling.

*Cisterns* (85-31/26, 85-31/33, and 86-36/25) were shafts, circular in cross-section, lined with brick or wood planks, which appear to have been cisterns or wells. All three features classified as cisterns consisted of a circular shaft that was set within a square or rectangular pit. Artifacts present in these features might represent accidental loss of objects dropped into the shaft, or trash deposits used to fill the shaft when it stopped being used as a well or cistern. From the available field records, Feature 85-31/33 appears to have been the best preserved prior to discovery and excavation.

The two features classified as *structures* (86-36/13 and 86-36/15) were described by ARS excavators as the remains of a floored room, possibly with a subsurface cellar or pit underneath the room. The stratigraphy of these two features is quite complex and needs further evaluation through artifact analysis.

Two features (85-31/27, 86-36/24) represent segments of an *acequia* or drainage ditch that originated during the Spanish-colonial period and may have been used until the 1887 fire. Artifacts recovered from these two features could have been deposited in the ditch at anytime during its uselife.

The largest group of features was *trash pits* (51). Trash pits included wood-lined pits (rectangular in cross-section) and unlined pits (rectangular, circular, or irregular in cross-section) that appear to have been intentionally formed for subsurface refuse disposal. Because our cataloging efforts and laboratory analyses have shown that features classified by ARS as “bone pits” frequently have non-bone artifacts, and those classified as “trash pits” often contain bone, we grouped bone pits with trash pits for the purposes of research potential analysis. Features classified by ARS as “trash lenses” were also included in this category. In general, lenses tended to be wider than they were deep, and pits tended to be deeper than they were wide, but there are several cases of features classified as “lenses” and “pits” whose reported measurements are

inconsistent with this definition. Because there was no clear morphological distinction, these features were thus grouped together for the purposes of research assessment.

Most of these trash pit features are classified as “pit – general” (25). These are the “typical” features represented by the Market Street Chinatown collection: they are either wood-lined or unlined; the feature was only moderately damaged by construction activity; the feature was excavated using ARS’s “rapid recovery” method; stratigraphy was either not recorded, or the association between artifacts and their stratigraphic context has been broken; and the documentation of field and laboratory processes is adequate but not complete.

An additional ten trash pits shared the general characteristics of the “pit – general” features but were categorized as “pit – early.” These pits were all located in parts of Block 1 that were covered by a livery or by brick or wooden structures by 1884. Laffey (1994) hypothesized that these trash pit features may represent deposits from the first decade (1866-1875) of the Market Street Chinatown, before construction had filled in that area of Block 1. If analysis of chronologically-sensitive artifacts confirms Laffey’s hypothesis, then these features will be particularly useful in diachronic comparisons of trash feature contents.

Eleven trash pits were categorized as “pit – stratigraphic.” This category includes both wood-lined and unlined pits that were excavated stratigraphically *and* for which at least some of the artifacts in the collection retain association with their stratigraphic context. Not coincidentally, these features also tend to have been the least damaged by construction activity and have the most documentation. These eleven features are the closest to providing a context for archaeological research, because stratigraphic differentiation allows finer-grained chronological control as well as both intra-feature as well as inter-feature comparative studies. We were tempted to rank these features as having the highest research potential. However, it became apparent that there was no consistent reason why some features were excavated stratigraphically, while others were not; it is not yet clear that whether stratigraphically-excavated features have a higher research value than other trash pits with similar levels of documentation.

There were only five pit features that we categorized as “pit – minimal” because the research potential of the pit had been severely compromised through damage by construction equipment, loss of some or most of the associated artifacts, or near lack of documentation. The artifacts associated with these features may still be useful for research on specific artifact types and in aggregate analyses of the Market Street Chinatown collection. Artifacts from these features may also be good candidates for use in public interpretation activities and museum displays.

**Table 5.1** Research Assessment of ARS Block 1 Features

Project	Feature	ARS Feature Type	Research Assessment
85-31	0	general surface collections	UNPROVENIENCED
85-31	1	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	2	pit, wood-lined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	3	trash pit, Spanish	PIT - EARLY
85-31	4	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	5	unclassified	DESTROYED
85-31	6	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	7	areal feature	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
85-31	8	bone pit, unlined	DESTROYED
85-31	9	bone pit, unlined	PIT - MINIMAL
85-31	10	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	11	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	12	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	13	trash pit, wood-lined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
85-31	14	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	15	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	16	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	17	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	18	pit, wood-lined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
85-31	19	bone pit, unlined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
85-31	20	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	21	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	22	pit, wood-lined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	23	trash pit, unlined	PIT - MINIMAL
85-31	24	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	25	trash pit, unlined	PIT - MINIMAL
85-31	26	circular feature, brick-lined	CISTERN/WELL
85-31	27	<i>acequia</i> (water ditch or storm drain)	ACEQUIA
85-31	28	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	29	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	30	circular feature, brick-lined	CISTERN/WELL
85-31	31	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	32	unclassified	DESTROYED
85-31	33	circular feature, brick-lined	CISTERN/WELL
85-31	34	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	35	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
85-31	36	bone pit, unlined	PIT - EARLY
85-31	37	trash pit, unlined	DESTROYED

Project	Feature	ARS Feature Type	Research Assessment
86-36	0	general surface collections	UNPROVENIENCED
86-36	1	oyster shell pit	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	2	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	3	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	4	trash pit, unlined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	5	pit, wood-lined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	6	trash pit, unlined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	6A	trash lens, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	7	cistern, wood-lined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	8	bone pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	9	trash pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	10	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	11	trash pit, unlined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	12	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	13	wooden structure	STRUCTURE
86-36	14	pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	15	wooden structure	STRUCTURE
86-36	16	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	17	trash pit, wood-lined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	18	pit, wood-lined	PIT - STRATIGRAPHIC
86-36	19	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	20	trash pit, lined	PIT - GENERAL
86-36	21	auger bores	UNPROVENIENCED
86-36	22	Not classified	PIT - MINIMAL
86-36	23	Not classified	PIT - MINIMAL
86-36	24	<i>acequia</i> (water ditch or storm drain)	ACEQUIA
86-36	25	cistern/well, wood-lined	CISTERN/WELL
88-91	26	trash pit, unlined	PIT - GENERAL

### 5.3 Conclusion

Overall, the MSCAP Context Project demonstrated that most of the Market Street Chinatown collection has strong research potential for intra-feature, intra-site, and inter-site archaeological analyses. In comparison with many orphaned collections, the artifacts in the Market Street Chinatown collection retain substantial integrity of context and association, due in great part to the original inventory method that embedded the location of discovery within most catalog numbers. Analysis of the Project Archive has allowed us to identify the biases introduced into the archaeological collection by the

methods used for excavation and post-excavation processing. In the process we also have identified several means through which continued artifact research may enable stronger reconstruction of context than is afforded by documentary analysis alone.

The Feature Summaries provide a direct source for future researchers to quickly reference the known context of each artifact in the collection. The data presented in the Feature Summaries has also revealed a set of clear priorities for the upcoming phases of research on the collection. Features categorized as “pit – stratigraphic” are the most likely to provide the fine-grained context that is highly prized in archaeological research, and thus are most suited for quantitative archaeological analyses and intra-feature diachronic comparative analyses. The presence of features potentially dating to the earliest decade of the Market Street Chinatown raise the possibility of intra-site research on cultural and economic changes across the community’s history.

Perhaps most importantly, the findings of this study indicate that substantial contextual data has been generated by the laboratory research conducted by Stanford students during 2002-2011. This suggests that continued artifact cataloging and analysis itself will continue to enhance the research potential of the collection.



## REFERENCES CITED

---

Allen, Rebecca, R. Scott Baxter, et al.

2002 Excavation of the Woolen Mills Chinatown (CA-SCL-807H), San Jose. Report prepared for California Department of Transportation, District 4, Oakland CA by Past Forward, Inc., Richmond, CA and EDAW, Inc., San Diego, CA.

Archaeological Resource Management

1991 Assessment of the ARS Archaeological Collection at the Stockton-Julian Street Warehouse. Report prepared for The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose Archaeological Collections Project by Archaeological Resource Management. Document # 3005-RPT.

Basin Research Associates

1993a Summary of ARS Fairmont Hotel Site Collection (ARS Project Number 85-31). Report prepared for The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose Archaeological Collections Project by Basin Research Associates. Document # 3031-RPT.

1993b Summary of ARS Silicon Valley Financial Center Collections (ARS Project Numbers 86-36 and 88-91). Report prepared for The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose Archaeological Collections Project by Basin Research Associates. Document # 3032-RPT.

Camp, Stacey, Liz Clevenger, Barbara L. Voss and Bryn Williams with Beverly Chang, Jun Frank, Cameron Matthews and Erica Simmons

2004 2003-2004 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project. Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology. Document # 7018-STR.

Clevenger, Elizabeth

2004 Reconstructing Context and Assessing Research Potential: Feature 20 from the San Jose Market Street Chinatown. M.A. dissertation, Department of Cultural and Social Anthropology, Stanford University. Document # 7017-STR.

Field, M.H.

1887 Grandma Bascom's Story of San Jose in '49. Overland Monthly XIV: 543-551.

Great Basin Foundation for Anthropological Research

1987 Wong Ho Leun: An American Chinatown (Volume One: History; Volume Two: Archaeology). San Diego: The Great Basin Foundation.

Greenwood, Roberta S.

1996 Down by the Station: Los Angeles Chinatown, 1880-1993. Los Angeles, Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Harry Farrell: Reflections

1986 San Jose Mercury News, February 18.

Henry, C. Shea

2011 Section 6.0 Overseas Chinese Foodways of the Western United States: From California to Idaho. In Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project: 2008-2011 Progress Report. Barbara L. Voss, ed. Pp. 6-1 to 6-7. Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center. Document # 7034-STR.

Johnson, Ann Hagerman

1985 Report of Phase III Research for Block 1, San Antonio Plaza, San Jose. For The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose. Theodoratus Cultural Research, Inc. Document # 3022-RPT.

Laffey, Glory Anne

1979 The Chinatowns of San Jose. MS on file, San Jose Historical Museum and E-764/S-5289, Northwest Information Center, California Archaeological Site Inventory, Rohnert Park. Document # 6005-HST.

1993 The Early Chinatowns of San Jose. Report prepared for Basin Research Associates, Inc. as part of The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose Archaeological Collections Project by Archives and Architecture. Document # 3011-RPT.

1994 Lot Histories for the Block 1 Chinatown San Jose, California. Report prepared for Basin Research Associates, Inc. as part of The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose Archaeological Collections Project by Archives and Architecture. Document # 3004-RPT.

Michaels, Gina

2003 Section 3.0 History of Prior Research on the Collection. In 2002-2003 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project. Barbara L. Voss, ed. Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology. Document # 7006-STR.

Milliken, R.

1995 A Time of Little Choice. Menlo Park: Ballena Press.

Roop, William with Dennis Gosser and Mary Ann Nardo

1988 Monitoring and Recovery of Archaeological Features within the Silicon Valley Financial Center Parcel [ARS Project 86-36]. For The Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose. Archaeological Resource Service. Document # 3002-RPT.

Roop, William and Katherine Flynn

1993 Archaeological Features in the Fairmont Hotel Parcel, San Jose, California [ARS Project 85-31]. For Basin Research Associates. Archaeological Resource Service. Document # 3001-RPT.

Voss, Barbara L.

2005 The Archaeology of Overseas Chinese Communities. In World Archaeology 37(3): 424-439. Document # 7021-STR.

2008 Between the Household and the World-System: Social Collectivity and Community Agency in Overseas Chinese Archaeology. In Historical Archaeology 42(3): 37-52. Document # 7032-STR.

Voss, Barbara L., with Rebecca Allen, R. Scott Baxter, R. Ezra Erb, Lynsie Ishimaru, Gina Michaels, Stephanie Selover and Bryn Williams

2003 2002-2003 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology.  
Document # 7006-STR.

Voss, Barbara L. with C. Shea Henry, Megan Kane, Adrian Myers and Guido Pezzarossi

2011 Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project: 2008-2011 Progress Report.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center. Document # 7034-STR.

Voss, Barbara L. and Rebecca Allen

2008 Overseas Chinese Archaeology: Historical Foundations, Current Reflections, and  
New Directions. In *Historical Archaeology* 42(3): 5-28. Document # 7031-STR.

Voss, Barbara L., Stacey Camp and Erica Simmons

2005 2004-2005 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology.  
Document # 7019-STR.

Voss, Barbara L. and Stacy Kozakavich

2008 2007-2008 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology.  
Document # 7030-STR.

Voss, Barbara L. and Bryn Williams

2006 2005-2006 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology.  
Document # 7022-STR.

2007 2006-2007 Progress Report: Market Street Chinatown Archaeological Project.  
Stanford: Stanford Archaeology Center and Cultural and Social Anthropology.  
Document # 7029-STR.

Yu, Connie Young

1991 Chinatown, San Jose, USA. San Jose: San Jose Historical Museum Association.