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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

At the request of Lowney Architecture, FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS) conducted a Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment at the proposed project area located within the City of San José, Santa Clara County, California Exhibit 1). The proposed project consists of a 10-story, 54-unit apartment building with 1,856 square feet of ground-floor retail and a rooftop terrace situated on a 0.10-acre parcel located at 565 Lorraine Avenue.

The purpose of this assessment is to identify the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the project area, and, if impacted by the proposed development, propose recommendations for mitigation. Completion of this investigation fulfills the requirements associated with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This report follows the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) procedures for cultural resource surveys and the OHP’s Archaeological Resource Management Report (ARMR) format for archaeological reports.

On May 28, 2013, FCS Professional Archaeologist, Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA, conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park, California for the project area and a 0.50-mile radius beyond the project boundaries. Results from the NWIC indicate that 36 resources have been recorded within 0.5-mile of the project area (see Table 1). In addition, 52 area-specific survey reports are on file with the NWIC for the search radius (see Table 2). None assessed the project area location, suggesting the project area has not been previously surveyed for cultural resources.

On June 20, 2013, FCS sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites are listed on its Sacred Lands File for the project area. The response from the NAHC was received on July 8, 2013 and indicated that the record search of the sacred land file failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. A list of 12 Native American tribal members who may have additional knowledge of the project area was included with the results. These tribal members were sent letters on July 9, 2013 asking for any additional information they might have concerning the project area. As of this date, no response has been received from any of the 12 tribal members.

FCS Professional Archaeologist Carrie D. Wills surveyed the project area on June 12, 2013. The project area is flat and predominantly covered with two residences, landscape elements, and sidewalks. One area of open ground was surveyed; no prehistoric or historic resources were discovered. The two residences were assessed for historic significance and considered not to meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CR) or the Local Register for the City of San José. They were recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary forms, as required.

Because no prehistoric or historic resources have been previously recorded within or adjacent to the project area and none were discovered during the course of the field survey, no further archaeological work is deemed necessary. Procedures for inadvertent discoveries are included in Section 4.
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Project Location

The project location is 565 Lorraine Avenue in the Delmas Park neighborhood of San José, California. The Montgomery 7 Project is approximately 0.4 acre in area (Exhibit 1). The project site is bounded by Montgomery Street (west), Park Avenue (north), commercial and residential uses (east), and Lorraine Avenue (south). Vehicular access is taken via driveways from Lorraine Avenue. Los Gatos Creek crosses under the intersection of Montgomery Street/Park Avenue in a culvert immediately north of the project site.

The project area is depicted on the San Jose West California, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map, in Township 7 South, Range 1 East, Section 18 (Exhibit 2). The project site is bounded by Montgomery Street (west), Park Avenue (north), commercial and residential uses (east), and Lorraine Avenue (south) (Exhibit 3).

1.2 - Project Description

The proposed project involves the removal of existing site structures and features, and the construction of a new multi-unit residential building. The 0.1-Acre project would establish a 10-story residential building with ground floor commercial space and a rooftop terrace. The project would construct 54 studio apartment units for a density of 540 units per acre. Floors 2 through 10 will accommodate six studio units with an average size of 498 square feet. Shared space on the ground floor would incorporate 1,856 square feet of retail, with the remainder used for office space, mechanical use, and a lobby.

1.3 - Assessment Team

FCS Professional Archaeologist Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA conducted the pedestrian survey and authored this report. Professional qualifications for Ms. Wills can be found in Appendix C.
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SECTION 2: CULTURAL SETTING

Following is a brief overview of the prehistory, ethnography, and historic background, providing a context in which to understand the background and relevance of sites found in the general project area. This section is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the current resources available; rather, it serves as a general overview. Further details can be found in ethnographic studies, mission records, and major published sources.

2.1 - Prehistoric Background

Early archaeological investigations in central California were conducted at sites located in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region. The first published account documents investigations in the Lodi and Stockton area (Schenck and Dawson 1929). The initial archaeological reports typically contained descriptive narratives, with more systematic approaches sponsored by Sacramento Junior College in the 1930s. At the same time, University of California at Berkeley excavated several sites in the lower Sacramento Valley and Delta region, which resulted in recognizing archaeological site patterns based on variations of inter-site assemblages. Research during the 1930s identified temporal periods in central California prehistory and provided an initial chronological sequence (Lillard and Purves 1936; Lillard, et al. 1939). In 1939, Lillard noted that each cultural period led directly to the next and that influences spread from the Delta region to other regions in central California (Lillard, et al. 1939). In the late 1940s and early 1950s, Beardsley documented similarities in artifacts among sites in the San Francisco Bay region and the Delta and refined his findings into a cultural model that ultimately became known as the Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS). This system proposed a uniform, linear sequence of cultural succession (Beardsley 1948 and 1954). The CCTS system was challenged by Gerow, whose work looked at radiocarbon dating to show that Early and Middle Horizon sites were not subsequent developments but, at least partially, contemporaneous (1954; 1974; Gerow with Force 1968).

To address some of the flaws in the CCTS system, Fredrickson (1973) introduced a revision that incorporated a system of spatial and cultural integrative units. Fredrickson separated cultural, temporal, and spatial units from each other and assigned them to six chronological periods: Paleo-Indian (10000 to 6000 B.C.); Lower, Middle and Upper Archaic (6000 B.C. to A.D. 500), and Emergent (Upper and Lower, A.D. 500 to 1800). The suggested temporal ranges are similar to earlier horizons, which are broad cultural units that can be arranged in a temporal sequence (Moratto 1984). In addition, Fredrickson defined several patterns—a general way of life shared within a specific geographical region. These patterns include:

- Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.)
- Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500)
- Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to historic period)

Brief descriptions of these temporal ranges and their unique characteristics follow.
2.1.1 - Windmiller Pattern or Early Horizon (3000 to 1000 B.C.)

Characterized by the Windmiller Pattern, the Early Horizon was centered in the Cosumnes district of the Delta and emphasized hunting rather than gathering, as evidenced by the abundance of projectile points in relation to plant processing tools. Additionally, atlatl, dart, and spear technologies typically included stemmed projectile points of slate and chert but minimal obsidian. The large variety of projectile point types and faunal remains suggests exploitation of numerous types of terrestrial and aquatic species (Bennyhoff 1950; Ragir 1972). Burials occurred in cemeteries and intra-village graves. These burials typically were ventrally extended, although some dorsal extensions are known with a westerly orientation and a high number of grave goods. Trade networks focused on acquisition of ornamental and ceremonial objects in finished form rather than on raw material. The presence of artifacts made of exotic materials such as quartz, obsidian, and shell indicates an extensive trade network that may represent the arrival of Utian populations into central California. Also indicative of this period are rectangular Haliotis and Olivella shell beads, and charmstones that usually were perforated.

2.1.2 - Berkeley Pattern or Middle Horizon (1000 B.C. to A.D. 500)

The Middle Horizon is characterized by the Berkeley Pattern, which displays considerable changes from the Early Horizon. This period exhibited a strong milling technology represented by minimally shaped cobble mortars and pestles, although metates and manos were still used. Dart and atlatl technologies during this period were characterized by non-stemmed projectile points made primarily of obsidian. Fredrickson (1973) suggests that the Berkeley Pattern marked the eastward expansion of Miwok groups from the San Francisco Bay Area. Compared with the Early Horizon, there is a higher proportion of grinding implements at this time, implying an emphasis on plant resources rather than on hunting. Typical burials occurred within the village with flexed positions, variable cardinal orientation, and some cremations. As noted by Lillard, the practice of spreading ground ochre over the burial was common at this time (Lillard, et al. 1939). Grave goods during this period are generally sparse and typically include only utilitarian items and a few ornamental objects. However, objects such as charmstones, quartz crystals, and bone whistles occasionally were present, which suggest the religious or ceremonial significance of the individual (Hughes 1994). During this period, larger populations are suggested by the number and depth of sites compared with the Windmiller Pattern. According to Fredrickson (1973), the Berkeley Pattern reflects gradual expansion or assimilation of different populations rather than sudden population replacement and a gradual shift in economic emphasis.

2.1.3 - Augustine Pattern or Late Horizon (A.D. 500 to Historic Period)

The Late Horizon is characterized by the Augustine Pattern, which represents a shift in the general subsistence pattern. Changes include the introduction of bow and arrow technology; and most importantly, acorns became the predominant food resource. Trade systems expanded to include raw resources as well as finished products. There are more baked clay artifacts and extensive use of Haliotis ornaments of many elaborate shapes and forms. Burial patterns retained the use of flexed burials with variable orientation, but there was a reduction in the use of ochre and widespread evidence of cremation (Moratto 1984). Judging from the number and types of grave goods associated with the two types of burials, cremation seems to have been reserved for individuals of
higher status, whereas other individuals were buried in flexed positions. Johnson (1976) suggests that the Augustine Pattern represents expansion of the Wintuan population from the north, which resulted in combining new traits with those established during the Berkeley Pattern.

Central California research has expanded from an emphasis on defining chronological and cultural units to a more comprehensive look at settlement and subsistence systems. This shift is illustrated by the early use of burials to identify mortuary assemblages and more recent research using osteological data to determine the health of prehistoric populations (Dickel et al. 1984). Although debate continues over a single model or sequence for central California, the general framework consisting of three temporal/cultural units is generally accepted, although the identification of regional and local variation is a major goal of current archaeological research.

### 2.2 - Native American Background

At the time of European contact, the San José area was occupied by various tribelets that were part of the Ohlone (previously Costanoan) tribe of California Native Americans (Levy 1978). The Ohlone group designates a language family consisting of eight branches of the Ohlone language that are considered too distinct to be dialects, with each being related to its geographically adjacent neighbors. These groups lived in approximately 50 separate and politically autonomous tribelet areas, each with one or more permanent villages, between the North San Francisco Bay and the lower Salinas River (Levy 1978).

The arrival of Ohlone groups into the Bay Area appears to be temporally consistent with the appearance of the Late Period artifact assemblage in the archaeological record, as documented at sites such as the Emeryville Shellmound or the Ellis Landing Shellmound. It is probable that the Ohlone moved south and west from the delta region of the San Joaquin-Sacramento River into the Bay Area during the Late Prehistoric. The tribal group that most likely occupied the project area was of the Tamyen ethnic group, whose territory extended over most of present day Santa Clara County. Their direct neighbors to the east may have been tribelets associated with Northern Valley Yokuts people.

The various Ohlone tribes subsisted as hunter-gatherers and relied on local terrestrial and marine flora and fauna for subsistence (Levy 1978). The predominant plant food source was the acorn, but they also exploited a wide range of other plants, including various seeds, buckeye, berries, and roots. Protein sources included grizzly bear, elk, sea lions, antelope, and black-tailed deer as well as smaller mammals such as raccoon, brush rabbit, ground squirrels, and wood rats. Waterfowl, including Canadian geese, mallards, green-winged teal, and American widgeon, were captured in nets using decoys to attract them. Fish also played an important role in the Chochenyo diet and included steelhead, salmon, and sturgeon (Jones 2007).

The Ohlone constructed watercraft from tule reeds and possessed bow and arrow technology. They fashioned blankets from sea otter pelts, fabricated basketry from twined reeds of various types, and assembled a variety of stone and bone tools in their assemblages. Ohlone villages typically consisted of domed dwelling structures, communal sweathouses, dance enclosures, and assembly houses constructed from thatched tule reeds and a combination of wild grasses, wild alfalfa, and ferns.
The Ohlone were politically organized into autonomous tribelets that had distinct cultural territories. Individual tribelets contained one or more villages with a number of seasonal camps for resource procurement within the tribelet territory. The tribelet chief could be either male or female, and the position was inherited patrilineally, but approval of the community was required. The tribelet chief and council were essentially advisors to the community and were responsible for feeding visitors, directing hunting and fishing expeditions, ceremonial activities, and warfare on neighboring tribelets.

The Gold Rush brought disease to the native inhabitants, and by the 1850s, nearly all of the Ohlone had adapted in some way or another to economies based on cash income. Hunting and gathering activities continued to decline and were rapidly replaced with economies based on ranching and farming.

2.3 - Historical Background

2.3.1 - Santa Clara County

Gaspar de Portola and a company of sixty-four men were the first Euro-Americans to visit what would become the Santa Clara Valley in 1769, intent on expanding the territorial holdings of Spain’s new world colony in North America. Following several additional expeditions and permanent Spanish settlement in the region, the El Camino Real (King’s Highway) was established as a major transportation route within the increasingly complex network of presidio outposts and Franciscan Missions (County of Santa Clara 2012).

The Mexican revolt against Spain (1822) followed by the secularization of the missions (1834) changed land ownership patterns in the Santa Clara Valley. During the Mexican Period, vast tracts of land were granted to individuals, including former Mission lands, which had reverted to public domain. During this period, the raising of cattle for tallow and hides was the major economic pursuit in the Santa Clara Valley (Findlay 1980).

In 1848, California became a United States territory as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ending the war with Mexico. Santa Clara County was one of the original 27 counties in California and with the population explosion resulting from the Gold Rush local farmers started to raise crops and livestock in the fertile Santa Clara valley. The development of irrigation and new transportation systems in California also led to wheat being replaced by more lucrative crops, such as fruit and vegetables. The opening of the transcontinental railroad made it easier to ship fresh and canned products to the major cities in the east coast by the early 1870s (Broek 1932).

By 1900, Santa Clara County had become a major food processing and commercial center with prunes, grapes, and orchard crops dominating the area. A major change in the focus of the Santa Clara Valley economy occurred in 1933 when the Naval Air Station in Sunnyvale opened and a variety of military related industries started up in the area. The change in the economic focus led to the eventual demise of the agricultural economy and the rise of the electronics industry in Santa Clara County. The expanding urbanization of Santa Clara in the 1940s and early 1950s helped spur the development of new housing for a non-farm population of working families, cannery and railroad workers, plumbers, carpenters, drivers and construction workers. The Silicon Valley boom of the
1980s and 1990s dramatically altered the regional landscape; industrial parks, commercial districts, and housing subdivisions have taken the place of the orchards that once flourished in the Santa Clara Valley (County of Santa Clara 2012).

2.3.2 - City of San José

The city of San José can trace its roots back to 1777 with the founding of The Pueblo of San José de Guadalupe by the Spanish government. The town, a small farming community founded by 68 colonists, was the first of three established in Alta California to help administer and coordinate the missions and presidios in the province. The original pueblo, established along the Guadalupe river near what is today Taylor Street, had to be abandoned in 1785 due to severe winter flooding. By 1791, it had been reestablished on higher ground approximately one mile to the south, centering on what is today César Chávez Plaza. The project is located approximately ½ mile to the west of the later pueblo location and is likely situated on what was once common land used for grazing. A later survey of pueblo lands east of César Chávez Plaza to Eighth Street, north to Julian and south to Reed streets, reveals that much of the land remained unoccupied as of 1847, and was later sold by the Alcalde at $50 per city block Plaza (Hendry and Bowman 1940, Laffey 1992). While the project location’s proximity to Los Gatos Creek would generally increases the probability of archaeological sensitivity, the highly disturbed and urban nature of the site including the construction of the 6-Lane wide intersection of South Montgomery Street and Park Avenue over the creek greatly reduces the likelihood of intact historical or archaeological resources being present within the project site.

In 1821, Mexico won independence from Spain and lands held in common, such as pueblo and mission lands, were granted to private individuals. In 1824, Mexico passed a law that allowed both foreign and native citizens to petition the governor for ownership of unoccupied tracts of land in an effort to stimulate further colonization (Broek 1932). Drawn by opportunities to establish farms and small scale commercial operations under Mexican rule, Anglo-American settlers increasing came to San José, and by the 1840s, the native Californians found themselves in the minority. 1846, the United States declared war on Mexico, and acquired the Mexican province of California in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo two years later. The discovery of gold in the Sierra foothills precipitated a sudden influx of population to the State, and as a central supply station for prospectors during the gold rush, San José underwent a population explosion. This event accelerated California statehood, established in 1850, with San José serving as the first State capital. A railroad line between San Francisco and San José was completed in 1864, followed a few years later by the Central Pacific line connecting San José with the transcontinental railroad in 1869. With the city now linked to national and international markets where the agricultural and manufactured goods of the valley could be sold, the city increasingly became a major center for farming, industrial and commercial activity, and exhibited steady growth over the following two decades (Laffey 1992). During this period, the project area consisted of residential lots with houses, a large barn, and ancillary structures (Sanborn Fire Insurance Company 1884, 1891).

Prior to World War II, San José, with its 18 canneries and 13 packinghouses, was the world’s largest canning and dried-fruit packing center. It also pioneered the manufacture of specialized mechanical farm equipment in California. The war years had a major effect on the region, with the construction of the naval air station at Moffett Field, and San Francisco acting as the gateway to the pacific from
1941 to 1945 (County of Santa Clara 2012). By 1950, the project area was the site of a veterinarian’s office with an on-site barn and corral. The site also contained three of the original family structures and ancillary buildings from the 1800s, two of which are still present on the site (Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, 1950).

Following World War II, San José shifted its focus away from agriculture in an attempt to attract new industries to the City. IBM had already established its West Coast headquarters in San José in 1943, and opened a new research and development facility in 1952. Both would prove to be forerunners of the city’s future economy, as Reynolds Johnson and his team would later invent RAMAC, as well as the Hard disk drive (Ward 1995).

During the 1950s and 1960s, San José entered into a period of unprecedented growth, skyrocketing from a city of 95,000 people and 17 square miles in 1950 to the fourth largest city in California with more than 450,000 people and 137 square miles by 1969. This growth can be directly related to the appointment of City Manager A. P. “Dutch” Hamann who annexed over 1,389 parcels into San José during his 19-year tenure (McKay 2006). As orchards were replaced with subdivisions and shopping centers and rural roads widened into freeways lined with restaurants and showrooms, an anti-growth reaction to the effects of rapid development emerged in the 1970s championed by mayors Norman Mineta and Janet Gray Hayes (Trounstine and Christensen 1982).

This did not limit the growth of the city’s fledgling computer industry however. The 1970s saw a series of major innovations as San José electronics manufacturers abandoned traditional vacuum tubes in favor of integrated circuits and silicon chips for computers and small electronics. The boom in production and consequent birth of the personal computer industry lead Don C. Hoefler, then editor of Microelectronics News, to begin referring to the Santa Clara Valley as “Silicon Valley” for the first time in 1971. By 1980, over 3000 electronics firms including IBM, Intel, and Hewlett-Packard had taken up residence in the area. The region became the capital of a lucrative booming technology industry that attracted new residents to San José and neighboring towns by the thousands- a trend that has continued to the modern day (PAST 2009).
SECTION 3: RESULTS

3.1 - Record Search

3.1.1 - Information Center Search

On May 28, 2013, FCS Professional Archaeologist, Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA, conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park, California for the project area and a 0.50-mile radius beyond the project boundaries. To identify any historic properties or resources, the current inventories of the National Register of Historic Places (NR), the California Register of Historic Resources (CR), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL) list, the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI) list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) were reviewed to determine the existence of previously documented local historical resources. Results from the NWIC indicate that 36 resources (see Table 1) have been recorded within 0.5-mile of the Project Area. In addition, 52 area-specific survey reports (see Table 2) are on file with the NWIC for the search radius. None assessed the project area location, suggesting the project area has not been surveyed for cultural resources.

All historic resources located within the 0.50-mile search radius are historic structures—including both residential and commercial structures—or historic districts. No prehistoric sites have been recorded within the 0.50-mile search radius.

Table 1: Known Cultural Resources Located within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Candidate Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001218</td>
<td>Union Ice Company-Ice Plant 804 W. San Fernando Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001282</td>
<td>CA-SCL-840H Historic Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001285</td>
<td>KNTV Building¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001300</td>
<td>Calpak San Jose Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001306</td>
<td>Historic Building 214 Dupont Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001323</td>
<td>Historic Building 733-741 Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001325</td>
<td>Historic Building 82 S. Montgomery Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001343</td>
<td>Historic Building 91 S. Autumn Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001345</td>
<td>Calpak East and West Warehouses 725 W. San Fernando Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.): Known Cultural Resources Located within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Candidate Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001348</td>
<td>Historic Building 801 Auzerias Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001534</td>
<td>Historic Building 655 Auzerias Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001181</td>
<td>Arata House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001882</td>
<td>Lutzen House Site 460 W. San Fernando Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001893</td>
<td>Haynes House 439 Lakehouse Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001894</td>
<td>Williams House 432 Lakehouse Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001895</td>
<td>Thurston/Cooking House 448 Lakehouse Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001896</td>
<td>Foss House 458 Lakehouse Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001897</td>
<td>Ferrell House #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001898</td>
<td>Dellwig House 124-126 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001899</td>
<td>Jordon House 130 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001900</td>
<td>Smith House 138 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001901</td>
<td>Carto Court 117 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001902</td>
<td>Lutzen/Carto House 125 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001903</td>
<td>Currllin House 131 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001904</td>
<td>Stojanovich House 137 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001905</td>
<td>Historic Site/ Lot 143 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001906</td>
<td>Gunn House 149 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001907</td>
<td>Lewis House 155 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.): Known Cultural Resources Located within 0.5-Mile Radius of the Candidate Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001908</td>
<td>Wilson House 163 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001909</td>
<td>Hartung House 169 Gifford Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001910</td>
<td>Knoth Bungalow 183 Sonoma Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001911</td>
<td>Lake House City Landmark Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001912</td>
<td>Martin House 431 Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001913</td>
<td>Gorin Office Building 437 Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001914</td>
<td>Historic Building/Offices 445 Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001915</td>
<td>Younk Linoleum Co. Building 457 Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002272</td>
<td>Southern Pacific Depot Historic District/ Southern Pacific Depot 65 Cahill Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
1 This resource was destroyed by fire after the FCS record search was completed.

Table 2: Cultural Resources Reports within 0.5 Mile Radius of the Candidate Location Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-004247</td>
<td>Winter, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004423</td>
<td>Cartier; 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004425</td>
<td>Cartier; 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004505</td>
<td>Cartier; 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004648</td>
<td>Edwards, Detlefs, and Reed; 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-004854</td>
<td>Cartier; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-005244</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-013874</td>
<td>Baney, Brittin, Rossa, and Sloan; 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-017625</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-019761</td>
<td>Baker; 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-020371</td>
<td>Roop; 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.): Cultural Resources Reports within 0.5 Mile Radius of the Candidate Location Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Additional Details¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-021179</td>
<td>Busby, Tannam, and Garaventa; 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022182</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022725</td>
<td>Ballard, Holson, and Pau; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022819</td>
<td>Nelson, Carpenter, and Costello; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-023061</td>
<td>Laffey; 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-023631</td>
<td>Peak and Peak; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024935</td>
<td>Harmon; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024972</td>
<td>Guedon; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-024976</td>
<td>Busby, Garaventa, Guedon, and Tannam; 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026588</td>
<td>Roop; 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-027015</td>
<td>Pesnichak and Evans; 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-028962</td>
<td>Busby; 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-029009</td>
<td>Pesnichak; 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031183</td>
<td>Jones; 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031577</td>
<td>Holman; 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033009</td>
<td>Busby; 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033026</td>
<td>Busby; 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033061</td>
<td>Sikes, et al.; 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-005301</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-006788</td>
<td>Garaventa, Anastasio, and Gallagher; 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008379</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008455</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008532</td>
<td>Roop; 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008564</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (cont.): Cultural Resources Reports within 0.5 Mile Radius of the Candidate Location Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-009486</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management; 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-012024</td>
<td>Banet, Garaventa, and Janis; 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-012437</td>
<td>Chavez and Hupman; 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-013329</td>
<td>Laffey; 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-013872</td>
<td>Banet and Busby; 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033889</td>
<td>Maggi, Duval, and Dill; 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-034169</td>
<td>Holman; 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-035291</td>
<td>Herbert; 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037032</td>
<td>Ruby, Waechter, Duval, and Rosenthal; 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Did not assess project area location

In addition to the NWIC record search, the City of San José’s Historic Resources Inventory was reviewed to determine if any significant historic resources were located adjacent to or within the project area. The results indicated that the historic resource closest to the project area is the KNTV Broadcast Facility (facility) built in 1955 and located at 645 Park Avenue approximately 460 feet west of the project area. This facility was considered eligible for listing on the CR and was a candidate for a City of San José Landmark status, however it was destroyed by fire in April of 2014. The proposed project will not have an adverse impact on any historic resources listed at the national, state or local level.

3.1.2 - Native American Heritage Commission Record Search

On June 20, 2013, FCS sent a letter to the NAHC in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites are listed on their Sacred Lands File for this portion of the City of San José, Santa Clara County. The response from the NAHC was received on July 8, 2013 and indicated that the record search of the sacred land file failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. A list of 12 Native American tribal members who may have additional knowledge of the project area was included with the results. These tribal members were sent letters on July 9, 2013 asking for any additional information they might have concerning the project area. As of this date, no response has been received from any of the 12 tribal members. If responses are received, they will be incorporated as an Addendum to this report when finalized.

3.2 - Pedestrian Survey

FCS Professional Archaeologist Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA, surveyed the project area on June 12, 2013. A small portion of the project area consisted of open ground and was examined using 5- to 7-
meter transects, walked in a zigzag pattern to ensure proper coverage (Photograph 2). The majority of the project area was covered by the existing buildings, sidewalks, and landscape elements; therefore, there was no ground surface visibility (Photograph 3).

In the area of open ground, no prehistoric or historic resources were discovered (Photograph 4).

3.2.1 - Buildings at 543 Lorraine Avenue and 565 Lorraine Avenue

The two residences within the project area are over 50 years old and therefore required an assessment of their historic significance and eligibility for listing on the CR. The houses were evaluated using each of the four CR eligibility criteria:

- Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States (Criterion 1).
- Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history (Criterion 2).
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values (Criterion 3).
- Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation (Criterion 4).

In brief, the properties do not appear to qualify for the CR under any of the above criteria. Therefore, the buildings are not considered to be an historic resource for the purposes listing on the CR or any local listings.

Building Descriptions and CR Evaluations

Residence at 543 Lorraine Avenue

The subject property is a circa-1920, one-story, symmetrical, rectangular shaped, Craftsman style, single-family residence located in a mixed commercial and residential neighborhood. The building has a concrete foundation, wood clapboard siding, and a medium pitch front gable roof. The roof has exposed rafter tails and composition shingles (Photograph 5).

The residence contains a centered front porch accessed by four wood stairs. The porch has a front gable roof over the porch entrance area and contains knee braces. The main entrance is a single, wood framed, wood door with a metal security door. The front entrance is flanked by single, wood framed, double hung sash style windows. The upper section of the window contains six lites\(^1\). The windows are placed at irregular intervals along the sides and rear of the building and include wood framed, double hung sash or casement style windows. Some windows have metal screens (Photograph 6).

The residence is sited on a small residential lot with chain link fencing. Landscaping is minimal and includes grass, mature bushes, and large trees. The building is in fair condition.

\(^1\) A lite is a unit of glass in a window.
CR Evaluation
Concerning the seven aspects of integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association—this circa-1920 Craftsman style single-family residential building has retained its original location and has not been moved. However, the setting, feeling, and association have not remained intact, as the urban area surrounding the structure has changed dramatically over the years. The design, materials, and workmanship have basically remained the same but various exterior alterations have reduced the original integrity. The integrity level is fair and the condition of the building is fair.

CR and Local Listing Eligibility Evaluation
The 543 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 1 for its potential significance as part of any historic trends or events that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history. The building was constructed as part of the overall continuing commercial and residential development of the City of San José area, which began in the 1850s and continues to the present time. There is no significant trend or event associated with the property. Therefore, the building does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 1: Event.

The 543 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 2 for its potential significance and association with a person of importance in national history. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the persons associated with the construction or development of the building were considered important in the history of the property or nation. None of the persons associated with the property appear to be historically significant at the level necessary to meet the criteria for listing on the CR. Therefore, the 543 Lorraine Avenue property does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 2: Person.

The building at 543 Lorraine Avenue was assessed under CR Criterion 3 for its potential significance as a property which embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction or style of Craftsman architecture, represents the work of a master architect, builder or craftsman, possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant or distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The buildings’ style does not rise to a level of significance to qualify for the CR. The 543 Lorraine Avenue residence is a typical, standard, 1920s-era Craftsman home with no distinguishing characteristics or features. The building is not a good example of the work of a master architect or craftsman, as no persons associated with the design or construction were identified. Therefore, the building cannot be considered to represent the work of a master architect, builder, or craftsman and does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 3: Architecture as a good example of Craftsman style architecture.

The 543 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 4 for its potential significance and its ability to convey information. The building does not yield, or may not be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. In order for buildings, structures, or objects to be significant under Criterion D, they need to “be, or must have been, the principal source of information.” This is not the case with this property; therefore, the property does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 4: Information Potential.
Furthermore, the building received a score of 22.16 points on the city’s Historic Evaluation Talley, a score below the 33 points required to qualify as a potential Historic Resource. Therefore, the building does not meet any of the criteria for historic and/or architectural significance at the National, State or local level.

**Residence at 565 Lorraine Avenue**

The residence at 565 Lorraine Avenue is a one-story, rectangular shaped, Craftsman style, single-family residence constructed in 1918 and located in a mixed commercial, residential neighborhood. The building has a concrete foundation, wood clapboard siding, and a medium pitch front gable roof. The roof has exposed rafter tails and composition shingles (Photograph 7).

The residence contains a centered front porch accessed by a narrow set of stairs. The porch has half-height wood siding walls. The porch has a front gable roof over the porch area that is supported by wood posts. The main entrance is a single, wood framed, wood door. The front entrance is flanked by single, wood framed, double-hung sash-style windows. Windows are placed are irregular intervals along the sides and rear of the building and include wood framed, double-hung sash- or casement-style windows. Some windows have metal screens (Photograph 8).

The rear of the building contains a small, enclosed wood porch with a set of wood framed, fixed pane windows. A brick fireplace is present on the west elevation.

The east side of the residence contains a corrugated plastic roof that serves to delineate a small carport. A concrete driveway leads to the carport area (Photograph 9).

The residence is sited on a small residential lot with chain link fencing. Landscaping is minimal and includes grass, mature bushes, and trees. The building is in fair condition (Photograph 10).

**CR Evaluation**

Concerning the seven aspects of integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association—this 1918 Craftsman style single-family residential building has retained its original location and has not been moved. However, the setting, feeling, and association have not remained intact, as the urban area surrounding the structure has changed dramatically over the years. The design, materials, and workmanship have basically remained the same but various exterior alterations have reduced the original integrity. The integrity level is fair and the condition of the building is fair.

**CR and Local Listing Eligibility Evaluation**

Similar to the residence at 543 Lorraine Avenue, the 565 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 1 for its potential significance as part of any historic trends or events that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history. The building was constructed as part of the overall continuing commercial and residential development of the City of San José area, which began in the 1850s and continues to the present time. There is no significant trend or event associated with the property. Therefore, the building does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 1: Event.
The 565 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 2 for its potential significance and association with a person of importance in national history. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the persons associated with the construction or development of the 565 Lorraine Avenue residence were important in the history of the property, City of San José or the nation. None of the persons associated with the residence appear to be historically significant at the level necessary to meet the criteria for listing on the CR. Therefore, the 565 Lorraine Avenue property does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 2: Person.

The 565 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 3 for its potential significance as a property that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction or style of Craftsman architecture; represents the work of a master architect, builder, or craftsman; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant or distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The style of the 565 Lorraine Avenue residence does not rise to a level of significance to qualify for the CR. The 565 Lorraine Avenue residence is a typical, 1920s-era Craftsman home with no distinguishing characteristics or features. The building is not a good example of the work of a master architect or craftsman, as no persons associated with the design or construction were identified. Therefore, the building cannot be considered to represent the work of a master architect, builder, or craftsman and does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 3: Architecture as a good example of Craftsman style architecture.

The 565 Lorraine Avenue residence was assessed under CR Criterion 4 for its potential significance and its ability to convey information. The building does not yield, or may not be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. In order for buildings, structures, or objects to be significant under Criterion D, they need to “be, or must have been, the principal source of information.” This is not the case with this property; therefore, the property does not appear to meet the criteria for significance under Criterion 4: Information Potential.

Furthermore, the building received a score of 21.3 points on the city’s Historic Evaluation Talley, a score below the 33 points required to qualify as a potential Historic Resource. Therefore, the building does not meet any of the criteria for historic and/or architectural significance at the national, state, or local level.
SECTION 4: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 - Summary

In accordance with CEQA regulations, FCS assessed the effects of development for the project area. Results from the NWIC indicate that 36 resources and 52 area-specific survey reports are on file with the NWIC for the search radius. None assessed the project, suggesting that the project area has not been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Although the NAHC indicated there were no cultural resources in the immediate project area, letters were sent to all of the tribal representatives on the list provided by the NAHC.

The results of the field survey were negative for prehistoric resources. While the project location’s proximity to Los Gatos Creek would generally increases the area’s archaeological sensitivity, the highly disturbed and urban nature of the site including the construction of the 6-Lane wide intersection of South Montgomery Street and Park Avenue over the creek reduces the likelihood of intact historical or archaeological resources considerably. The two buildings located within the project area were evaluated for CR eligibility and were considered not eligible for listing on the CR under any of the four criteria. Because the buildings are not considered historic resources, they were documented on DPR Primary forms only (Appendix E).

4.2 - Recommendations

4.2.1 - Cultural Resources Recommendations

Based on the results of the record searches and pedestrian survey, FCS considers the project area to have low sensitivity for prehistoric and historic resources, and archaeological monitoring is not recommended.

Procedures for inadvertent discoveries of human remains, and cultural resources are provided below.

4.3 - Inadvertent Discovery Procedures

4.3.1 - Accidental Discovery of Human Remains

There is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown, buried human remains. Should this occur, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code applies, and the following procedures shall be followed.

In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 5097.98 must be followed. In this instance, once project-related earthmoving begins and if there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is
required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98, or

2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his/her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendent or on the project area in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
   - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission;
   - The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or
   - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

4.3.2 - Accidental Discovery of Cultural Resources

It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown, buried cultural resources. In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during construction, operations shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist and shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.
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Appendix A: Project Area Photographs
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Photograph 1: View to historic resource, KNTV Facility from project area; facing northwest

Photograph 2: Open ground area within project area; facing south
Photograph 3: Overview of project area (left) and surrounding sidewalk and street; facing east

Photograph 4: Open ground area behind fence, residence 543 Lorraine on right; facing northeast
Photograph 5: 543 Lorraine south elevation; facing north

Photograph 6: 543 Lorraine west and south elevations; facing northeast
Photograph 7: 565 Lorraine south and west elevations; facing northeast

Photograph 8: 565 Lorraine south elevation; facing north
Photograph 9: 565 Lorraine south and east elevations; facing northwest

Photograph 10: 565 Lorraine west elevation and view of lot with chain link fencing; facing south
Appendix B: Cultural Resources Correspondence
B.1 - Native American Heritage Commission
Sacred Lands File Search Response
July 8, 2013

Carrie D. Wills
2633 Camino Ramon
San Ramon, CA 94583

By Fax: 925-830-2715

Number of Pages 3

Re: Montgomery 7 project, Santa Clara County

Dear Ms. Wills:

A record search of the sacred land file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3713.

Sincerely,

Debbie Pilas-Treadway
Environmental Specialist III
## Native American Contacts
### Santa Clara County
### July 3, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jakki Kehl</td>
<td>720 North 2nd Street, Patterson, CA 95363</td>
<td>(209) 892-1060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band</td>
<td>Melvin Ketchum III, Environmental Coordinator</td>
<td>7273 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA 95020</td>
<td>408-842-3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Erolinda Perez</td>
<td>PO Box 717, Linden, CA 95236</td>
<td>(209) 887-3415</td>
<td><a href="mailto:canutes@verizon.net">canutes@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda G. Yamane</td>
<td>1585 Mira Mar Ave, Seaside, CA 93955</td>
<td>831-394-5915</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rumslien123@yahoo.com">rumslien123@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band</td>
<td>Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson</td>
<td>789 Canada Road, Woodside, CA 94062</td>
<td>650-851-7489 - Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amah Mutsun Tribal Band</td>
<td>Jean-Marie Feyling, Chairperson</td>
<td>19350 Hunter Court, Redding, CA 96003</td>
<td>530-243-1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amah Mutsun Tribal Band</td>
<td>Edward Ketchum, Chairperson</td>
<td>35867 Yosemite Ave, Davis, CA 95616</td>
<td>510-581-5194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan</td>
<td>Ann Marie Sayets, Chairperson</td>
<td>P.O. Box 28, Hollister, CA 95024</td>
<td>831-637-4238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area</td>
<td>Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson</td>
<td>PO Box 360781, Milpitas, CA 95036</td>
<td>408-205-9714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.9 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 1067.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.86 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable to contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Montgomery 7 project, Santa Clara County.
The Ohlone Indian Tribe  
Andrew Galvan  
PO Box 3152  
Fremont, CA 94539  
chochenyo@AOL.com  
(510) 882-0527 - Cell  
(510) 687-9393 - Fax  

Ohlone/Costanoan  
Bay Miwok  
Plains Miwok  
Patwin

Trina Marine Ruano Family  
Ramona Garibay, Representative  
30940 Watkins Street  
Union City , CA 94587  
510-972-0645-home  

Email: soaprootmo@msn.com

Ohlone/Costanoan  
Bay Miwok  
Plains Miwok  
Patwin

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7008, 5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5007.64 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5007.98 of the Public Resources Code

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Montgomery 7 project, Santa Clara County
B.2 - Native American Information Request Representative Letter
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July 8, 2013

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Valentin Lopez, Chairperson
PO Box 5272
Galt, CA 95632

Subject: Proposed Montgomery 7 Project, City of San Jose, Santa Clara County

Dear Valentin Lopez:

At the request of California Boutique Rental Fund 1 LLC, First Carbon Solutions is conducting a Cultural Resources Assessment for a proposed project within the City of San Jose, CA. The proposed project consists of development of four multi-level residential buildings on an approximately 0.4-acre project site at 565 Lorraine Avenue, San Jose, CA. The proposed project area is depicted on the attached map.

The project area was surveyed on June 12, 2013 and no prehistoric resources were observed.

Consultation

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the City to consider the effect this project may have on historic properties. The definition of “historic properties” includes, in some cases, properties of traditional religious and cultural significance to Native American tribes. To determine whether any historic properties may be affected by the project, FCS-MBA has consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and received a response letter indicating that there may be additional information to be gained from individual tribal members and/or tribal organizations. FCS-MBA is sending this letter to give you the opportunity to provide any additional information you may have about the project area. Because public involvement is a key ingredient in successful CEQA consultation, we are soliciting your input as part of this process.

Please feel free to contact me at 925.788.9097 or via email at cwills@brandman.com if you have any questions or would like to discuss the project in more detail.

Sincerely,

Carrie O. Wills
Senior Scientist, Archaeology
First Carbon Solutions
2633 Camino Ramon Ste. 460
San Ramon, CA 94583
Mobile Phone 925.788.9097 Office 925.830.2733 FAX 925.830.2733

Enc: Project Location Map
Appendix C: Personnel Qualifications
Overview

Has over 22 years experience and has worked in the areas of prehistoric and historic archaeology on tasks that included pre-field assessments, archival research, pedestrian field surveys, site evaluation and testing, and data recovery and analysis since 1991.

Associations and Certifications

- Registered Professional Archaeologist #11138
- Society for Historical Archaeology
- Society for California Archaeology

Education

- Master’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward
- Bachelor’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward

Carrie Wills, RPA, has extensive experience conducting field research, evaluating sites and features for historic significance and preparing reports that comply with the CEQA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the NEPA. Her experience includes evaluating and assessing historic structures and resources for inclusion on the National Register and the California Register. In addition, Ms. Wills has conducted numerous consultations with Native American tribal representatives and has good working relationships with numerous governmental agencies. She has provided feasible mitigation that protects significant resources while staying within budgetary constraints.

Experience and Client Summary

- Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment – DSRSD Central Dublin Recycled Water Distribution and Retrofit Project, City of Dublin, Alameda County, California.
- Lake Solano Regional Park Visitor’s Center Project, Archaeologist, County of Solano.
- KB Home Monte Vista, Historic American Buildings Survey, City of San Jose.
- KRC Aggregates Quarry Expansion Project, San Joaquin County.
- Gustine Municipal Airport Project, Archaeologist, County of Merced
- Section 106 Evaluation – Dixon Veterans Memorial Hall Project and the Benicia
- Veterans Memorial Hall Project, County of Solano.
- Cultural Resources Assessment – Zone 3A, Line D Capacity Improvements Project and Zone 5, Line A West Levee Improvements Projects, County of Alameda.
- Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment/HABS Documentation – St. Regis Napa Valley Project, City of Napa, Napa County.
- General Plan Update, Archaeologist, County of Monterey.
- Trails Specific Plan Project, Archaeologist, City of Livermore.
Appendix D: Regulatory Framework
REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Government agencies, including federal, state, and local agencies, have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by projects regulated, funded, or undertaken by the agency. Federal and state laws that govern the preservation of historic and archaeological resources of national, state, regional, and local significance include the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition, laws specific to work conducted on federal lands includes the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the American Antiquities Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

The following Federal or CEQA criteria were used to evaluate the significance of potential impacts on cultural resources for the proposed project. An impact would be considered significant if it would affect a resource eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CR), or if it is identified as a unique archaeological resource.

Federal-Level Evaluations

Federal agencies are required to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings under NEPA § 106. Federal agencies are responsible for initiating NEPA § 106 review and completing the steps in the process that are outlined in the regulations. They must determine if NHPA § 106 applies to a given project and, if so, initiate review in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). Federal agencies are also responsible for involving the public and other interested parties. Furthermore, NHPA S106 requires that any federal or federally assisted undertaking, or any undertaking requiring federal licensing or permitting, consider the effect of the action on historic properties listed in or eligible for the NRHP. Under the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 36 CFR Part 800.8, federal agencies are specifically encouraged to coordinate compliance with NEPA § 106 and the NEPA process. The implementing regulations “Protection of Historic Properties” are found in 36 CFR Part 800. Resource eligibility for listing on the NRHP is detailed in 36 CFR Part 63 and the criteria for resource evaluation are found in 36 CFR Part 60.4 [a-d].

The NHPA established the NRHP as the official federal list for cultural resources that are considered important for their historical significance at the local, state, or national level. To be determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, properties must meet specific criteria for historic significance and possess certain levels of integrity of form, location, and setting. The criteria for listing on the NRHP are significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture as present in districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In addition, a resource must meet one or all of these eligibility criteria:

a.) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
b.) Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C.) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic values, represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

d.) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criterion D is usually reserved for archaeological resources. Eligible properties must meet at least one of the criteria and exhibit integrity, measured by the degree to which the resource retains its historical properties and conveys its historical character.

**Criteria Considerations**

Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, buildings that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the NRHP. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

a.) A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.

b.) A building or structure removed from its original location but which is primarily significant for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event.

c.) A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building associated with his or her productive life.

d.) A cemetery that derives its primary importance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.

e.) A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived.

f.) A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance.

g.) A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

**Thresholds of Significance**

In consultation with the SHPO/THPO and other entities that attach religious and cultural significance to identified historic properties, the Agency shall apply the criteria of adverse effect to historic
properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The Agency official shall consider the views of consulting parties and the public when considering adverse effects.

**Federal Criteria of Adverse Effects**

Under federal regulations, 36 CFR Part 800.5, an adverse effect is found when an undertaking alters, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualifies the property for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that diminishes the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration will be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative.

According to 36 CFR Part 800.5, adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to, those listed below:

- Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.
- Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties per 36 CFR Part 68 and applicable guidelines.
- Removal of the property from its historic location.
- Change of the character of the property’s use or of physical features within the property’s setting that contribute to its historic significance.
- Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features.
- Neglect of a property that causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization.
- Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

**If Adverse Effects Are Found**

If adverse effects are found, the agency official shall continue consultation as stipulated at 36 CFR Part 800.6. The agency official shall consult with the SHPO/THPO and other consulting parties to develop alternatives to the undertaking that could avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic resources. According to 36 CFR Part 800.14(d), if adverse effects cannot be avoided then standard treatments established by the ACHP maybe used as a basis for Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
According to 36 CFR Part 800.11(e), the filing of an approved MOA, and appropriate documentation, concludes the § 106 process. The MOA must be signed by all consulting parties and approved by the ACHP prior to construction activities. If no adverse affects are found and the SHPO/THPO or the ACHP do not object within 30 days of receipt, the agencies’ responsibilities under § 106 will be satisfied upon completion of report and documentation as stipulated in 36 CFR Part 800.11. The information must be made available for public review upon request, excluding information covered by confidentiality provisions.

State-Level Evaluation Processes

An archaeological site may be considered an historical resource if it is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military or cultural annals of California per PRC § 5020.1(j) or if it meets the criteria for listing on the CR per California Code of Regulations (CCR) at Title 14 CCR § 4850.

The most recent amendments to the CEQA guidelines direct lead agencies to first evaluate an archaeological site to determine if it meets the criteria for listing in the CR. If an archaeological site is an historical resource, in that it is listed or eligible for listing in the CR, potential adverse impacts to it must be considered as stated in PRC §§ 21084.1 and 21083.2(l). If an archaeological site is considered not to be an historical resource, but meets the definition of a “unique archeological resource” as defined in PRC § 21083.2, then it would be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

With reference to PRC § 21083.2, each site found within a project area will be evaluated to determine if it is a unique archaeological resource. A unique archaeological resource is described as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

As used in this report, “non-unique archaeological resource” means an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the criteria for eligibility for listing on the CR, as noted in subdivision (g) of PRC § 21083.2. A non-unique archaeological resource requires no further consideration, other than simple recording of its components and features. Isolated artifacts are typically considered non-unique archaeological resources. Historic structures that have had their superstructures demolished or removed can be considered historic archaeological sites and are evaluated following the processes used for prehistoric sites. Finally, OHP recognizes an age threshold
of 45 years. Cultural resources built less than 45 years ago may qualify for consideration, but only under the most extraordinary circumstances.

Title 14, CCR, Chapter 3 § 15064.5 is associated with determining the significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources. Here, the term historical resource includes the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CR (PRC § 5024.1; Title 14 CCR, § 4850 et seq.).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC § 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the PRC § 5024.1(g) requirements, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC § 5024.1; Title 14 CCR § 4852) including the following:
   A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
   B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
   C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
   D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Typically, archaeological sites exhibiting significant features qualify for the CR under Criterion D because such features have information important to the prehistory of California. A lead agency may determine that a resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC §§ 5020.1(j) or 5024.1 even if it is:

- Not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CR.
- Not included in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC § 5020.1(k).
- Identified in an historical resources survey per PRC § 5024.1(g).

**Threshold of Significance**

If a project will have a significant impact on a cultural resource, several steps must be taken to determine if the cultural resource is a “unique archaeological resource” under CEQA. If analysis
and/or testing determine that the resource is a unique archaeological resource and therefore subject to mitigation prior to development, a threshold of significance should be developed. The threshold of significance is a point where the qualities of significance are defined and the resource is determined to be unique under CEQA. A significant impact is regarded as the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the resource will be reduced to a point that it no longer meets the significance criteria. Should analysis indicate that project development will destroy the unique elements of a resource; the resource must be mitigated for under CEQA regulations. The preferred form of mitigation is to preserve the resource in-place, in an undisturbed state. However, as that is not always possible or feasible, appropriate mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to:

1. Planning construction to avoid the resource.
2. Deeding conservation easements.
3. Capping the site prior to construction.

If a resource is determined to be a “non-unique archaeological resource,” no further consideration of the resource by the lead agency is necessary.

Local-Level Evaluation Processes

City of San Jose Municipal Code Chapter 13 § 48.110: Historic Landmark Designation Criteria

A. Any potentially historic property can be nominated for designation as a city landmark by the city council, the historic landmarks commission or by application of the owner or the authorized agent of the owner of the property for which designation is requested. When a landmark has been nominated by application of the owner or authorized agent of the owner, the application may be withdrawn at any time by the applicant by the filing of a notice of such withdrawal with the city clerk, provided that said applicant may reapply for landmark designation at any time thereafter, and provided that the council may nominate the property for such designation at any time after withdrawal.

B. Any such applications shall be filed with the director of planning upon the prescribed form and shall include the following data:
   1. Assessor’s parcel number of the site;
   2. Description of the characteristics and category of the landmarks which meets the requirements this chapter detailing the landmark’s special historical, architectural, cultural, aesthetic, or engineering interest or value of an historical nature;
   3. Sketches, drawings, photographs or other descriptive material;
   4. Statement of condition of the proposed landmark;
   5. Statement of the special historical, architectural, cultural, aesthetic or engineering interest or value of an historical nature of the proposed landmark; and
   6. Other information requested by said director.

C. When the nomination documentation is complete, the city council, by resolution, shall initiate the procedure for the designation of a landmark so nominated.
D. Whenever proceedings for designation of a landmark have been initiated or withdrawn, the city clerk shall transmit a copy of the record of initiation or withdrawal to the director of planning, director of neighborhood preservation, and director of public works, for their information, and to the building official to be maintained in the roster of proposed and designated landmarks and historic districts.

E. Every designation of a proposed landmark however nominated, shall be considered by the historic landmarks commission at a public hearing. The hearing of the commission shall be held within ninety days from the date of city council adoption of a resolution initiating a landmark nomination. The historic landmarks commission shall report to city council within thirty days after the close of the public hearing on the landmark nomination, in any event, no later than one hundred twenty days from initiation.

F. Notice of the time and place of such commission hearings and the purpose thereof shall be given by publication of a notice to appear once in a newspaper of general circulation in the city of San José of at least ten days prior to the date of said hearing; and by mailing the same, postage prepaid, (1) the owner of said property, as shown on the last equalized assessment roll adopted by the county of Santa Clara, or to the address shown for such purposes on the application if the proceedings were initiated by application of the owner, and (2) the occupant of the property if other than the owner. In addition, the director of planning shall cause notices of the time, place, and purpose of such hearings to be posted along the frontage of the site of the proposed landmark. Said notices shall contain:
   1. A statement of the general location of the landmark;
   2. A notice of the time and place and purpose of the hearing;
   3. A reference to the application or other documents on file with the director of planning for particulars;
   4. A statement that any interested person may appear in person or by agent and be heard;
   5. An identification and description of the landmark.

G. After such public hearing, the historic landmarks commission shall recommend to the city council approval, disapproval or modified approval of every such proposed designation. Such recommendation shall be advisory only and shall not be binding on the council. Failure of the historic landmarks commission to report to the council within one hundred twenty days of city council initiation shall be deemed a recommendation of denial of the proposed designation.

H. Prior to recommending approval or modified approval, the historic landmarks commission shall find that said proposed landmark has special historical, architectural, cultural, aesthetic, or engineering interest or value of an historical nature, and that its designation as a landmark conforms with the goals and policies of the general plan. In making such findings, the commission may consider the following factors, among other relevant factors, with respect to the proposed landmark:
   1. Its character, interest or value as part of the local, regional, state or national history, heritage or culture;
   2. Its location as a site of a significant historic event;
3. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the local, regional, state or national culture and history;
4. Its exemplification of the cultural, economic, social or historic heritage of the city of San José;
5. Its portrayal of the environment of a group of people in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
6. Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;
7. Its identification as the work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has influenced the development of the city of San José;
8. Its embodiment of elements of architectural or engineering design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which represents a significant architectural innovation or which is unique. (Ords. 20884, 21704, 23408.)

**Tribal Consultation**

The following serves as an overview of the procedures and timeframes for the Tribal Consultation process, for the complete Tribal Consultation Guidelines, please refer to the State of California Office of Planning and Research web site.

Prior to the amendment or adoption of general or specific plans, local governments must notify the appropriate tribes of the opportunity to conduct consultation for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to cultural places located on land within the local government’s jurisdiction that is affected by the plan adoption or amendment. The tribal contacts for this list maintained by the NAHC and is distinct from the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) list. It is suggested that local governments send written notice by certified mail with return receipt requested. The tribes have 90 days from the date they receive notification to request consultation. In addition, prior to adoption or amendment of a general or specific plan, local government must refer the proposed action to tribes on the NAHC list that have traditional lands located within the city or county’s jurisdiction. Notice must be sent regardless of prior consultation. The referral must allow a 45-day comment period.

In brief, notices from government to the tribes should include:

- A clear statement of purpose.
- A description of the proposed general or specific plan, the reason for the proposal, and the specific geographic areas affected.
- Detailed maps to accompany the description.
- Deadline date for the tribes to respond.
- Government representative(s) contact information.
- Contact information for project proponent/applicant, if applicable.
The basic schedule for this process is:

- 30 days: time NAHC has to provide tribal contact information to the local government; this is recommended not mandatory.

- 90 days: time tribe has to respond indication whether or not they want to consult. Note: tribes can agree to a shorter timeframe. In addition, consultation does not begin until/unless requested by the tribe within 90 days of receiving notice of the opportunity to consult. The consultation period, if requested, is open-ended. The tribes and local governments can discuss issues for as long as necessary, or productive, and need not result in agreement.

- 45 days: time local government has to refer proposed action, such as adoption or amendment to a general plan or specific plan, to agencies, including the tribes. Referral required even if there has been prior consultation. This opens the 45-day comment period.

- 10 days: time local government has to provide tribes of notice of public hearing.
Appendix E:
Department of Parks and Recreation Forms
State of California — The Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION  
PRIMARY RECORD

Other Listings
Review Code  
Reviewer  
Date

Resource Name or #: FCS#1

P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location:  
☐ Not for Publication  ☑ Unrestricted

*a. County: Santa Clara  
and  
(P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad: San Jose West  
Date: 1979  
T 7S ;  
R 1E; of Sec 18 ;  
M.D. B.M.

c. Address: 543 Lorraine  
City: San Jose  
Zip: 95110

d. UTM:  
Zone: 10 ;  
mE/  
mN (G.P.S.)

e. Other Locational Data:  
(e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:

From I-280 North, take Bird Avenue exit, travel ~0.6 mile, continue onto South Montgomery Street ~350 feet, turn right onto Lorraine Avenue, 543 is on left.

*P3a. Description:  
(Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The subject property is a ca. 1920, one-story, symmetrical, rectangular shaped, Craftsman style, single family residence located in a mixed commercial and residential neighborhood. The building has a concrete foundation, wood clapboard siding, and a medium pitch front gable roof. The roof has exposed rafter tails and composition shingles. The residence contains a centered front porch accessed by four wood stairs. The porch has a front gable roof over the porch entrance area and contains knee braces. The main entrance is a single, wood framed, wood door with a metal security door. The front entrance is flanked by single, wood framed, double hung sash style windows. The upper section of the window contains six lites. Windows are placed at irregular intervals along the sides and rear of the building and include wood framed, double hung sash or casement style windows. Some windows have metal screens. The residence is sited on a small residential lot with chain link fencing. Landscaping is minimal and includes grass, mature bushes and large trees. The building is in fair condition.

*P3b. Resource Attributes:  
(List attributes and codes)  
HP2

*P4. Resources Present:  
☑ Building  
☐ Structure  
☐ Object  
☐ Site  
☐ District  
☐ Element of District  
☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

*P5a. Photo or Drawing:  
(Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

*P5b. Description of Photo:  
(Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

View of west and south elevations; June 6, 2013; Photograph #3

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  
☐ Prehistoric  
☐ Historic  
☐ Both

*P7. Owner and Address:  
Unknown

*P8. Recorded by:  
(Name, affiliation, and address)

Carrie O. Wills, FirstCarbon Solutions,  
2633 Camino Ramon, San Ramon, CA  
94583

*P9. Date Recorded:  
June 6, 2013

*P10. Survey Type:  
(Describe)

Reconnaissance

*P11. Report Citation:  
Phase I  
Cultural Resources Assessment  
Montgomery 7 Project  
565 Lorraine Avenue, City of San Jose,  
Santa Clara County, California

*Attachments:  
☑ NONE  
☐ Location Map  
☐ Sketch Map  
☐ Continuation Sheet  
☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record  
☐ Archaeological Record  
☐ District Record  
☐ Linear Feature Record  
☐ Milling Station Record  
☐ Rock Art Record  
☐ Artifact Record  
☐ Photograph Record  
☐ Other (List):
P1. Other Identifier:

*Resource Name or #: FCS#2

P2. Location:

- Not for Publication  ❑ Unrestricted
- County: Santa Clara  (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
- USGS 7.5' Quad: San Jose West  Date: 1979  T 7S; R 1E; of Sec 18; M.D. B.M.
- Address: 565 Lorraine  City: San Jose  Zip: 95110
- UTM: Zone: 10; mE/mN (G.P.S.)
- Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:

  From I-280 North, take Bird Avenue exit, travel ~0.6 mile, continue onto South Montgomery Street ~350 feet, turn right onto Lorraine Avenue, 565 is on left.

P3a. Description:

The subject property is a ca. 1920, one-story, symmetrical, rectangular shaped, Craftsman style, single family residence located in a mixed commercial and residential neighborhood. The building has a concrete foundation, wood clapboard siding, and a medium pitch front gable roof. The roof has exposed rafter tails and composition shingles. The residence contains a centered front porch accessed by a narrow set of stairs. The porch has half height wood siding walls. The porch has a front gable roof over the porch area which is supported by wood posts. The main entrance is a single, wood framed, wood door. The front entrance is flanked by single, wood framed, double hung sash style windows. Windows are placed at irregular intervals along the sides and rear of the building and include wood framed, double hung sash or casement style windows. Some windows have metal screens. The rear of the building contains a small enclosed wood porch with a set of wood framed, fixed pane windows. A brick fireplace is present on the west elevation. The side of the residence contains a corrugated plastic roof which serves to delineate a small carport. A concrete driveway leads to the carport area. The residence is sited on a small residential lot with chain link fencing. Landscaping is minimal and includes grass, mature bushes and trees. The building is in fair condition.

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP2

P4. Resources Present:

- Building  ❑ Structure  ❑ Object  ❑ Site  ❑ District  ❑ Element of District  ❑ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photo or Drawing:

(Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo:

View of east and south elevations, facing northwest; June 6, 2013; Photograph #38

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

- Historic  ❑ Prehistoric  ❑ Both

P7. Owner and Address:

Unknown

P8. Recorded by:

Carrie D. Wills, FirstCarbon Solutions, 2633 Camino Ramon, San Ramon, CA 94583

P9. Date Recorded:

June 6, 2013

P10. Survey Type:

Reconnaissance

P11. Report Citation:

Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment
Montgomery 7 Project
565 Lorraine Avenue,
City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, California

*Attachments: ❑NONE  ❑Location Map  ❑Sketch Map  ❑Continuation Sheet  ❑Building, Structure, and Object Record  ❑Archaeological Record  ❑District Record  ❑Linear Feature Record  ❑Milling Station Record  ❑Rock Art Record  ❑Artifact Record  ❑Photograph Record  ❑Other (List):
Appendix F:
City of San José Historical Resources Tally
# HISTORIC EVALUATION SHEET

**Historic Resource Name:** Residence at 593 Lorraine Avenue

*Note: Complete all blanks. Use spaces to justify ratings. For example, a rating of "E" on No. 9, Age, would be justified by "Built in 1850".*

## A. VISUAL QUALITY/DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
<td>Some decorative elements present</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td>Craftsman Style Home</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DESIGNER</td>
<td>Designer Unknown</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Standard Craftsman Construction</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. HISTORY/ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PERSON/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>No connections known</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>No connections known</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PATTERNS</td>
<td>Commercial and residential development post 1850</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Built circa 1920</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C. ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CONTINUITY</td>
<td>No contribution to continuity</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SETTING</td>
<td>No contribution to context setting</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FAMILIARITY</td>
<td>Not particularly conspicuous/familiar</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. INTEGRITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>Fair overall condition</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS</td>
<td>Minor alterations</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL REMOVALS</td>
<td>No remains</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>Has not been moved</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E. REVERSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
<td>Reversible changes</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVIEWED BY:** ______________________  **DATE:** __________

# EVALUATION TALLY SHEET (Part I)

## A. VISUAL QUALITY/DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXTERIOR</td>
<td>E 16 VG 12 G 6 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. STYLE</td>
<td>E 10 VG 8 G 4 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DESIGNER</td>
<td>E 6 VG 4 G 2 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>E 10 VG 8 G 4 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS</td>
<td>E 8 VG 6 G 3 FP 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** 14

## B. HISTORY/ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. PERSON/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>E 20 VG 15 G 7 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVENT</td>
<td>E 20 VG 15 G 7 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PATTERNS</td>
<td>E 12 VG 9 G 5 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AGE</td>
<td>E 8 VG 6 G 3 FP 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** 8

## C. ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. CONTINUITY</td>
<td>E 8 VG 6 G 3 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SETTING</td>
<td>E 6 VG 4 G 2 FP 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FAMILIARITY</td>
<td>E 10 VG 8 G 4 FP 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** 0

**"A" & "C" SUBTOTAL:** 14

**"B" SUBTOTAL:** 8

**TOTAL:** 22

(Sum of A, B & C)
### EVALUATION TALLY SHEET (Part II)

#### D. INTEGRITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>$0.05 \times 22 = 1.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>$0.05 \times 14 = 0.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>$0.03 \times 8 = 0.24$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL REMOVALS</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>$0.20 \times 14 = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>$0.10 \times 8 = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>$0.10 \times 8 = 0.8$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From A, B, C Subtotals
*From A and C Subtotals
*From B Subtotal
*From B Subtotal

**INTEGRITY DEDUCTIONS SUBTOTAL:** 2.84

**ADJUSTED SUBTOTAL:** 22 - 2.84 = 19.16

(Preliminary Total minus Integrity Deductions)

#### E. REVERSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 22.16
HISTORIC EVALUATION SHEET

Historic Resource Name: Residence at 565 Lorraine Avenue

Note: Complete all blanks. Use spaces to justify ratings. For example, a rating of "E" on No. 9. Age, would be justified by "Built in 1850".

A. VISUAL QUALITY/DESIGN

1. EXTERIOR Some design elements present E VG G FP
2. STYLE Craftsman Style Home E VG G FP
3. DESIGNER Designer Unknown E VG G FP
4. CONSTRUCTION Standard Craftsman Construction E VG G FP
5. SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS None E VG G FP

B. HISTORY/ASSOCIATION

6. PERSON/ORGANIZATION No Connections known E VG G FP
7. EVENT No Connections known E VG G FP
8. PATTERNS Commercial + Residential development post 1850 E VG G FP
9. AGE Built in 1918 E VG G FP

C. ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXT

10. CONTINUITY No Contribution to Continuity E VG G FP
11. SETTING No Contribution to Current Setting E VG G FP
12. FAMILIARITY Not particularly conspicuous/Familiar E VG G FP

D. INTEGRITY

13. CONDITION Fair overall condition E VG G FP
14. EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS Some Attention E VG G FP
15. STRUCTURAL REMOVALS No Removals E VG G FP
16. SITE Has not been moved E VG G FP

E. REVERSIBILITY

17. EXTERIOR Reversible Changes E VG G FP

REVIEWED BY: ___________________________ DATE: ___________________________
# EVALUATION TALLY SHEET (Part I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. VISUAL QUALITY/DESIGN</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXTERIOR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. STYLE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DESIGNER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. HISTORY/ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. PERSON/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVENT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PATTERNS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AGE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXT</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. CONTINUITY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SETTING</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FAMILIARITY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"A" & "C" SUBTOTAL: 14
"B" SUBTOTAL: 8
**TOTAL:** 22
(Sum of A, B & C)
### EVALUATION TALLY SHEET (Part II)

**D. INTEGRITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. CONDITION</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. STRUCTURAL REMOVALS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SITE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ .05 \times 22 = 1.1 \]
\[ .10 \times 14 = 1.4 \]
\[ .05 \times 8 = .4 \]
\[ .20 \times 14 = 0 \]
\[ .10 \times 8 = 0 \]
\[ .10 \times 8 = .8 \]

**INTEGRITY DEDUCTIONS SUBTOTAL:** 3.7

**ADJUSTED SUBTOTAL:** 22 - 3.7 = 18.3

(Preliminary Total minus Integrity Deductions)

---

**E. REVERSIBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. EXTERIOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 21.3