

4.4 Cultural Resources

4.4.1 Introduction

This section evaluates the potential for the proposed project, which includes the Housing Element Update (HEU), the Stanford Community Plan (SCP) update, and related rezonings (collectively, the “project”) to result in substantial adverse effects related to cultural resources. Below, the Environmental Setting portion of this section includes descriptions of existing conditions relevant to cultural resources. Further below, existing plans and policies relevant to cultural resources associated with implementation of the proposed project are provided in the Regulatory Setting section. Finally, the impact discussion evaluates potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from implementation of the HEU in the context of existing conditions.

While this EIR is a program-level EIR and covers the entirety of Santa Clara County, the County has identified housing opportunity sites where housing could be developed to meet the County’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation. Additionally, the action would include an update to the Stanford Community Plan (SCP), which includes expanded housing opportunities on the Stanford campus, as well as designation of a potential future elementary school site on the Stanford campus within the West Campus Development District. Accordingly, this section provides a site-level analysis of potential impacts to cultural resources within the housing opportunity sites and the portion of the West Campus Development District that has been identified as a potential future school site, as well as a program-level analysis for the entire County.

The term *indigenous*, rather than *prehistoric*, is used as a synonym for Native American (except when quoting), while *pre-contact* is used as a chronological adjective to refer to the period prior to Euroamerican arrival in Santa Clara County. *Indigenous* and *pre-contact* are often, but not always, synonymous, since the former refers to a cultural affiliation and the latter chronological order.

Notice of Preparation Comments

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR was circulated on August 8, 2022, and a scoping meeting was held on August 23, 2022. A revised NOP reflecting changes to the HEU’s list of opportunity sites was circulated on March 21, 2023. Both NOPs circulated for a period of 30 days, and the NOPs and the comments received during their respective comment periods can be found in **Appendix A** of this EIR.

Information Sources

The primary sources of information referenced in this section included those listed below. Please note that a full list of references for this topic can be found at the end of this section.

- Santa Clara County General Plan (1994);
- Stanford University Community Plan (2000);
- County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement (Rev. 2012); and

- Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory Update: South County (2003).

4.4.2 Environmental Setting

Archaeological Setting

Categorizing the pre-contact period into broad cultural stages allows researchers to describe a broad range of archaeological resources with similar cultural patterns and components during a given time frame, thereby creating a regional chronology. This section provides a brief discussion of the pre-contact chronology for the area known now as Santa Clara County.

Archaeologists developed individual cultural chronological sequences tailored to the archaeology and material culture of each subregion of California. Each of these sequences is based principally on the presence of distinctive cultural traits and stratigraphic separation of deposits. Milliken et al. (2007) provide a framework for the interpretation of the San Francisco Bay Area. The authors divided human history in California into three periods: the *Early Period*, the *Middle Period*, and the *Late Period*. In many parts of California, four periods are defined; the fourth being the *Paleoindian Period* (11500–8000 B.C.), characterized by big-game hunters occupying broad geographic areas. Evidence of human habitation during the Paleoindian Period has not yet been discovered in the San Francisco Bay Area. Economic patterns, stylistic aspects, and regional phases further subdivide cultural periods into shorter phases. This scheme uses economic and technological types, socio-politics, trade networks, population density, and variations of artifact types to differentiate between cultural periods.

During the Early Period (Lower Archaic, 8000–3500 B.C.), geographic mobility continued from the Paleoindian Period and is characterized by the milling slab and handstone as well as large wide-stemmed and leaf-shaped projectile points. The first cut shell beads and the mortar and pestle are first documented in burials during the Early Period (Middle Archaic, 3500–500 B.C.), indicating the beginning of a shift to sedentism. During the Middle Period, which includes the Lower Middle Period (Initial Upper Archaic, 500 B.C.–A.D. 430), and Upper Middle Period (Late Upper Archaic, A.D. 430–1050), geographic mobility may have continued, although groups began to establish longer term base camps in localities from which a more diverse range of resources could be exploited. The first rich black middens are recorded from this period. The addition of milling tools, obsidian, and chert concave-base projectile points, as well as the occurrence of sites in a wider range of environments, suggest that the economic base was more diverse. By the Upper Middle Period, mobility was being replaced by the development of numerous small villages. Around A.D. 430, a dramatic cultural disruption occurred as evidenced by the sudden collapse of the *Olivella* saucer bead trade network. During the Initial Late Period (Lower Emergent, A.D. 1050–1550), social complexity developed toward lifeways of large, central villages with resident political leaders and specialized activity sites. Artifacts associated with the period include the bow and arrow, small corner-notched projectile points, and a diversity of beads and ornaments.

Ethnographic Setting

A compilation of ethnohistorical, historical, and archeological data indicates that the San Francisco Bay Area was inhabited by a cultural group known as the Ohlone before the arrival of Europeans (Milliken, 1995). While traditional anthropological literature portrayed the Ohlone peoples as having a static culture, today it is better understood that many variations of culture and ideology existed within and between villages. While these static descriptions of separations between native cultures of California make it an easier task for ethnographers to describe past behaviors, this approach masks Native adaptability and self-identity. California's Native Americans never saw themselves as members of larger cultural groups, as described by anthropologists. Instead, they saw themselves as members of specific village communities, perhaps related to others by marriage or kinship ties, but viewing the village as the primary identifier of their origins.

Levy (1978) describes the language group spoken by the Ohlone (often referred to as "Costanoan" in the literature). This term is originally derived from a Spanish word designating the coastal peoples of Central California. Today Costanoan is used as a linguistic term that refers to a larger language family that included distinct sociopolitical groups that spoke at least eight languages of the Penutian language group. The Ohlone once occupied a large territory from San Francisco Bay in the north to the Big Sur and Salinas Rivers in the south.

Economically, the Ohlone engaged in hunting and gathering. Their territory encompassed both coastal and open valley environments that contained a wide variety of resources, including grass seeds, acorns, bulbs and tubers, bear, deer, elk, antelope, a variety of bird species, and rabbit and other small mammals. The Ohlone acknowledged private ownership of goods and songs, and village ownership of rights to land and/or natural resources; they appear to have aggressively protected their village territories, requiring monetary payment for access rights in the form of clam shell beads, and even shooting trespassers if caught.

In 1770, the Ohlone lived in approximately 50 separate and politically autonomous nations. The Ohlone in Santa Clara County, spoke Tamien, also known as Tamyen or Santa Clara Costanoan. During the Mission Period (1770 to 1835), native populations, especially along the California coast, were brought—usually by force—to the missions by the Spanish missionaries to provide labor. The missionization caused the Ohlone people to experience cataclysmic changes in almost all areas of their life, particularly a massive decline in population caused by introduced diseases and declining birth rate, resulting in large part from colonization by the Spanish missionaries. Following the secularization of the missions by the Mexican government in the 1830s, most Native Americans gradually left the missions and established rancherias in the surrounding areas (Levy, 1978).

After European contact, Ohlone life ways were severely disrupted by missionization, disease, and displacement. Today the Ohlone still have a strong presence in the San Francisco Bay Area and are very interested in their historic-era and pre-contact past.

Historic Setting

History

The County has prepared two context statements, *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement* and *Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory Update*, to establish the chronology of development in Santa Clara County. While the HEU covers all of Santa Clara County, the HEU housing opportunity sites are either vacant lots or developed with 20th century buildings and structures. Therefore, the following history, which is taken from the *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement*, focuses on 20th century development:¹

The business of fruit production, the combination of growing, packing and canning, continued to be the focus of Santa Clara County agriculture in the early twentieth century. Fruit production peaked in the 1920s. With the increased ratio of crop value to land unit, large farms that had evolved in the nineteenth century out of the ranchos became unnecessary. The increased land prices, cultivation costs, and growing population of ready buyers led to the subdivision of large farmlands into highly specialized “fruit ranches” that were 3 to 50 acres in size.

The introduction of the automobile and commercial development of the trucking industry in the early part of the twentieth century had a significant impact on land use patterns throughout Santa Clara County. Until about 1910, local residents relied on horse-drawn vehicles for local transportation and the railroad, with its many depots, for longer distances. The automobile greatly extended the distance an individual could travel to acquire goods and services.

INTERWAR PERIOD (1918-1945)

In the early 1920s, the Western Pacific Railroad alignment between Fremont and San José was constructed. The freight (1921) and passenger depots (1923) were built on East Santa Clara Street between North Twenty-Seventh and North Twenty-Eighth Streets (Holmes 1985). The construction of this railroad changed land uses in some areas from residential and agricultural to industrial use. In 1931, Western Pacific ended passenger service and the East San José passenger depot was closed. Both depots have since been demolished. In 1982, Western Pacific was merged with Union Pacific, which still owns the old right-of-way through East San José (Holmes 1985). In 1927, the Southern Pacific Railroad constructed the Newhall Yard on the old Stockton Ranch property east of the City of Santa Clara.

By 1928, all of San José’s city streets had been paved and old wooden bridges were being replaced by concrete bridges. In 1930, San José had the greatest weekday auto traffic count in California and was the only city in the state whose weekday traffic count exceeded that of holidays (James and McMurry 1933). Highway improvements included the widening of the San Francisco and Oakland

¹ Dill Design Group, *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement*, revised February 2012, page 23.

highways in 1929-1932, the construction of the Bayshore Highway in the Santa Clara County in 1927 and realigning and widening the Santa Cruz Highway. With increased automobile competition, streetcar lines were abandoned in the 1920s and 1930s and replaced by private bus lines. In the mid-1950s, Bayshore Freeway (101) was completed, bisecting the East San José area.

World War II, like the Gold Rush a century before, had a major effect on the changing complexion of Santa Clara County. The San Francisco Bay area was the gateway to the Pacific theater from 1941 to 1945. The large naval air station at Moffett Field became a center of much activity. Thousands of military personnel were brought to the area for training and processing, exposing the Santa Clara Valley to public view.

Events at Stanford University were also setting the stage for significant developments in the post-war period. Frederick Terman became an engineering professor at Stanford in 1930. Under his guidance, the university became a leader in the field of electronics. Many of Stanford's pre-war graduates played important roles in the post-war development of the local electronics industry.

PERIOD OF INDUSTRIALIZATION AND SUBURBANIZATION (1945-1975)

William Hewlett and David Packard, two of Professor Terman's students at Stanford University, developed electronic test equipment in a Palo Alto garage in 1939. During World War II, this small company obtained government contracts and continued to grow during the post-war period. In 1954, the Stanford Industrial Park was established attracting the companies of Hewlett-Packard and the Varian brothers (also students of Terman) as well as Sylvania, Philco-Ford, General Electric, and Lockheed's research laboratory. These companies formed the nucleus of what became known as Silicon Valley. Soon after World War II, the business community launched an active campaign to attract new non-agricultural related industries to Santa Clara County. Early industries that established plants in the Santa Clara Valley included Chicago's International Mineral and Chemical Corporation's Accent plant in 1946, the General Electric plant in the early 1950s, and in the 1950s International Business Machines (IBM) began to expand their West Coast operations in San José that were established in 1943. By the 1960s, Santa Clara County's economic base was dependent upon the electronic and defense industries. The 1970s saw the development of the personal computer industry stimulated by Apple's "user friendly" computers.

In 1949, the San José Airport was completed on the remaining undeveloped Stockton Ranch acreage. Attracted by the increasing job market, the population of the Santa Clara Valley experienced phenomenal growth after 1950. Between 1950 and 1975 the population increased from 95,000 to over 500,000. Correspondingly, the municipal boundaries of the City of San José spread from

17 square miles in 1950 to over 120 square miles in 1970. Orchards were replaced with subdivisions and shopping centers. San José's expansion and urban growth can be directly related to the appointment of City Manager Dutch Hamann in 1950 by the pro-growth city council. Under Hamann's pro-annexation policy, San José annexed 1,419 outlying areas by the end of 1969 when Hamann left the position. Between 1950 and 1969, residential subdivisions replaced orchards at amazing speed. Rural roads were widened into freeways, and expressways and boulevards were lined with restaurants and automobile salesrooms. The automobile was the basic mechanism that allowed the development of the Santa Clara Valley. In the years following World War II the American public intensified its love affair with the automobile. Beginning in the early years of the twentieth century, America, and California in particular, became a car-oriented society by mid-century. This aspect of American culture is reflected in the architecture and resource types of the contemporary period. Suburban housing tracts are characterized by prominent, attached two or three car garages. Commercially, the Industrialization and Urbanization Period is characterized by the proliferation of fast food chains and other quick service, car-oriented establishments.

Santa Clara County cities and towns along major transportation arteries grew exponentially. The commercial migration, once centered in downtown San José, started in 1956 when the first store at Valley Fair, San José's first regional shopping center, opened for business. Major and minor strip mall shopping centers sprung up to serve outlying residential areas throughout the County, attracting additional residential and commercial development.

Palo Alto²

The following is an excerpt from the *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement* prepared in 2012:

Established at the same time as Stanford University, Palo Alto was incorporated in 1894. Conceived by the Stanfords and originally built as a "dry" town near the University's student population, Palo Alto serves as a home and central shopping area for the professors who work at the university. Located on the San Francisco Peninsula, not far from the bay and extending to the foothills of the Coastal Range, this city of over 58,000 is on the northern border of Santa Clara County, between unincorporated Santa Clara County and the cities of Mountain View and Los Altos. To the north, Palo Alto abuts San Mateo County, including the communities of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto.

² Dill Design Group, *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement*, revised February 2012, page 77.

Stanford University

Stanford University is a private university that was founded in 1855 by Leland and Jane Stanford. From its inception, Stanford University was planned as a residential campus. Frederick Law Olmsted's 1887 master plan for Stanford University included a residential community surrounding the core academic campus with neighborhoods radiating diagonally from all four corners of the main quad.³ It is largely located in an unincorporated portion of Santa Clara County.

San José⁴

The following is an excerpt from the *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement* prepared in 2012:

The largest city in Santa Clara County is San José, one of the largest cities in the United States as well. Its area encompasses 174 square miles, and almost 900,000 people today call it home. The city boundaries stretch throughout the Santa Clara Valley and surrounding foothills. The city extends from Alviso on San Francisco Bay to Coyote at the head of the South County and from Milpitas and the unincorporated east foothills to a complex western border that abuts the cities of Mountain View, Santa Clara, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Campbell, and the town of Los Gatos, as well as numerous unincorporated County pockets. At its beginning in 1777, it was one of only two secular Spanish developments in California (along with Los Angeles) it was neither mission nor presidio when most Spanish settlements were one or the other. It was the first capital of the State of California, incorporated in 1850.

Current Setting

This current setting focuses on the housing opportunity sites, which are spread out throughout the County in the following areas and a possible future elementary school site at Stanford's campus.

Stanford University

There are three housing opportunity sites on the Stanford University campus (**Table 4.4-1**). Two of the sites are on Quarry Road near El Camino Real (APN 142-04-036); they are in an area of commercial development on the northern edge of the Stanford University Campus. The two Quarry Road parcels flank the Stanford Health Care facility at 211 Quarry Road and are across the street from the Stanford Shopping Center. The sites on Quarry Road do not include any historic-age buildings or structures.

³ Angoloti, Elena, Sapna Martatia, Felicia Bill, Laura Jones, and Koji Ozawa, *The Row Neighborhood: Historic Context and District Evaluation*, 2015, p. 5.

⁴ Dill Design Group, *County of Santa Clara Historic Context Statement*, revised February 2012, page 78.

**TABLE 4.4-1
 HOUSING OPPORTUNITY SITES - STANFORD**

Address / APN	Description	Eligibility
Quarry Road / 142-04-036	Vacant lot	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
Quarry Road / 142-04-036	Parking lot	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
Escondido Village / 142-04-036 and 142-09-006	Graduate residential housing	Peter Couatts Library/Ayshire Farm – Local Landmark (142-09-006). Additional potentially historic-age buildings/structures present (142-04-036)

The third housing opportunity site on the Stanford University campus is located in Escondido Village, a graduate residential community on Escondido Road between Campus Drive and Stanford Avenue. The Peter Couatts Library/Ayshire Farm, an eligible local Landmark, is located on this site.

A relocated potential future school location is in the West Campus Development District. The Palo Alto Stock Farm Horse Barn (a.k.a. Red Barn), a National Register listed building and local Landmark, and the golf course, which has not previously been evaluated as a potential historical resource, are in the West Campus Development District. However, the school site would not be located at either one of these locations.

San José

There are 18 housing opportunity sites in six areas of San José. The first area, which includes 1515 and 1587 Nort Capitol Avenue, is adjacent to I-680. The combined site is currently occupied by a VTA Park and Ride Lot (1515 North Capitol Avenue, APN 245-01-004) and a rural residential parcel (1587 North Capitol Avenue, APN 245-01-003) (**Table 4.4-2**). The area is generally characterized by residential development, primarily single-family homes, with a small shopping center across Hostetter Road to the northwest. The VTA Park and Ride Lot does not appear to have any historic-age buildings present. The rural residential parcel appears to have historic-age buildings/structures present.

The second area includes seven properties on Vaughn Avenue, West San Carlos Avenue, and Rutland Avenue in the Burbank neighborhood. West San Carlos Avenue is a commercial corridor with residential neighborhoods to the north and south.

The third area includes two properties on Thornton Way and Moorpark Avenue, southeast of the State Route 17 and I-280. The area includes a mix of single family and multi-family homes as well as commercial and office buildings.

The fourth area includes one property on Camden Avenue in the Cambrian Park neighborhood. The commercial property is located on the southwest corner of Camden and Leigh avenues. This portion of Camden Avenue is a combination of residential and commercial properties.

**TABLE 4.4-2
HOUSING OPPORTUNITY SITES – SAN JOSÉ**

Address / APN	Description	Eligibility
1587 N. Capitol Avenue	Accessory building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
1515 N. Capitol Avenue	Orchard	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
974 Vaughn Avenue / 277-06-025	Residence	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
312 Vaughn Avenue / 277-07-027	VTA Park and Ride Lot	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
1930-1936 W. San Carlos / 277-07-028 and -029	Auto Center West – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
1924 W. San Carlos / 277-08-030	San José Tattoo – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
1904 W. San Carlos / 277-08-031	Commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
308 Rutland Avenue / 277-12-027	Commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
1800 W. San Carlos / 277-12-029	Cash 4 Cars – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
2400 Moorpark Avenue / 282-02-037	Health center – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
800 Thornton Way / 282-03-016	Commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
14520 Camden Avenue / 419-12-044	Strip mall (Cask N Flask Liquor, Subs Alicious, cellphone repair, barbershop) – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
350 N. White Road / 599-01-064	7-11 – commercial building	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
282 Vista Avenue / 599-39-047	Residence	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
125 Kirk Avenue / 601-07-066	Residence	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures present
14830 Corralitos Lane / 612-21-004	Vacant lot	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
3504 East Hills Drive / 601-25-119	Vacant lot	N/A – no historic-age buildings or structures are visible from the public right-of-way
S. Watt and Tully roads (649-23-001 and -023)	Golf course	Potentially historic-age buildings/structures/landscape present

The fifth area includes five properties on N. White Road, Vista Avenue, Kirk Avenue, Corralitos Lane and East Hills Drive between I-680 and the foothills. The North White Road property is a commercial building north of McKee Road in an area of concentrated commercial development surrounded by residential buildings. The Vista Avenue and Corralitos Lane properties are in the East Foothills and Alum Rock neighborhoods. The Kirk Avenue and East Hills Drive properties are in the Alum Rock neighborhood.

The sixth area includes two parcels (649-23-001 and -023) on South White and Tully roads that constitute the former and decommissioned Pleasant Hills Golf Course. The golf course was constructed circa 1967 and closed in 2004.

Previously Identified Cultural Resources

For the purposes of this section, cultural resources are defined as physical evidence of a place of past human activity, including sites, objects, landscapes, or structures of significance to a group of people traditionally associated with it. Archaeological resources can be both pre-contact and historic-era and consist of cultural resources, which are on the surface or in the subsurface. Historic resources are historic-era (i.e., 50 years old or older) buildings or structures that have been determined as significant and eligible for, or listed on, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and/or the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and/or the Santa Clara County Heritage Resources Inventory.

ESA completed records searches at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System on September 14, 2022 (File No. 22-0436), October 27, 2022 (File No. 22-0691), and January 17, 2023 (File No. 22-1068). The reviews focused on the proposed housing opportunity sites and potential future school location on Stanford's campus. Previous surveys, studies, and site records were accessed. Records were also reviewed in the Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) for Santa Clara County, which contains information on places of recognized historical significance including those evaluated for listing in the National Register, the California Register, the California Inventory of Historical Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. The purpose of the records search was to (1) determine whether known cultural resources have been recorded within the County; (2) assess the likelihood for unrecorded cultural resources to be present based on historical references and the distribution of nearby sites; and (3) develop a context for the identification and preliminary evaluation of cultural resources.

Identified Historic Resources

The following provides a list of previously identified historic resources listed locally on the Historic Resources Inventory (**Table 4.4-3**). There are no listed National or California register properties on any of the housing opportunity sites. The reconnaissance survey in October 2022 provided important information on the current general architectural setting of the housing opportunity sites, however, it did not verify the previously identified historic resources or identify any additional resources since evaluation was outside of the scope of this effort.

**TABLE 4.4-3
PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Name of Property (if applicable)	Location	Source
Coyote Depot Complex	8215 Monterey Road, Coyote	HRI Update
Coyote Grange Hall	8140 Monterey Road, Coyote	HRI Update
Coyote Ranch	No. 1 Coyote Ranch Road, Coyote	HRI Update
Old Stone Building	9500 Malech Road, Coyote	HRI Update
Orvis Stevens Ranch	9611 Malech Road, Coyote	HRI Update
Bell's Station	15110 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Bertero Winery	4100B Hecker Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Bloomfield Ranch	Monterey Road and Bloomfield Avenue, Gilroy	HRI Update
Bonesio Winery	11550 Watsonville Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Calhoun Ranch	4355 Monterey Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Casa Del Rancho	610 San Felipe Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Cordes House	10550 Watsonville Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Edwin Willson House and Barn	6650 Holsclaw Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Eschenburg-Silva Barn	3665 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Fellom Ranch House	3575 Leavesley Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Frank Norris Cabin	7155L Redwood Retreat Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Fraser-Ellis House	4945 Frazier Lake Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Furlong House	6860 Holsclaw Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Gilroy Hot Springs	13800 Gilroy Hot Springs Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Harrison-Clifton-Phegley House	2080 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Hartshorn Ranch	7949 Whitehurst Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Henry Miller Family Cemetery	4355 Monterey Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Hirasake-Sakai Ranch	800 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Horace Wilson Ranch	1980 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Kickham Ranch	7290 Holsclaw Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Mayock House	Gavilan College, Gilroy	HRI Update
Milne House	8440 Burchell Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Morandi Winery-Cassa Brothers	4525 Hecker Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Nelson-Jones-Hoenck House	9480 Murray Avenue, Gilroy	HRI Update
Rofinella Winery	4390 Hecker Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
San Ysidro Presbyterian Church	6780 Holsclaw Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
San Felipe Church	Gavilan College, Gilroy	HRI Update
Uriah Wood House	5411 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Vanumanutangi	7155I Redwood Retreat Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
White-Sturla Ranch	1855 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy	HRI Update
Barney Machado Barn	14905 Santa Teresa Boulevard	HRI Update
Bevilacqua House #1	675 Peebles Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Bevilacqua House #2	565 Peebles Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update

**TABLE 4.4-3 (CONTINUED)
 PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Name of Property (if applicable)	Location	Source
Castillon Farm	2214 Tennant Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Cochrane-Jackson House	6000 E. Dunne Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Coe-PineRidge Ranch	East end of Dunne Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Colombini House	350 Peebles Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Emilio Guglielmo Winery	1480 East Main Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Fountain Oaks Ranch	2880 Tennant Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Kellogg House	16010 Carey Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Machado School	15130 Sycamore Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Malaguerra Winery	East end of Burnett Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Marchetti Winery	12775 Uvas Road, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Miller Summer House Ruins	7850 Pole Line Road, Gilroy	HRI Update
Noll Ranch	1855 East Main Street, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Stephens-Thomas House and Barn	17350 Hill Road, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Tilton House	19665 Hale Avenue, Morgan Hill	HRI Update
Arnold House	455 E. Fitzgerald Avenue #E, San Martin	HRI Update
San Martin Presbyterian Church	13200 Lincoln Avenue, San Martin	HRI Update
San Martin Winery	13000 Depot Street, San Martin	HRI Update
Shield's House	13310 Lincoln Avenue, San Martin	HRI Update
Baldanzi House	468 Leigh Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Baldwin House	334 Rutland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Bern House	19 Boston Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Bern's Court	12 Boston Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Brooklyn Avenue Bungalow Court	26 Brooklyn Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Brooklyn Avenue House	139 Brooklyn Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Buehring House	136 Cleveland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Dorsa House	36 Brooklyn Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Douglas Street House	1425 Douglas Street, San José	HRI Update
Drew House	403 Leigh Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Elliott House	365 Raymond Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Fierro House	102 Topeka Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Hiatt House	101 Wabash Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Hinkley House	393 Rutland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Leland Avenue House	336 Leland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Mileham House	484 Arleta Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Oteri House	57 Boston Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Owen House	30 Boston Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Page Street House	319 Page Street, San José	HRI Update
Perriera House	383 Leland Avenue, San José	HRI Update

**TABLE 4.4-3 (CONTINUED)
PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Name of Property (if applicable)	Location	Source
Pioneer Grocery Store	398 Irving Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Richards House	404 Leland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Richmond Avenue House No. 2	413 Richmond Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Rutland Avenue House	482 Rutland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Sellitti House	367 Arleta Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Sidensol House	492 Arleta Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Thomsen-McCrory House	39 Wabash Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Vizzusi House	327 Leland Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Wabash Avenue House	47 Wabash Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Willard Avenue House	410 South Willard Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Montebello School	15101 Montebello Road, Cupertino	HRI Update
Perrone Ranch	17100 Montebello Road, Cupertino	HRI Update
Picchetti Ranch	13100 Montebello Road, Cupertino	HRI Update
Woodhills	22800 Prospect Road, Cupertino	HRI Update
Hale Ranch Tank House	410 Border Hill Drive, Los Altos	HRI Update
Kotano-En	Ravine Road, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Alma College Complex	19480 Bear Creek Road, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Averill House	22951 Summit Road, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Bohemia	22160 Loma Prieta Way, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Holy City	21200 Old Santa Cruz Highway, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Menuhin House	Alma Bridge Road, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Montezuma School for Boys	19480 Bear Creek Road, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Schultheis House	Old Santa Cruz Highway, Los Gatos	HRI Update
Wright's Station	Austrian Dam and Los Gatos Creek	HRI Update
Curtner-Weller Estate	1414 El Camino Higuera, Milpitas	HRI Update
Laguna Cemetery	Ed Levin Park, Milpitas	HRI Update
Laguna School	4001 New Calaveras Road, Milpitas	HRI Update
Casa Grande	21350 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
Employees Cottages	21650, 21660, 21676, 21684, 21692, Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
Hacienda Cemetery	Bertram Road, San José	HRI Update
Hacienda Hotel	21747 Bertram Road, San José	HRI Update
Helping Hand	21756 Bertram Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 1	21472 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 2	21474 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 3	21490 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 4	21498 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 5	21506 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 6	21512 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update

TABLE 4.4-3 (CONTINUED)
PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES

Name of Property (if applicable)	Location	Source
House No. 11	21550 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 12	21560 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 13	21570 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 14	21590 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 15	21600 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
House No. 16	21620 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
Pfeiffer House	18611 Graystone Lane, San José	HRI Update
St. Anthony's Church	21800 Bertram Road, San José	HRI Update
Toll Gate House	21744 Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
Vichy Springs	Almaden Road, San José	HRI Update
Bailey House	23201 McKean Road, San José	HRI Update
Belknap House	5325 Alum Rock Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Cotttle Ranch	5285 Snel Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Hillside Orchard	509 Porter Lane, San José	HRI Update
Holt House	2662 Monterey Road, San José	HRI Update
Joseph D. Grant Ranch	18450 Mt. Hamilton Road, San José	HRI Update
Lick Observatory	Mount Hamilton Road, San José	HRI Update
Miguelita Creek Bridge	Alum Rock Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Novell-D-Amico House	11150 Mount Hamilton Road, San José	HRI Update
Rancho Canada de Pala	16100 Mount Hamilton Road, San José	HRI Update
Valley Medical Center Building H12	751 South Bascom Avenue, San José	HRI Update
Bernal-Johnson-Norred Ranch	350 Bernal Road, San José	HRI Update
Jacoba Bernal-Fisher House	272 Curie Drive, San José	HRI Update
Pedro Bernal House	400 Bernal Road, San José	HRI Update
400 Bernal Road, San José	14831 Pierce Road, Saratoga	HRI Update
Villa Montalvo	15400 Montalvo Road, Saratoga	HRI Update
Dyer House	Skyline Boulevard, Saratoga	HRI Update
Welch-Hurst	Welch-Hurst House, Saratoga	HRI Update
Main Quad and Memorial Church	450 Serra Mall, Stanford University	HRI Update
Cecil H. Green Library West	459 Lasuen Mall, Stanford University	HRI Update
Cooksey House	550 San Juan Street, Stanford University	HRI Update
Dunn-Bacon House	565 Mayfield Avenue, Stanford University	HRI Update
Durand-Kirkman House	623 Cabrillo Avenue, Stanford University	HRI Update
Electioneer Statue	Fremont Road, Stanford University	HRI Update
Encina Hall	616 Serra Street, Stanford University	HRI Update
Escondite Cottage	890 Escondido Road, Stanford University	HRI Update
Fire Truck House	433 Santa Teresa St, Stanford University	HRI Update
Frenchman's Tower	Frenchman's Tower, Stanford University	HRI Update

**TABLE 4.4-3 (CONTINUED)
PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Name of Property (if applicable)	Location	Source
Griffen-Drell House	570 Alvarado Row, Stanford University	HRI Update
Hanna House	737 Frenchman's Rd, Stanford University	HRI Update
Hesperides	766 Santa Ynez Ave, Stanford University	HRI Update
Hoover Tower	550 Serra Mall, Stanford University	HRI Update
The Knoll	660 Lomita Court, Stanford University	HRI Update
Leland Stanford Jr. Museum	Lomita Drive, Stanford University	HRI Update
Owen House	553 Salvatierra Walk, Stanford University	HRI Update
Red Barn-Palo Alto Stock Farm	Fremont Road, Stanford University	HRI Update
Stanford Barn-Palo Alto Winery	700 Welch Road, Stanford University	HRI Update
Thomas Welton Stanford Gallery	419 Lasuen Mall, Stanford University	HRI Update
Tower House-Frenchman's Library	860 Escondido Road, Stanford University	HRI Update
Dirigible Hangar No. 1	Moffett Field	HRI Update
Unitary Plan Wind Tunnel	Ames Research Center, Moffett Field	HRI Update

NOTES: HRI –Historic Resources Inventory

Of the 24 potential housing opportunity sites, nine are parking lots (no buildings present), two are vacant (no buildings present), and 13 have buildings that appear to meet the historic age threshold and have not yet been evaluated. None of the sites contain a historic landmark or previously identified historic resource.

Identified Archaeological Resources

The NWIC records searches indicated that there are no pre-contact or historic-era archaeological resources recorded within the potential housing opportunity sites or the potential future school location on Stanford's campus. There are two recorded historic-era resources recorded within 0.25 mile of the housing opportunity sites. There are six pre-contact resources recorded within 0.25 mile of the potential future school location on Stanford's campus. **Table 4.4-4** describes the eight archaeological resources within 0.25 mile the potential housing opportunity sites and the Stanford potential future school location.

**TABLE 4.4-4
 PREVIOUSLY RECORDED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Name/Type of Resource	Nearest Opportunity Site	Source	Description	Eligibility
Santa Clara County Valley Medical Center Cemetery (P-43-002692/ CA-SCL-920H)	San José (APN 282-020-37)	NWIC	Historic – cemetery	Recommended eligible for the National Register and California Register
Well-001H (P-43-003555)	San José (APN 245-010-04)	NWIC	Historic – buried well	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Oak Knoll (P-41-000259/P-43-002239)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – occupation and cemetery site with extensive midden, groundstone, and lithics	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Sand Hill Road Site (P-43-000295)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – occupation and cemetery site; and Historic-era – remains of Buelna-Rodriguez Adobe residence	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Creekbank Site (P-43-000579)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – scatter of occupation debris including shell, groundstone and lithics	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Lower Golf Course Site (P-43-000581)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – occupation and cemetery site with extensive midden, groundstone, and lithics	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Area A (P-43-000587)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – occupation site with shell, lithics, and hearth-related artifacts; and, Historic-era – dense late 19 th to early 20 th century deposit of bricks, plaster, glass and ceramics	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register
Upper Golf Course (P-43-000616)	Potential Future Stanford School Location	NWIC	Pre-contact – occupation site with midden, groundstone, lithics, and bedrock milling features; and Historic-era – late 1800s to mid-1900s occupation materials including glass, ceramics, metal, and brick	Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register

SOURCE: NWIC, 2022

There are also many archaeological resources recorded within the boundary of the County that are in proximity to the HEU’s housing opportunity sites. There are 40 archaeological resources documented by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP, 2012) as eligible for the National Register within Santa Clara County. There are many more archaeological resources in Santa Clara County that are eligible for the National Register and/or the California Register that have

not yet been evaluated or have been evaluated since the latest version of the OHP list was produced in 2012.

4.4.3 Regulatory Setting

Federal

Under federal law, historical and archaeological resources are considered through the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (54 U.S.C. 306108), and its implementing regulations. Before an “undertaking” (e.g., federal funding or issuance of a federal permit) is implemented, Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of the undertaking on historic properties (i.e., properties listed in or eligible for listing in the national register) and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect properties eligible for listing in the National Register. Under the NHPA, a property is considered significant if it meets the National Register listing criteria A through D, at 36 Code of Federal Regulations 60.4, as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and that:

- a) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, or
- b) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past, or
- c) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction, or
- d) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

For a resource to be eligible for the National Register, it must also retain enough integrity to be recognizable as a historic property and to convey its significance. Resources that are less than 50 years old are generally not considered eligible for the National Register.

Federal review of the effects of undertakings on significant cultural resources is carried out under Section 106 of the NHPA and is often referred to as “Section 106 review.” This process is the responsibility of the federal lead agency and occurs when an undertaking involves federal funding or a federal approval action. Section 106 review typically involves a four-step procedure, which is described in detail in the implementing regulations of the NHPA (36 Code of Federal Regulations 800):

- Define the Area of Potential Effects in which an undertaking could directly or indirectly affect historic properties;
- Identify historic properties in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and interested parties;
- Assess the significance of effects of the undertaking on historic properties; and

- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer, other agencies, and interested parties to develop an agreement that addresses the treatment of historic properties and notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and proceed with the project according to the conditions of the agreement.

State

The State of California implements the NHPA of 1966, as amended, through its statewide comprehensive cultural resource surveys and preservation programs. The California Office of Historic Preservation, as an office of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, implements the policies of the preservation act on a statewide level. The Office of Historic Preservation also maintains the California Historical Resources Inventory. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is an appointed official who implements historic preservation programs within the state's jurisdictions.

CEQA and the California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the state and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including those formally determined eligible for or listed in the National Register (PRC 5024.1[d][1]). These resources are termed “historical resources.”

Based on Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, historical resources include, but are not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant or that is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Generally, a resource is considered by a lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register (PRC Section 5024.1), or qualifies as a “unique historical resource” (PRC Section 21083.2).

To be eligible for the California Register, a cultural resource must meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. 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; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

For a resource to be eligible for the California Register, it must also retain enough integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to be recognizable as a

historical resource and to convey its significance. Resources that are less than 45 years old are generally not considered eligible for the California Register.

Impact assessment under CEQA considers only historically significant cultural resources; that is, resources that meet CEQA criteria for eligibility to the California Register (historical resources) or qualify as unique archaeological resources, as detailed below. Impacts on resources that do not meet these criteria are not considered in impact assessment under CEQA. Similarly, for projects with federal involvement, only resources that meet the criteria of eligibility for the National Register receive further consideration in impact analysis.

CEQA considers archaeological resources as an intrinsic part of the physical environment and thus requires that, for any project, the potential of the project to adversely affect archaeological resources be analyzed (CEQA Section 21083.2). For a project that may have an adverse effect on a significant archaeological resource, CEQA requires preparation of an environmental impact report (CEQA Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15065). CEQA recognizes two different categories of significant archaeological resources: “unique” archaeological resource (CEQA Section 21083.2) and an archaeological resource that qualifies as a “historical resource” under CEQA (CEQA Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5).

Health and Safety Code, Sections 7052 and 7050.5

Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

Other Relevant State Regulations

Sections of the Public Records Act (Government Code §§6254(r), 6254.10), Health and Safety Code (§7050.5), Penal Code (§622.5), and Public Resources Code (§622.5) provide guidance for protection of archaeological resources and human remains. These codes provide protection from unauthorized excavation, looting, or vandalism; guidance following discovery of human remains; penalty for injuring or destroying objects of historic or archaeological interest; and penalty for unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological or historical features.

Local

Santa Clara County Ordinance Code

Historic Preservation Ordinance of the County of Santa Clara (Division C-17 – Historic Preservation)

The Heritage Preservation Ordinance outlines the County’s Heritage Resource Inventory process and criteria, County landmark designation process and criteria, the responsibilities of the Historical Heritage Commission, and the role of the Board of Supervisors in these processes. A landmark is defined as “a historic resource designated as a landmark by the County of Santa Clara

pursuant to the provisions of Article III” of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. A resource must meet the following designation criteria:

- A. *Fifty years or older.* If less than 50 years old, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the historic resource and/or the historic resource is a distinctive or important example of its type or style; and
- B. *Retains historic integrity.* If a historic resource was moved to prevent demolition at its former location, it may still be considered eligible if the new location is compatible with the original character of the property; and
- C. *Meets one or more of the following criteria of significance:*
 - 1. 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;
 - 2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history;
 - 3. 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; or
 - 4. Yielded or has the potential to yield information important to the pre-history or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Santa Clara County General Plan

The Santa Clara County General Plan is a comprehensive long-range general plan for the physical development of the County of Santa Clara (County of Santa Clara, 1994). The General Plan contains the current County of Santa Clara Housing Element, which was adopted in 2015. The various elements within the General Plan include goals and policies for the physical development of the County. General Plan strategies and policies related to cultural resources, referred to as heritage resources by the County, and relevant to implementation of the HEU are listed below.

Countywide and Rural Unincorporated Area Issues & Policies

Strategies and policies relating to cultural resources, described as heritage resources in the General Plan, are in two different sections of the document: countywide issues and policies and rural unincorporated area issues and policies. The strategies and policies for heritage resources in these two sections have very similar text, the main difference is the location of these resources within the County. Therefore, for the purposes of this list, for those strategies and policies which are similar, we have included the text from the countywide section, but provided the naming convention for both versions of the topic.

Strategy: The general approach to cultural heritage resource protection outlined by the General Plan consists of three basic strategies

Policy C-RC 49/R-RC 81: Cultural heritage resources within Santa Clara County should be preserved, restored wherever possible, and commemorated as appropriate for their scientific, cultural, historic and place values.

Policy C-RC 50/R-RC 82: Countywide, the general approach to heritage resource protection should include the following strategies:

- 1. Inventory and evaluate heritage resources.

2. Prevent or minimize adverse impacts on heritage resources.
3. Restore, enhance, and commemorate resources as appropriate.

Strategy #1: Inventory and Evaluate Heritage Resources.

Policy C-RC 51: Inventories of heritage resources should be maintained as the basis for local decision-making regarding such resources.

Policy R-RC 83: The County's Heritage Resources database shall be maintained and used to review private development projects and guide the design of public projects.

Strategy #2: Prevent or Minimize Adverse Impacts on Heritage Resources.

Policy C-RC 52: Prevention of unnecessary losses to heritage resources should be ensured as much as possible through adequate ordinances, regulations, and standard review procedures. Mitigation efforts, such as relocation of the resource, should be employed where feasible when projects will have significant adverse impact upon heritage resources.

Policy C-RC 53: Cities should balance plans for urban redevelopment with the objectives of heritage resource preservation in such cases where potential conflicting interest may arise. Case should be taken to integrate heritage resources with new development wherever possible.

Policy R-RC 85: No heritage resource shall knowingly be allowed to be destroyed or lost through a discretionary action (zoning, subdivision site approval, grading permit, building permit, etc.) of the County of Santa Clara unless:

- a. The site or resource has been reviewed by experts and the County Historic Heritage Commission and has been found to be of insignificant value; or
- b. There is an overriding public benefit from the project and compensating mitigation to offset the loss is made part of the project.

Policy R-RC 86: Projects in areas found to have heritage resources shall be conditioned and designed to avoid loss or degradation of the resources. Where conflict with the resource is unavoidable, mitigation measures that offset the impact may be imposed.

Policy R-RC 87: Land divisions in areas with heritage resources shall be encouraged to cluster building sites in locations which will minimize the impacts to heritage resources.

Policy R-RC 88: For projects receiving environmental assessment, expert opinions and field reconnaissance may be required if needed at the applicant's expense to determine the presence, extent, and condition of suspected heritage resources and the likely impact of the project upon the resources.

Policy R-RC 89: Demolition permits proposed for designated heritage resources shall be referred to the Historic Heritage Commission for review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Policy R-RC 90: Heritage and old growth trees, particularly redwoods, should not be cut, except in instances where public safety is jeopardized.

Policy R-RC 91: The application of historic district zoning to areas containing historic structures shall be encouraged.

Policy R-RC 92: The participation of concerned citizens and professionals dealing with heritage resources in the identification of sites and the review and conditioning of projects by its boards and commissions shall be encouraged by the County.

Strategy #3: Restore, Enhance and Commemorate Resources.

Policy C-RC 54/R-RC 93: Heritage resources should be restored, enhanced, and commemorated as appropriate to the value and significance of the resource. All historic rehabilitation activities should comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Policy C-RC 55/R-RC 94: Public awareness and appreciation of existing heritage resources and their significance should be enhanced through community organizations, neighborhood associations, the educational system, and governmental programs.

Policy C-RC 56/R-RC84: Heritage resource acquisition, preservation, restoration, and interpretation projects eligible for funding with County Parks Charter Funds are identified in the "Santa Clara County Heritage Resources Inventory" adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Special Area Policies – New Almaden Historical Area

Policy R-LU 97: The New Almaden Historical Area, a nationally registered historic site, shall be preserved under the provisions of the special Historical Conservation Zoning District (H1) applied to the area.

Stanford University Community Plan

The current Stanford University Community Plan was adopted in 2000 (County of Santa Clara, 2000). The primary purpose of the Community Plan is to guide future use and development of Stanford University-owned lands in a manner that incorporates key County General Plan principles of compact urban development, open space preservation, and resource conservation. The Community Plan was adopted as an amendment of the General Plan in the manner set forth by California Government Code Section 65350 et seq. Any revisions to the Community Plan must also be made according to the provisions of State law for adopting and amending general plans. Community strategies and policies related to cultural resources and relevant to implementation of the HEU and Community Plan Update are listed below.

Resource Conservation Strategy #7: Inventory and Evaluate Heritage Resources.

Policy SCP-RC-21: Maintain informational databases and formal inventories of heritage resources as the basis for local decision-making regarding historic buildings, archaeological and paleontological sites, heritage trees, and landscape features.

Resource Conservation Strategy #8: Protect Heritage Resources Through Avoidance, Adaptive Reuse and Sensitive Planning Design.

Policy SCP-RC 22: Protect heritage resources, including sites, structures, and trees in campus development through careful campus land use planning, individual project design, project review, use of appropriate guidelines, and other implementation plans.

Policy SCP-RC 23: Protect the integrity of significant archaeological sites and other heritage resources. Ensure the confidentiality of archaeological site locations in conformance with state laws.

Policy SCP-RC 24: Protect archaeological and paleontological resources in any environmental enhancement activities involving creek restoration and flood control.

Policy SCP-RC 25: Give priority to the avoidance or adaptive reuse of historic structures over demolition whenever possible.

Resource Conservation Strategy #10: Maintain and Enhance the Scenic Values of Urbanized Area Settings

Policy SCP-RC 30: Preserve significant historic landscape elements within the fabric of the campus' architecture and design.

4.4.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Thresholds

The thresholds used to determine the significance of impacts related to cultural resources are based on Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Implementation of the proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Public Resources Code §15064.5.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Public Resources Code §15064.5.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Methodology and Assumptions

This is a program-level EIR that considers the potential impacts from implementing the proposed project. While the HEU would be applicable Countywide, special focus was given to the HEU's housing opportunity sites in unincorporated San Jose, on the Stanford campus, and the potential future school location on the Stanford campus. Impacts on cultural resources are evaluated using the criteria listed above and based on information included in the Santa Clara County General Plan (1994) and the Stanford University Community Plan (2000). Impacts to historical resources were also informed by a reconnaissance-level survey conducted in October 2022 that was supervised by a qualified architectural historian.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts

Impact CR-1: Implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. (*Significant and Unavoidable Impact, with Mitigation*)

CEQA Guidelines define a historical resource as any building, structure, site, or object listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register or determined by a lead agency to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational,

social, political, or cultural annals of California. The following discussion focuses on historic-age architectural and structural resources. Archaeological resources, including archaeological resources that are potentially historical resources according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, are addressed under Impact CR-2, below.

HEU and Stanford Community Plan

The primary purpose of the HEU component of the proposed project is to comply with the requirements of State law by updating goals, policies, objectives, and implementation programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, and providing a list of viable development sites to meet the County's RHNA requirement plus a buffer. The County has identified the housing opportunity sites discussed above as potential locations for new multifamily housing. As described above in the Environmental Setting, archival research considered known and potential historical resources on the HEU housing opportunity sites and the potential future school location as well as whether or not buildings and structures that are historic-age, and are therefore considered as potentially eligible, are present at those locations.

Modification or demolition of buildings associated with physical development that could occur under the proposed project could result in damage to or destruction of historical resources, which would constitute a significant impact.

As detailed in the Regulatory Setting above, there are several federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect historical resources. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine, prior to approval, if a project would have a significant adverse effect on historical resources and requires the lead agency to prescribe any feasible mitigation measures that would reduce significant impacts.

In addition, the General Plan and Stanford University Community Plan include policies and implementation programs designed to identify and protect historical resources. For example, General Plan Policy C-RC 50/R-RC 82 and Stanford Community Plan Policies SCP-RC-21 through SCP-RC-25 call for the identification, prevention or minimization of adverse impacts and restoration of resources. General Plan Policy C-RC 49/R-RC 81 calls for the preservation and restoration of resources.

While the aforementioned regulations and policies to protect historical resources are aimed at protecting resources by requiring projects to identify and mitigate impacts to potential historical resources, there remains the potential for construction activities undertaken as a result of the project to damage or destroy historical resources. A number of the housing opportunity sites contain buildings that potentially meet the age criteria for eligibility but have not yet been evaluated, so their eligibility status cannot be determined. In addition, since the project considers development that has not yet been proposed and therefore may not occur until an unknown time in the future, it is possible that some existing buildings that do not currently meet the age criteria for eligibility could meet that criterion at a later time. As such, the eligibility status of those structures cannot be determined and known at this time. Nevertheless, if development were to be undertaken at some point in the future and if potentially eligible resources were to be demolished

or otherwise lost, a potentially significant impact could occur. Accordingly, the following mitigations are prescribed:

Mitigation Measure CR-1A: Identify Historical Resources.

Prior to any demolition work or significant alterations to any building or structure that is 50 years old or older, the County shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards evaluate the building or structure for eligibility for listing on the National Register, California Register, and as a County Historic Landmark.

Mitigation Measure CR-1B: Identify Character-Defining Features.

Prior to any demolition work or significant alterations initiated at a known historical resource or a resource identified via implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1A, the County shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards identifies character-defining features of each historical resource. Despite being presumed or having been previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register, character-defining features of the historical resources that would be demolished or may be significantly altered may not have been explicitly or adequately identified. According to guidance from the National Park Service, a historical resource “must retain... the essential physical features [i.e., character-defining features] that enable it to convey its historic identity. The essential physical features are those features that define both *why* a property is significant...and *when* it was significant” (National Park Service, 1997). The identification of character-defining features is necessary for complete documentation of each historical resource as well as appropriate public interpretation and salvage plans.

Mitigation Measure CR-1C: Document Historical Resources Prior to Demolition or Alteration.

Prior to any demolition work or significant alterations initiated of a known historical resource or a resource identified via implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1A, the County shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards thoroughly documents each building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still photography and a written documentary record of the building to the National Park Service’s standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) or the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled drawings and architectural descriptions. If available, scaled architectural plans will also be included. Photos include large-format (4”x5”) black-and-white negatives and 8”x10” enlargements. Digital photography may be substituted for large-format negative photography if archived locally. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site-specific and comparative archival research and oral history collection as appropriate. Copies of the records shall be submitted to the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University.

Significance After Mitigation: Development provided for under the proposed project could result in the demolition or significant alteration of historical resources, which would constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resources. While the mitigation measures included above would require identification and documentation of the resources, they would not fully mitigate these actions to a less-than-significant

level if these resources were permanently lost. Therefore, even with implementation of Measures CR-1A, CR-1B, and CR-1C the impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Impact CR-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. (*Less than Significant Impact, with Mitigation*)

This section discusses archaeological resources, both as historical resources according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, as well as unique archaeological resources, as defined in California Public Resources (PRC) (CEQA) Section 21083.2(g).

HEU and Stanford Community Plan

As described above in the *Environmental Setting*, a records search did not identify previously recorded pre-contact archaeological resources in the housing opportunity sites or within the potential future school location on the Stanford campus. However, there are many pre-contact archaeological resources within the County boundary. Given the long history of pre-contact and historic-era human occupation, the County is considered sensitive for the presence of subsurface cultural resources.

Archaeological resources have the potential to contain intact deposits of artifacts, associated features, and burials that could contribute to the regional pre-contact or historic record and be of substantial importance to members of the local and regional community. Ground disturbance associated with physical development that could occur under the HEU could result in damage to or destruction of these resources, which would constitute a significant impact.

As detailed in the *Regulatory Setting* above, there are federal, state, and local regulations in place to protect archaeological resources and human remains. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine, prior to approval, if a project would have a significant adverse effect on historical or unique archaeological resources and requires the lead agency to make provisions for handling the inadvertent discovery of historical or unique archaeological resources during construction.

In addition, the proposed SCP update and the existing General Plan include policies and implementation programs designed to identify and protect archaeological resources that could be adversely affected by development activities. For example, the General Plan's three basic strategies to inventory and evaluate heritage resources, prevent or minimize adverse impacts on heritage resources, and restore, enhance, and commemorate resources and associated policies aim to identify and protect cultural resources.

While the goal of the aforementioned policies is to protect archaeological resources and human remains, exact procedures are not outlined on how these policies are to be enacted. Therefore, there remains the potential for ground-disturbing construction activities to inadvertently damage or destroy archaeological resources or human remains because these policies and programs do not establish a project review process for cultural resources or an exact policy for inadvertent

discovery of archaeological resources during project construction. Nor do these policies and programs address tribal involvement during the inadvertent discovery of indigenous resources during project construction.

While there are no known archaeological resources within the housing opportunity sites or the potential future school location, only some of the sites have been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Therefore, there may be unknown archaeological resources or human remains within these areas. Therefore, the HEU is considered to have a **potentially significant** impact on archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure CR-2A: Cultural Resources Study Requirements.

The County shall ensure that a cultural resources records search is performed at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project area of all discretionary housing development projects arising from the HEU that require ground disturbance (i.e., excavation, trenching, grading, etc.). To receive project approval, an archaeologist meeting the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SOIS) for Archeology must review the results and identify if the project would potentially impact cultural resources. Additionally, the County shall consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to be affiliated with Santa Clara County to determine if there are tribal cultural resources that may be impacted by development of housing opportunity sites or the possible future elementary school site on Stanford's campus and allow tribes to request additional project- and site-specific mitigation.

If the archaeologist determines that known cultural resources or potential archaeologically sensitive areas may be impacted by the project, a pedestrian survey must be conducted under the supervision of a SOIS-qualified archaeologist of all accessible portions of the project area, if one has not been completed within the previous five years. Additional research, including subsurface testing, monitoring during construction, and/or a cultural resources awareness training may be required to identify, evaluate, and mitigate impacts to cultural resources, as recommended by the SOIS-qualified archaeologist. If avoidance is not feasible, the County shall consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to be affiliated with Santa Clara County for the purposes of tribal consultation under Chapter 905, California Statutes of 2004 (if the resource is pre-contact or indigenous) to determine treatment measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any potential impacts to the resource pursuant to PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. This shall include documentation of the resource and may include data recovery (according to PRC Section 21083.2), if deemed appropriate, or other actions such as treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity and protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource (according to PRC Section 21084.3). A cultural report detailing the results of the research shall be prepared and submitted for review by the County and a final draft shall be submitted to the NWIC. Once the report has been approved by the County, the County may issue appropriate permits.

Mitigation Measure CR-2B: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources.

If pre-contact or historic-era archaeological resources are encountered during project construction and implementation, all construction activities within 100 feet shall halt and the County shall be notified. Pre-contact archaeological materials might include obsidian

and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-age materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. An archaeologist meeting the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (SOIS) for Archeology shall inspect the findings within 24 hours of discovery.

If the County determines that the resource qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines) and that the project has potential to damage or destroy the resource, mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, with a preference for preservation in place. If preservation in place is feasible, this may be accomplished through one of the following means as per Program LU-22.1.6 of the General Plan: (1) siting improvements to completely avoid the archaeological resource; (2) incorporating the resource into a park or dedicated open space, or by deeding the resource into a permanent conservation easement; (3) capping and covering the resource before building the project on the resource site after the resource has been thoroughly studied by a SOIS qualified archaeologist and a report written on the findings.

If avoidance is not feasible, the County shall consult with appropriate Native American tribes (if the resource is pre-contact), and other appropriate interested parties to determine treatment measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any potential impacts to the resource pursuant to PRC Section 21083.2, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. This shall include documentation of the resource and may include data recovery (according to PRC Section 21083.2), if deemed appropriate, or other actions such as treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity and protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource (according to PRC Section 21084.3).

Significance After Mitigation: Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-2A and CR-2B, would reduce the potential impact to a **less-than-significant** level because all projects with ground-disturbance would be reviewed by an SOIS qualified archaeologist and any potential archaeological resources identified would be evaluated and treated appropriately, including consulting with Native American representatives.

Impact CR-3: Implementation of the proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of designated cemeteries (*Less than Significant Impact, with Mitigation*)

HEU and Stanford Community Plan

As described above, there are known cultural resources with human remains within the County boundary. Based on the overall sensitivity of the County for cultural resources, there is the potential for previously unknown human remains to be discovered during ground-disturbing activities. In the event that human remains are discovered, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, the human remains could be inadvertently damaged or lost, which would be a

significant impact for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, the HEU is considered to have a **potentially significant** impact on archaeological resources and human remains.

Mitigation Measure CR-3: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.

Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5 (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered, the Project applicant shall ensure that all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps are taken to ensure the integrity of the immediate area. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the landowner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance.

Significance After Mitigation: Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-3 would reduce the potential impact to human remains to a **less-than-significant** level because all laws and regulations regarding the inadvertent discovery of human remains would be followed.

Cumulative Impacts

This section presents an analysis of the cumulative effects of the proposed project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects that could cause cumulatively considerable impacts. Significant cumulative impacts related to cultural resources could occur if the incremental impacts of the project combined with the incremental impacts of one or more of the cumulative projects or cumulative development projections included in the project description and described in Section 4.0.3, *Cumulative Impacts*.

Impact CR-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other cumulative development, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. (*Significant and Unavoidable Impact, with Mitigation*)

HEU and Stanford Community Plan

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative historical resources impacts is cumulative development in Santa Clara County.

Future development under the proposed project as well as other residential projects within Santa Clara County could potentially impact historical resources that may be present. The cumulative effect of this future development is the continued loss of significant historical resources. Potential

future development increases the likelihood that additional historical resources could be lost. It is therefore possible that cumulative development could result in the demolition or destruction of significant historical resources. The loss of these resources would result in a significant impact, and impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered cumulatively considerable, resulting in a **significant impact**.

Implementation of Measures CR-1 through CR-3, which would require previously unevaluated historic-age resources be evaluated, character-defining features of historic resources be identified, and documentation of those significant historic resources that would be altered or demolished, would reduce the severity of impacts associated with the proposed project, but they would remain significant. As a result, the significant impact would be considered cumulatively considerable and a significant cumulative effect.

Mitigation Measure: Implement **Mitigation Measures CR-1A, CR-1B, and CR-1C**.

Significance After Mitigation: Because demolition or significant alteration of potential historical resources could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, no measures would fully mitigate these actions to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, even with implementation of Measures CR-1A, CR-1B, and CR-1C the impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Impact CR-5: Implementation of the proposed project, when combined with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a substantial adverse effect on the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 or could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (*Less than Significant Impact, with Mitigation*)

HEU and Stanford Community Plan

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative archaeological resource and human remains impacts is the cumulative development of the County of Santa Clara.

Since much of Santa Clara County was developed either as urban or agricultural landscapes prior to widespread awareness and concern about archaeological resources, or before implementation of regulations to protect such resources, it can be assumed that many significant pre-contact and historic-era archaeological resources have been disturbed or destroyed by construction work associated with the development of the County over numerous decades of urban construction and agricultural activities.

Future development in the County under the proposed project could include excavation and grading that could potentially impact archaeological resources and human remains that may be present. The cumulative effect of this future development is the continued loss of cultural remains. Potential future development increases the likelihood that additional archaeological resources could be uncovered and potentially impacted. It is therefore possible that cumulative development could result in the demolition or destruction of unique archaeological resources,

which could contribute to the erosion of the pre-contact and historic archaeological record of the region. The loss of these resources would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact, and the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable prior to mitigation.

Though archaeological resources can sometimes be preserved when discovered during excavation, there is no guarantee that these resources can be protected and preserved. The proposed project would contribute a negligible **less than significant** impact after the implementation of Measures CR-2A, CR-2B, and CR-3 which would require a SOIS qualified archaeologist to conduct a review of discretionary housing projects prior to construction, the cessation of activities in the vicinity of archaeological finds or unanticipated human remains, and tribal consultation when indigenous resources or human remains are inadvertently identified during project construction. As a result, the less-than-significant incremental impact would not be cumulatively considerable and thus would not combine with the incremental impact of other projects in the cumulative scenario to cause a significant cumulative effect.

4.4.5 References

- County of Santa Clara. 1994. *County of Santa Clara General Plan*. Available online: <https://plandev.sccgov.org/ordinances-codes/general-plan>. Accessed August 15, 2022.
- County of Santa Clara. 2000. *Stanford University Community Plan*. Available online: https://stgenpln.blob.core.windows.net/document/SU_CP.pdf. Accessed August 15, 2022.
- Levy, Richard, "Costanoan", In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 485-495, Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Milliken, Randall, *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area 1769-1810*, Ballena Press, Menlo Park, CA, 1995.
- Milliken, Randall, Richard T. Fitzgerald, Mark G. Hylkema, Randy Groza, Tom Origer, David G. Bieling, Alan Leventhal, Randy S. Wiberg, Andrew Gottsfield, Donna Gillette, Viviana Bellifemine, Eric Strother, Robert Cartier, and David A. Fredrickson, "Punctuated Cultural Change in the San Francisco Bay Area", In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 99-124, AltaMira Press, Lanham, MD, 2007.
- OHP (Office of Historic Preservation), *Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, Santa Clara County*, 2012.

This page intentionally left blank