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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

At the request of SyWest Development, a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment was conducted at the proposed project area located within Santa Clara County, California (Exhibit 1). The proposed project consists of demolishing an existing Century 24 theatre located on the west side of Winchester Boulevard between Magliocco Drive and Riddle Road. Redevelopment of the site is anticipated and will maintain associated parking and landscaping throughout the project site.

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 April 22, 2013, FCS Senior Project Archaeologist, Carrie D. Wills, conducted a record search at the Northwest Information Center in Rohnert Park, California. The records search included the project area and a 0.50-mile radius beyond the project boundaries. Results from the record search indicate that three resources have been recorded within 0.5 mile of the project area: a historic ranch, the Winchester Mystery House, and a group of apartment buildings. None of these resources would be impacted by project development. In addition, 21 survey reports have been recorded within 0.5 mile of the project area.

On April 30, 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. Their June 20, 2013, response stated that the Sacred Land File search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. Included was a list of 10 Native American representatives who were sent information request letters on June 20, 2013. As of this date, no responses have been received from any of the 10 Native American representatives.

FCS Professional Archaeologist Carrie D. Wills surveyed the project area on April 29, 2013. The project area is entirely covered with asphalt parking areas, adjacent buildings, and the theater building. No prehistoric resources were discovered during the survey, however, one historic structure (Century 24 Theater) was observed within the project area. The theater was evaluated by Kathy Crawford, FCS Architectural Historian, for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NR), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and local listings. Results of the evaluation indicate that the Century 24 Theater is considered not eligible for listing on the NR, CRHR, or City of San Jose’s local listings.
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Project Location

The proposed project area is located at 741 South Winchester Boulevard, City of San Jose in Santa Clara County, California (Exhibit 1).

The project area is depicted on the San Jose West California, United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map, in Township 7S, Range 1W, Section23 (Exhibit 2). The property is loosely bounded by Riddle Road to the north, Opal Drive to the west, commercial buildings and Magliocco Drive to the south and South Winchester Boulevard to the east (Exhibit 3).

1.2 - Project Description

The proposed project consists of demolishing an existing Century 24 theatre on the west side of Winchester Boulevard between Magliocco Drive and Riddle Road. Redevelopment of the site is anticipated and will maintain associated parking and landscaping throughout the project site.

1.3 - Assessment Team

FCS Professional Archaeologist Carrie D. Wills conducted the pedestrian survey and co-authored this report. FCS Architectural Historian, Kathy Crawford, evaluated the theater for listing on the NR, CRHR, and local listings and co-authored this report. Professional qualifications for Ms. Wills and Ms. Crawford can be found in Appendix C.
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, including Beardsley (1948), Bennyhoff (1950), Fredrickson (1973 and 1974), Kroeber (1925), Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1984), and Moratto (1984).

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 Jose area was occupied by various tribelets that were part of the Ohlone (previously Costanoan) tribe of California Native Americans (Harrington 1942, Levy 1978). The Ohlone group designates a language family consisting of eight branches of the Costanoan 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 sweat houses, 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 patrilinearly, 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 - Historic Background

#### 2.3.1 - Santa Clara County

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.

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.

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.
2.3.2 - City of San Jose

The City of San Jose was founded in 1777 by Mexican colonists and named El Pueblo de San Jose de Guadalupe for St. Joseph and the Guadalupe River near the original town site. The town was established to bring agricultural development to the Alta California territory where the farmers joined the Spanish missionaries in the area.

As a central supply station for prospectors during the gold rush, San Jose underwent a population explosion. It was the state capital from 1849 to 1851 when it became an important stage and boat link to San Francisco. Growth continued through the 1880s, culminating with the real estate boom and bust of 1887 when land sales were over two million per day before the real estate market collapsed. By the turn of the century, San Jose was a major center for the cultivation of apricots, prunes, and grapes; with rail connections to other cities, it was also an important regional shipping hub.

Prior to World War II, San Jose, 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. In the 1950s, San Jose’s focus changed to high technology because of one of its natural resources, silicon. This element is used to manufacture semiconductors, a basic component in technology industries. Thus, San Jose and Santa Clara County came to be known as “Silicon Valley.” Triggered by this high-tech revolution, San Jose’s growth continued from the 1950s through the early 1980s. During this period, a steady flow of venture capital poured into San Jose to finance new companies and this expansion began to moderate only when the 1985 recession hit the computer industry. By the twenty-first century, the City of San Jose offered great economic opportunity, jobs, and a high standard of living and this trend continues today.

2.3.3 - Origins of the American Movie Theater

Except where noted, the following is taken from “Dome Theater Final Historic Resource Evaluation Report” authored by Garavaglia Architecture, Inc. in 2013.

In April 2006, Andrew Murray and Katie Tom of the Office of the Legislative Analyst, Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco, completed a draft study on movie theater development, which addressed both national and local trends (Murray and Tom 2006). This context provides a good overview of movie theater development through the immediate post World War II period. Relevant portions of the context statement document are quoted below:

‘Traditional’ theater (also referred to as ‘legitimate’ or ‘serious’ theater), including drama, opera, and concerts, has a history spanning millennia. During the 1800s, traditional theaters became important fixtures of town centers throughout the country, supported by population growth, westward expansion, and rising incomes...Vaudeville acts traveled the country and exhibited in venues owned or rented by the theater company. Managers of vaudeville shows and other amusements were continually seeking new novelties.
The 1890s saw the birth or maturation of many scientific discoveries that would revolutionize economic and social life, including electricity, the street car, the telephone, the automobile, the typewriter, and the phonograph. One additional revolutionary discovery was the moving picture. The Kinetoscope, a device invented in association with Thomas Edison, allowed patrons to view moving pictures, which Edison had produced, in a box through a peephole. Debuting in New York in 1894 at a phonograph parlor, the enterprise was immediately successful, with the machines soon thereafter featured at fairs and in traveling shows. The movies were ‘shorts’ lasting only a few minutes with stock actors portraying a single scene or event (‘actualities’), such as people and horses walking. Although audiences soon tired of the simplicity of the content and patronage quickly declined, the power of the form of entertainment had been demonstrated.

In 1896, the Vitascope, a motion picture projector, premiered at a music hall in New York. By the end of 1896, many vaudeville companies were displaying motion pictures between regular acts. This form of entertainment became sufficiently popular in some areas that buildings dedicated to movie viewing were required. The first movie theaters were created by modifying existing buildings, either retail storefronts or vaudeville theaters.

A number of factors fed into the emergence of movies as the most widespread form of popular entertainment. Vaudeville, the most popular form of mass entertainment at the turn of the century, was experiencing challenges. Vaudeville actors went on strike in 1901 to protest perceived abuses by theater company owners. Although the strike ended soon after it began, it provided an opportunity for motion pictures to become feature entertainment, as many vaudeville theater owners began showing movies full time to keep their doors open. This allowed motion pictures to gain a toehold relative to established forms of entertainment in America long before it gained one in Europe, and helped establish the United States as the film capital of the world.

Although vaudeville producers did not initially think motion pictures would threaten or supplant live entertainment, and therefore were willing to show them on a limited basis, by 1910 motion pictures were indeed gaining hold. Some live theaters were incorporating motion pictures as a normal part of their presentation (in special venues referred to as ‘combination houses’). Other live theaters were being converted to motion picture theaters.

In 1905, a new twist was added to motion picture exhibition. Two theater owners in Pittsburgh, including Harry Davis, a wealthy vaudeville theater owner, began showing movies continuously throughout the day from 8 AM until midnight in their storefront theater, a converted storeroom. Charging a low admission price of five cents, enabled by the multiple screenings per day, they called the new format ‘nickelodeon’ because a person could see an entire program of films, which lasted ten to thirty minutes, for a nickel. By 1906, large vaudeville organizations, including the Keith theaters, began converting their venues into ‘nickel’ motion picture

...
houses, and by 1908 there were an estimated eight thousand theaters located on side streets throughout America, showing programs that lasted up to one hour. In addition to their popularity (creating a ‘nickel craze’), and hence sizable revenues, nickelodeons were a profitable format because they were very economical to operate.

Nickelodeons flourished economically, then disappeared quite quickly, unable to keep up with a new grand, luxurious style of theater, the movie palaces built in the mid-1910s and 1920s, which outclassed nickelodeons. A confluence of many factors led to the creation of the movie palace. Increasing affluence and the country’s emergence from World War I as a world power created an appetite for more luxurious goods, so tastes migrated away from storefront theaters. Also, customer expectations were elevated by an earlier transition in vaudeville to luxurious vaudeville theater palaces. Many of the vaudeville palaces were eventually converted to motion picture theaters, creating luxurious motion picture theaters by happenstance.

The first movie palaces opened in 1913 and 1914 in New York, the Strand, Vitagraph, and Regent, which were modeled after the Doge’s Palace in Venice. Palaces grew to feature a host of luxurious appointments and services, including uniformed staff, house symphony orchestras, lounges, and printed programs. Although higher quality, feature-length productions led to higher ticket prices (and reserved seats, scheduled showings, and longer runs), patrons felt compensated with better quality and additional services. And, at just ten to twenty five cents per show, movie palaces continued the inclusive and democratic tradition of the movie industry, allowing access by the middle class to services that had previously been out of reach, only known in fine hotels and clubs.

With their new allure, and with motion pictures having achieved some degree of respectability, movie palaces expanded into downtown areas formerly reserved for office buildings and traditional theater. Star, marquee theaters emerged in the 1910s and 1920s, along with movie stars. Their profitability allowed designers sizable budgets to get creative. In the 1910s and 1920s motion pictures were fantastic, silent adventures and romances, often set in imaginary lands. Movie palaces were equally exotic and romantic. Theater designers began to design specifically to the customer experience. Whereas traditional theaters were designed around the stage and backstage production areas, the new ones were designed around the projection booth, and more importantly, the audience, which could consume a greater share of space.

The ‘Roaring 20s’ was filled with feelings of egalitarianism, immediacy, and freedom. Mass culture arrived in force, shaped by mass production, mass consumption, and mass media. Motion pictures with sound were introduced in 1926, and ‘talkies’ in 1927. By the 1930s, movie sound supplanted the need for any live music, so theater design requirements changed. This was the end of the era of theaters that combined live and film entertainment.
The air of exuberance ended abruptly with the Great Depression. The changing economic picture affected the motion picture industry like all others. American cinema attendance dropped by 56% from 1928 - 1933, construction slowed, and designs generally became more modest. But, by 1934 things were already beginning to rebound. Weekly attendance increased to 70 million per week, and movies remained the number one source of entertainment throughout the Depression and World War II, with many people attending the movies two or three times per week. Out of a total U.S. population of 130 million, it is estimated that 55 to 60 million Americans went to the movies every week. In 1946, 90 million people per week viewed movies, an average of 33 performances per person per year, fueled by messages of romance and patriotism (By 2005 that number had dwindled to just 5).

Due to changing preferences and the influence of television, overall attendance at movie theaters began to fall in 1949, never again to reach the popularity of earlier eras. Movie production slowed to an all-time low in the early 1950s, due to indecision regarding technological changes and movie studios cutting back on production, choosing instead to focus on big budget films that they felt would fare well against the television. The disbanding of studio-owned theaters and suburbanization also played a role (Murray and Tom: 2006).

The American movie-going experience was characterized by several distinct trends in the early 1960s. One of these trends, seen in the Bay Area and in communities across the nation, was the construction of movie theaters in or adjacent to suburban shopping centers (Meissner 2011). Suburban expansion and population growth in post-World War II America created a need for new and convenient retail establishments, and by 1964, there were 7,600 shopping centers in the United States (ICSC 2013). In an effort to follow its audience, the film industry collaborated with the broader retail sales industry, just as the predominance of the shopping mall was expanding. Movie theaters soon began appearing near – and often inside – these new shopping centers (Corbett 2001).

Drive-in movie theaters had also increased significantly in popularity by the early 1960s; by 1963 “the total number of drive-ins...topped 3,500, a little over one-quarter of all American Theaters...It was into this context—the increasing spread of the suburban shopping-center theatre— that another exhibition trend began to emerge in 1962: the twin movie theatre”

According to author Christofer Meissner (2011):

. . . the twin movie theatre trend was one in which an individual theatre with a single identity and usually with shared box office, entrance, lobby, and amenities such as restrooms and concession stand, had two separate auditoriums for exhibiting movies. The phenomenon of multiple auditoriums in a single movie theatre complex (now known more commonly as a ‘multiplex’) became the mainstream of American film exhibition by the 1970s, but the practice was a novel one in 1962, one that trade publication Boxoffice in February of that year called ‘a revolutionary concept in screen entertainment.'
By the late 1970s and early 1980s, the popularity of cable TV and VCRs in the home threatened to dominate the industry and lead to the demise of the movie theater as an entertainment destination. However, a renewed interest in theatrical moviegoing came about in spite of the widespread use of new home technologies and by the “mid-1980s . . . so many people were going to movie theaters that the film industry’s profits were higher than they had been since the mid-1940s” (Corbett 2001). With increased attendance at American movie theaters, new theater chains developed and, “in an attempt to restore the escapist fantasy and glamour element to the theatrical moviegoing experience . . . [these new chains] built theaters that were bigger, brighter, cleaner, and better decorated” than earlier versions of the multiplex (Corbett 2001). This trend accelerated in the mid-1990s as “new ‘megaplexes’—cinemas with eighteen, twenty-four, and even thirty screens were constructed” (Oakland Tribune 1967). Stadium seating and elaborate concession stands with more upscale food options also emerged in the 1990s and this type of megaplex continues to dominate the new theater market today.

2.3.4 - San Jose Movie Theatre History

Compared to other theaters built in the Santa Clara valley in the 1960s, the dome theaters were considered unique and futuristic in appearance, and the design was seen as an iconic symbol of things to come. With their huge domes and ample interior spaces, many of the theaters were twinned or even multiplexed, as were the grand downtown theaters in the 1920s and 1930s.

As early as 1915, the downtown core area of San Jose was home to more than ten theaters. The earliest theater building was the Stark Theater located on First Street north of Santa Clara Street which opened in 1859 as a professional Shakespearian theater. The first theater to evolve into a motion picture theater was the Victory Theatre that was constructed in 1899 at 57 North First Street; however, did not introduce the first motion picture to San Jose residents. The Unique Theatre at 20 East Santa Clara Street was the first to show motion pictures starting in February 1903. The new motion picture technology was a great success and by 1910 half of the eight theaters in the downtown area were movies houses, the first of which was the Empire Theater at 23 North Second Street. By 1913, the Theater De Luxe at 236 South First Street (subsequently the T&D, the California and finally the Mission) was running as a movie house but also provided other types of entertainment such as vaudeville acts and organ accompaniments to movies. Following the De Luxe were the Liberty Theater at 67 South Market Street in 1914, the Hippodrome at 261 South First Street in 1919, and the California (Fox) Theater at 345 South First Street in 1927. The California was the first locally built “movie palace” that was equipped to handle movies, vaudeville acts, and stock company presentations and was the last of this type as subsequent theaters were designed at a smaller scale and strictly as movie houses.

Following World War II, the resurgence in movie goers resulted in the construction of two theaters, the Gay and the Studio, on San Salvador Street. The theaters in downtown San Jose began to decline steadily in the 1950s and 1960 due to the introduction of television and the appearance of drive-in theaters which began to appear locally in 1945.
Except where noted, the following is taken from “Images of America: Theatres of San Jose,” authored by Gary Lee Parks, in 2009.

In the early years of the 20th century, once San Jose’s entertainment began to outgrow the converted meeting halls and storefronts that were its first theatres, the showmen turned to skilled architects, some of them local and some of wider renown, to design venues that would lift the image of San Jose’s entertainment to a more respectable and refined level. This ushered in the era of the movie palace, and while San Joe’s finest theatres were not the 3,000-4,000- or even 5,000-seat temples of art and showmanship found in San Francisco, Los Angeles, the Midwest, or the East Coast, the best of them were likely the most impressive and luxurious buildings available to the population of this agricultural capital at the time.

As suburbia became an American phenomenon, downtowns all across the nation began to decline, and San Jose’s was no exception. The decision by Macy’s to locate at Valley Fair – San Jose’s first major shopping development – signaled a vast change in the city’s image. San Jose grew to become a decentralized city. Soon entertainment followed, with new theatres and drive-in springing up along the major commercial thoroughfares, which had only decades before been dirt roads connecting San Jose with the smaller rural communities of the valley.

With the transition of San Jose from an agricultural to a technological hub, its economic focus was scattered across the Santa Clara Valley, ultimately to be more commonly known as Silicon Valley. Downtown, with its legacy of older buildings, was struggling to reinvent itself. As the 1960s and 1970s unfolded, large swaths of San Jose’s heart were leveled, taking many theatres in the process. The era of the suburban multiplex had arrived, and by this time, the theatres of downtown were hardly relevant. Those in San Jose’s neighborhoods and in surrounding smaller city centers fared little better, either being converted to other commercial uses or demolished. Occasionally one would carry on for a time, showing classic, foreign, or independent films or locally produced live entertainment, and a couple of them survive on such a policy today.

Happily, San Jose has benefited in the last two decades by an increased awareness of and respect for all aspects of its history, and its remaining theatres from the first half of 20th century, though a precious few, have lasted long enough to be widely appreciated. Just as vital are the efforts to make those architectural treasures hold their own in a contemporary culture where art and taste have become ever more varied and transitory. Nevertheless, whether it is an old stage theatre built when electricity was new, and now showcasing cutting-edge comedy, or a movie palace resounding with operatic triumph, or the revival of a wide-screen epic on one of suburbia’s first domed cinemas, it is yet possible to find audiences who come together to experience a special event in a special place. San Jose still preserves a fine legacy of theatre buildings, both in those that stand and in those that survive only in photographs and memories.

2.3.5 - Raymond Syufy and Century Theaters

The following historical background information is quoted from Garavaglia Architecture (2013) and an online resource offering historical profiles and corporate histories:
Raymond Syufy was born near the end of the First World War into a family of Lebanese immigrants in Sacramento, California. Growing up in nearby Berkeley, he worked at his parents’ grocery store and later attended college and law school. While there, he worked nights at a movie theater to help support himself. In 1940, at the age of 23, Syufy took charge of his own theater, the Rita in Vallejo, California.

The theater business at this time was firmly in the grip of the major film producers such as Paramount, Loew’s, Inc. (MGM), and RKO, who controlled the top product offered to exhibitors. They often kept the best first-run films away from independent operators, exclusively showing them in the chains of theaters that they owned, and the U.S. Justice Department had been trying since the late 1930s to force them to open their product to others. Independent exhibitors were also in on the fight, forming trade associations and initiating lawsuits against the majors. Raymond Syufy, with his legal background, was perfectly suited to take up this cause, and he did starting in the late 1940s. A major battle for independents was won in 1949 when the Supreme Court ordered RKO and Paramount to sell off many of their theaters and separate their chains from the production and distribution ends of their companies. In 1950 the ruling was extended to Warner Brothers, Loew’s, and Twentieth Century Fox. Rules also were enacted to prevent shareholders in the production/distribution businesses from gaining control over the divested theater chains.

This legal settlement enabled independent theater operators like Raymond Syufy to improve their film offerings dramatically, and the company expanded during the 1950s and 1960s, opening additional theaters as well as many drive-ins. Syufy’s circuit gradually moved outward from California to Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico. The company’s buildings gained a reputation for interesting architecture, with a number of its indoor theaters featuring a domed “igloo” design. In 1968 in San Jose, California the company opened its first theater to use so-called “stadium” seats, in which each succeeding row is positioned higher than the one in front, allowing patrons an unobstructed view of the screen. By the end of the decade, Syufy Enterprises, as the company was then known, owned more drive-ins than indoor screens and was in fact one of the top drive-in chains in the world.

By 1986 Syufy Enterprises had grown to some 267 screens (including drive-ins). The closely held company did not reveal annual revenues or profits, but analysts estimated that Syufy was one of the most profitable theater chains in the United States.

Also in the mid-1980s, Syufy expanded its holdings in the San Francisco area. The company’s headquarters had long been established there, and it had opened several multiplexes and drive-ins in the Bay area over the years. In 1984, a new 8-plex was introduced, and the following year the Mountain View ten-screen theater opened on the site of the former Syufy-owned Moffet Drive-in. The Mountain View reportedly featured the largest theater lobby in the world. In 1986 Syufy purchased the 650-seat Presidio single-screen theater, an art house. The company also was
continuing to open new theaters throughout its territory, such as the 12-screen Century Park 12 in Tucson, which opened in 1989 on the former site of one of its drive-ins. By 1990, Syufy Enterprises had 325 screens.

Raymond J. Syufy, the company’s patriarch, passed away in the spring of 1995. His son, Raymond W., had assumed the mantle of company CEO, and several of his siblings also worked for the company. Syufy Enterprises gave way to the name Century Theaters, Inc. around this time. In late 1995 Century announced plans to expand from its then-total of 476 to nearly 700 screens and, a few months later, changed the plan to ‘1,000 Screens by 2000’ (Funding University website; accessed January 2013).

Syufy Enterprises sold off its Century Theaters chain in 2006.

2.3.6 - Vincent G. Raney

Except where noted, the following is taken from “Dome Theater Final Historic Resource Evaluation Report” authored by Garavaglia Architecture, Inc. in 2013.

Architect Vincent Gerard Raney was born on October 17, 1905 in Loogootee, Indiana to Frank and Ruth Ellen Raney. He earned an undergraduate degree in architectural engineering from the University of Illinois; Champaign-Urbana in 1930 and by 1935 had established his own practice in San Francisco, California. Before establishing his own business, Raney worked as a draftsman for H.G. Atherton in Anderson, Indiana (1928), and for William I. Garren, Architect, and Masten & Hurd Architects in San Francisco between 1930 and 1935 (Pacific Coast Architecture Database; accessed online January 2013). Raney made a name for himself in California as a gas station designer for the Associated Oil Company in San Francisco, and his commissions for the company included 600 service stations. His work as an architect also produced over 100 movie theaters, shopping centers and commercial buildings, industrial and office buildings, churches, and schools (SFGate 2013).

Raney designed several movie theaters in the western states over the course of his career, including earlier (c.1940s) single-screen neighborhood movie theaters and later (1950s through the 1980s) drive-ins and suburban multiplexes. In the early 1960s, Raymond Syufy hired Raney for the design of a new dome theater in suburban San Jose. Through Syufy’s connections with the people behind Cinerama in New York, Raney was able to review already developed plans for a Cinerama dome theater. Raney then designed the first Century dome for Raymond Syufy, loosely based on the design of New York’s Cinerama (SFGate online; accessed January 2013).

San Jose’s Century 21 Theatre opened in 1964, the mothership in a series of Vincent Raney designed dome theaters that would grace the Bay Area roadside in the 1960s. Although the Century 21 was originally designed for presenting films using the 3-strip Cinerama process, movies were actually shown using 70mm film. The theater was built to operate, and continues to function, as a one-screen venue, with accommodations for approximately 950 patrons.
Since he was based in San Francisco, several of his theater designs were located in Northern California, but Raney also designed theaters in Washington, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, Hawaii, and Southern California (Cinema Treasures online; accessed January 2013).

Raney designed all of the Syufy Century theaters from 1964 through the early 1990s, and used the form of the dome in several of his earlier enclosed and drive-in theater designs. The dome as an architectural form had become popularized in the late 1940s and early 1950s by a small group of individuals, the most well known of which was R. Buckminster Fuller. Fuller’s work concentrated specifically on the geodesic dome, which is defined by the Oxford Dictionaries online as “a dome constructed of short struts following geodesic lines and forming an open framework of triangles or polygons” (Oxford Dictionary; accessed January 2013). Through Raney’s dome theaters were not designed using a geodesic dome, the dome in general was nevertheless a popular and “futuristic” architectural form in the 1960s and 1970s and came to be a familiar characteristic in the Syufy chain of suburban movie theaters.

Vincent Raney continued his architectural practice into the 1990s and died at age 96 on December 31, 2001.

2.4 - Century Theaters

Excerpted from “Images of America: Theatres of San Jose,” authored by Gary Lee Parks, in 2009.

After World War II, movies theaters were opened under the assumption that movies would remain America’s primary form of cheap entertainment. Television was originally viewed as a technological curiosity but then became a serious contender for public attention as more and more people stayed home to watch television instead of going to the movies.

In the 1960s, drive-in theatres proliferated in the suburbs and rural areas and many of the downtown movie palaces were closing and being demolished. Drive-ins emerged as popular entertainment for the whole family but held special appeal for teen-agers who were raised with America’s car culture.

However, there was still a demand for indoor movie theaters in the suburbs and the new theatres were “modernistic tributes to the world of tomorrow” (Parks 2009). As with the movie palaces of the past, the new theatres were designed by skilled architects who made use the futuristic styles of the day. One of the main features was the presentation of new technology as noted by Parks (2009):

The theatres themselves were very comfortable, but the main amenities promoted by the exhibitors were the wide screens, superior sound and projection, and clarity of image and color, which television could never hope to match. This, however, was the last mighty gasp of traditional movie showmanship prior to the multiplex era.

Despite being a hub of such sweeping cultural and technological change, the Santa Clara Valley has made significant strides in preserving its history. Many of its theatres live on only in photographs, but a few, including some of the best, still stand, having their valued place in today’s San Jose.
The Century dome theaters were constructed during a time when most of the downtown movie theaters had been closed or repurposed. Following World War II, the suburbs surrounding San Jose's downtown area continued to grow and new theaters were being located in suburban areas in the hopes of luring suburbanites from their television sets back to theaters. Although many downtown theaters had closed, theaters continued to be constructed in the 1940s and 1950s. One theater of note was the Garden Theater built in 1949 at 1165 Lincoln Avenue and offering 1,000 seats. Decorated with murals and chandeliers, the Garden continued to operate unchanged architecturally until the mid-1970s, when an ownership change switched the venue to Spanish language movies. With the increasing gentrification of the neighborhood, this policy no longer was profitable and the theater closed in 1988.

Theaters that opened after World War II, including the Century Theaters, were working under the assumption that movies would continue to be the primary form of entertainment for most American families. Several domed theaters (Century Theaters) were erected in many western cities from the 1960s through the mid-1980s, offering the movie-going public innovation in architectural style and theatrical presentation.

The Century dome theaters were different from the other theaters being built in the mid-1960s in that their architectural (dome) style was unique and they were located in suburban locations rather than in downtown locations. In addition, most of the Century domes utilized a 70mm format project system, at least initially. One of their competitors, United Artists Theatre Circuit in Santa Clara’s Moonlite Shopping Center, used the new Dimension 150 All-Purpose Project System beginning in 1966.

2.4.1 - Century 21 Theater

The first Century Theater (theater), Century 21, located at 3161 Olsen Drive in San Jose, opened its doors in November 1964 showing movies in 70mm format. The theater was constructed to showcase Cinerama style movies (a process that simultaneously projects images from three synchronized 35 mm projectors onto a huge, deeply curved screen); however, it continued to show movies exclusively in 70mm format. The theater’s original screen was replaced during a renovation with a flat screen model, which is still in use today.

Designed by famed San Francisco architect, Vincent G. Raney, this classic dome theater was constructed with amphitheater-style seating for 950 and served as the prototype for a number of dome-style theaters that the Century Theatre chain built across California in the 1960s and 1970s (Photograph 1). The Century 21 moniker was used to convey a “futuristic image” of theaters to come and this image was reinforced by the lobby’s uniquely innovative bubble lights with metallic gold accents. Adding to the space-age feel, at the top of the dome was a large orange metal ornament that was functional as well as decorative as it allowed employees to rappel from it when the outer track lighting needed repairs or maintenance.

The theater differs from the other dome theaters in two ways, first, the exterior is constructed exclusively with decorative concrete block walls and second, the lobby is larger. The interior walls are false plaster and fabric with alternate floors of in/out washed aggregate concrete. The lobby is
carpeted and the interior lighting consists of Peerless and Lightolier (recessed parabolic fluorescent lights) lights throughout.

**Excerpted from Recent Mercury News Article – Century Theaters**

The Century 21 dome movie theater on Winchester Boulevard, along with its siblings Century 22 and Century 23 domes, is a place of significant memories for longtime Silicon Valley residents.

Heather David, author of Mid-Century by the Bay, spotlighting Bay Area mid-century architecture, started looking for support [to save the theaters from demolition] in late 2012.

“We knew the lease was coming up in 2013, so we sent a letter of concern to the city of San Jose,” says David, who lives in the Rose Garden area. “It’s a fantastic example of mid-century modern architecture, and it’s a unique cultural resource.” David would like to see all three-dome theaters preserved, but if it comes down to just one, her vote is Century 21. The Century 25 dome is scheduled for demolition and most believe the Century 24, adjacent to Toys “R” Us, will also disappear for new development.

David says the Century 24 dome “has no historic significance” and that the Century 21 is the one that needs to be saved.

**2.4.2 - Century 22 Theater**

Opened on March 8, 1966, the Century 22 Theater located at 3162 Olin Avenue, San Jose opened its doors with a seating capacity of 800+ (Photograph 2). Similar to the Century 21 Theater, this theater was designed by Vincent G. Raney and constructed with similar features and materials; it was also designed to utilize the 70mm format. In the 1970s, two smaller dome theaters were added to the front portion of the theater, providing three viewing screens rather than just one.

Of the two smaller screens, the Dome B was retrofit with a digital projector for the release of “Star Wars Episode II: Attack of the Clones” in 2002 and is still in use today.

The original dome has the largest screen and although it was somewhat diminished by being reformatted to a flat-screen back 1992, it continues to provide an enhanced viewing experience.

**2.4.3 - Century 23 Theater**

The Century 23 (3164 Olsen Drive) opened as a companion to the successful Century 21 and Century 22 theatres that stood across Olsen Drive (Photograph 3). The theater’s debut was in March 14, 1967 and featured “The Sand Pebbles” starring Steve McQueen.

Century 23 was twinned in June 1973 when a wall was built down its center creating two smaller theatres. In the mid-1990s, the theater was remodeled to reposition the seats and screens thus improving the views and site lines. To provide a new feel to the overall theater experience, the décor was changed to all red, including the seats, carpet, curtains, and restrooms.
Though the theater’s signage remains as Century 23, it was renamed Winchester 23 in the media. The Century 21, 22, 23, and 24 theaters have often been referred to as “The Block” by employees working at these or any of the other nearby Century Theatres (Cinema Treasures; accessed July 2013).

2.4.4 - Century 24 Theater

The Century 24 Theater is located across Interstate 280 (I-280) from its three sister theaters, Century 21, 22, and 23 (Photographs 4-14). It opened on July 17, 1968 with an afternoon screening of Gone with the Wind. It should be noted that review of the City of San Jose’s Building Department Building Permit Records did not contain copies of the original construction permits.

In June of 1973, a wall was built down the center of the theater’s dome separating the single-screen theater into a double-screen theater. The theater reopened to the public on June 17, 1973 (Cinema Treasures; accessed May 2013).

Century 24 was one of several geodesic-domed theaters designed for Raymond Syufy of Syufy Enterprises (later Century theaters) by San Francisco architect Vincent G. Raney. Syufy erected several domed theaters in many western cities from the 1960s through the mid-1980s, and Raney designed all of the Syufy Century theaters through the early 1990s. The Century 24 Theater was constructed in the same dome style as the other dome theaters and with similar building materials that were used for the Century 22 and 23 theaters that preceded it (the original Century 21 dome includes ornate features that were not included in subsequent dome designs). Century 24 was also altered in 1973 when it was twinned by a single wall built down the center and most of the other dome theaters remain single theaters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1968</td>
<td>Century 24 Theater under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 1968</td>
<td>Afternoon showing of Gone with the Wind marks the opening of Century 24 Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1973</td>
<td>A wall was built down the middle of the dome and reopened for the public as a twin on June 17, 1973.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Century 24 was separated from her sisters Century 21, 22, and 23 when Century Theaters sold to Cinemark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.5 - Century 25 Theater

The Century 25 opened at 1694 Saratoga Avenue on May 27, 1969, as a single screen theater but was twinned in November 1974 providing 625 seats and two viewing screens (Photograph 15). In late-August 2009, it was christened the Retro Dome featuring a mix of classic movies and live band and comedy performances.
2.4.6 - Century Almaden 3 & 4 Theatre

Although extensive archival research was conducted, very little information was found on this three-dome theater that is located at 5655 Gallup Drive and is currently the Cornerstone Community Church (Photograph 16). However, permits were issued in 1971.

To try to determine when the Theatre was used as a church, an email was sent to Pastor Selness of the Cornerstone Community Church on July 19, 2013. An email response was received the same day from Pastor Selness stating, “We’ve been using the Century Almaden domed theater as a church full-time since 1996. We used it just on Sunday mornings for church between 1993 and 1996.”

The opening dates for the Century Theatres are provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theater Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Estimated Opening Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Century 21 Theatre</td>
<td>3161 Olsen Drive, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>November 24, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 22 Theatre</td>
<td>3162 Olin Avenue, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>March 8, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 23 Theatre</td>
<td>3164 Olsen Drive, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>March 14, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 24 Theatre</td>
<td>741 S. Winchester Boulevard, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>July 17, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 25 Theatre</td>
<td>1694 Saratoga Avenue, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>May 27, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century - Almaden</td>
<td>5655 Gallup Drive, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>(permits issued in 1971)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Opening dates are based on the information included on this website: http://www.cinematour.com/main.php.
SECTION 3: RESULTS

3.1 - Record Search

3.1.1 - Information Center Search

On April 22, 2013, FCS Senior Project Archaeologist, Carrie D. Wills, conducted a record search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located in Rohnert Park, California. The records search included 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) for Santa Clara County were reviewed to determine the existence of previously documented local historical resources.

Results from the NWIC indicate that 21 previous studies were conducted within 0.50 mile of the project area; none included the project area. Two historic structures and one historic ranch site have been recorded within a 0.50-mile radius of the project area (Table 3). One of the structures, the Winchester Mystery House, is listed on the NR and is located across I-280 from the project. No prehistoric resources have been recorded within the 0.50-mile record search radius.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report #</th>
<th>Author/Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-004636</td>
<td>Brent W. Miller;1974</td>
<td>Nation Register of Historic Places Nomination For, Winchester Mystery House, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-008217</td>
<td>Robert Cartier; 1986</td>
<td>Prehistoric Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Teresi Village Site on Winchester Blvd., San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-009872</td>
<td>Robert Cartier; 1988</td>
<td>Prehistoric Cultural Resource Evaluation of a Parcel at 751 Winchester Boulevard, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-009942</td>
<td>Robert Cartier; 1988</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Action Day Nursery School Project in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010188</td>
<td>Robert Cartier; 1988</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of 780 S. Winchester Boulevard, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010451</td>
<td>Miley Paul Holman</td>
<td>Archaeological Field Inspection of the Met-Life Monroe Street Project Area, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (cont.): Studies Conducted within 0.50 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report #</th>
<th>Author/Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-010852</td>
<td>Archaeological Resource Management</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of a Parcel (APN 279-2-5) off Moorpark Ave. San Jose, County of Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-017637</td>
<td>Robert Cartier and Lynne Eckert; 1995</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation, Phase II of the Action Day Nursery School Project on Moorpark Ave, San Jose, County of Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-020134</td>
<td>Robert Cartier; 1997</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of a Parcel located at 801 Winchester Blvd., San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-021669</td>
<td>Miley Paul Holman; 1999</td>
<td>Archaeological Field Inspection of the Huff Ave. Housing Project, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-022228</td>
<td>Robert R. Cartier; 1999</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of 0.75 Acres of land at 440 S. Winchester Blvd., San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-025268</td>
<td>Miley Holman; 2001</td>
<td>Archaeological Literature Review and Field Inspection of the 3080 Neal Ave. Property, APN 279-09-50, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-026393</td>
<td>Carolyn Losee; 2002</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Analysis for Cingular Wireless BA-352-02 Grocery Outlet Site, San Jose, CA (Letter Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-030615</td>
<td>Basin Research Associates; 2004</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment Report, 745 S. Winchester Blvd., San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-031568</td>
<td>Miley Paul Holman; 2005</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Literature Review and Field Inspection of the 3030 and 3040 Neal Avenue Development Site, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-033545</td>
<td>National Park Service; 1994</td>
<td>Draft Comprehensive Management and Use Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, Arizona and California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-034242</td>
<td>Basin Research Associates; 2007</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment Report, Santana Row Parcel 8B, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036451</td>
<td>Randy Wiberg; 2009</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report with Results of Extended Phase I Geoarchaeological Explorations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036876</td>
<td>Ward Hill; 2009</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report for the Modifications to I-880/Stevens Creek Blvd., SR-17/I-280/I-880..., San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-039036</td>
<td>Basin Research Associates; 2008</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment Report, Santana Row Parcel 3B Garage, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Historic Resources within 0.50 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance from Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-000400</td>
<td>525 S. Winchester Boulevard, San Jose, CA&lt;br&gt;Winchester Mystery House&lt;br&gt;Listed on the NR as an individual property</td>
<td>~1400 feet south; across I-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-001022</td>
<td>751 S. Winchester Boulevard; Teresi Ranch&lt;br&gt;No longer extant; currently a Toys-R-Us Store</td>
<td>~225 feet southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-002236</td>
<td>524, 534, and 544 Dudley Avenue (Brentwood Apts. and O’Dell Arms Apts.); not on CR or NR</td>
<td>~1600 feet northeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1.2 - Native American Heritage Commission Record Search

On April 30, 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. On June 20, 2013, a response was received from the NAHC stating 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 10 Native American representatives who may have additional information about the project site was sent with the results. On June 20, 2013, letters were sent to each of the 10 representatives requesting further information about the project area. As of this date, no responses have been received from any of the Native American representatives.

#### 3.2 - Pedestrian Survey

FCS Senior Project Archaeologist, Carrie D. Wills, surveyed the project area on April 22, 2013. The entire project area is covered by asphalt parking lots, adjacent buildings, sparse landscape elements, and the theater structure. Therefore, since there was no ground surface visibility, the survey consisted of photographing the theater structure, and taking overview photographs of the nearby buildings and residences to provide a geographic context.

The project area consists of asphalt parking areas with the Century 24 theater located at the northwest corner of the lot (Appendix A: Photograph 4). To the east is asphalt parking with South Winchester Boulevard beyond (Photograph 5) and to the west is fencing and a row of trees with residences and Opal Drive beyond (Photograph 6). North of the theater is an asphalt parking area, with fencing, trees and residences – Riddle Road is north of the residences (Photograph 7). South of the theater is a large Toys R Us building (Photograph 8), a row of shops housed in a single building and parking with Magliocco Drive behind (south) of the shops (Photograph 9).

The theater is a one-story, circular-shaped, asymmetrical, Modern style, movie theater building sited within a large shopping center complex. The building has a concrete foundation, concrete block and stucco exterior and a concrete, dome-shaped roof structure. The main entrance on the east elevation includes pairs of metal and glass double doors flanked by floor to ceiling metal and glass window sections. The entrance area includes concrete pillars that support a metal overhang and marquee style roof system. The roof section supported by the pillars extends around the edge of the
dome roof system and forms a horizontal detail element (Photograph 10). A metal staircase provides access to the overhang and lower roof area. This section of the elevation contains four dormer style windows (Photograph 11). The northwest elevation has two sets of double-doors and a single employee entrance door (Photograph 12). Signage is present on the exterior of the building.

The interior of the structure was originally a one-theater viewing system. The building's interior was altered in 1973 by the construction of a wall down the center of the interior of the theater, creating two separate theaters. Although every effort was made to obtain interior photos on the day of the field survey, the low lights and other obstructions resulted in blurred photographs (Photographs 13 and 14). However, the interior of all the dome theaters was constructed using standard designs and materials.

The building is in good condition and no major exterior alterations were noted. The property includes a large parking lot area with mature palm trees placed at intervals around the property.

3.3 - Evaluation Framework

3.3.1 - The California Register Criteria for Evaluation

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is the official list of properties, structures, districts, and objects significant at the local, state, or national level. CRHR properties must have significance under one of the four following criteria and must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and convey the reasons for their significance (e.g., retain integrity). The CRHR utilizes the same seven aspects of integrity as the National Register. Properties that are eligible for the National Register are automatically eligible for the CRHR. Properties that do not meet the threshold for the National Register may meet the CRHR criteria.

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of local or regional history, or cultural heritage of California or the United States;

2. Associated with the lives of persons important to the local, California or national history

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a design-type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic value; or

4. Yields important information about prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

CRHR criteria are similar to NR criteria and are tied to CEQA, so any resource that meets the above criteria, and retains a sufficient level of historic integrity, is considered a historical resource under CEQA.

Integrity

A resource may be considered individually eligible for listing in the NR/CRHR if it meets one or more of the above listed criteria for significance and it possesses historic integrity. Historic properties
must retain sufficient historic integrity to convey their significance. The NR recognizes seven aspects or qualities that define historic integrity:

- **Location.** The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- **Design.** The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Setting.** The physical environment of a historic property.
- **Materials.** The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- **Workmanship.** The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- **Feeling.** A property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- **Association.** The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

To retain historic integrity, a resource should possess several of the above-mentioned aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is essential for a resource to convey its significance. Comparisons with similar properties should also be considered when evaluating integrity as it may be important in deciding what physical features are essential to reflect the significance of a historic context.

### 3.3.2 - Criteria Consideration G: Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Past 50 Years

The NR Criteria for Evaluation exclude properties that achieved significance within the past 50 years unless they are of exceptional importance. Fifty years is a general estimate of the time needed to develop historical perspective and to evaluate historic significance. This consideration guards against the listing of properties of passing contemporary interest and ensures that the NR is a list of truly historic places.

### 3.3.3 - Examples of Properties that must Meet Criteria Consideration G: Properties that have Achieved Significance within the Past 50 Years

- A property that is less than 50 years old.
- A property that continues to achieve significance into a period less than 50 years before the nomination.
- A property that has non-contiguous Periods of Significance, one of which is less than 50 years before the nomination.
• A property that is more than 50 years old and had no significance until a period less than 50 years before the nomination.

3.3.4 - Applying Criteria Consideration G: Properties that have Achieved Significance within the Last 50 Years: Eligibility for Exceptional Importance

The phrase “exceptional importance” may be applied to the extraordinary importance of an event or to an entire category of resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual. Properties listed that had attained significance in less than 50 years include the launch pad at Cape Canaveral from which men first traveled to the moon and the home of nationally prominent playwright Eugene O’Neill.

Historical Perspective

A property that has achieved significance within the past 50 years can be evaluated only when sufficient historical perspective exists to determine that the property is exceptionally important. The necessary perspective can be provided by scholarly research and evaluation, and must consider both the historic context and the specific property’s role in that context.

Comparison with Related Properties

In justifying exceptional importance, it is necessary to identify other properties within the geographical area that reflect the same significance or historic associations and to determine which properties best represent the historic context in question. Several properties in the area could become eligible with the passage of time, although it is unknown which ones might qualify now as exceptionally important.

3.4 - Findings

3.4.1 - California Register of Historical Resources

This section uses the historic information discussed above to evaluate the Century 24 Theater for historic significance. The CRHR uses generally the same guidelines as the NR; as such, selected language from those guidelines will be quoted below to help clarify the evaluation discussion.

To be potentially eligible for individual listing on the CRHR, a structure must usually be more than 50 years old, must have historic significance, and must retain its physical integrity. The subject building was constructed in 1968 (currently 45 years old) and therefore does not meet the age requirement. Because the property is less than 50 years old, it will be evaluated below under Criterion G for exceptional importance.

Criterion 1 (Event)

Criterion 1 “recognizes properties associated with single events, such as the founding of a town, or with a pattern of events, repeated activities, or historic trends, such as the gradual rise of a port city’s prominence in trade and commerce.” When considering a property for significance under this criterion, the associated event or trends “must clearly be important within the associated context:
settlement, in the case of the town, or development of a maritime economy, in the case of the port city. Moreover, the property must have an important association with the event or historic trends.”

The Century 24 Theater was constructed in July of 1968. Though the Theater was built during a time of local San Jose expansion, research does not show that the theater is exceptionally significant for its individual role in the expansion of San Jose. As such, the theater does not appear to exhibit a level of significance that would warrant listing at the state level under this criterion.

The film industry followed its market and established several multiplex movie theaters in the 1960s and 1970s. Though the Century 24 theater is associated with this pattern of development, it was not the first or last of its type to be constructed, other dome theaters were being constructed in other parts of California. A better example of theaters associated with this type of development is the cluster of theaters located north and across I-280 from this theater. Therefore, the subject property does not appear to exhibit a significant, or exceptional, level of significance for association with a pattern of theater development in the 1960s.

For the reasons discussed above, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

**Criterion 2 (Person)**

This criterion applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented. The NPS defines significant persons as “individuals whose activities are demonstrably important within a local, state, or national historic context. The criterion is generally restricted to those properties that illustrate (rather than commemorate) a person’s important achievements. The persons associated with the property must be individually significant within a historic context.” The NPS also specifies that these properties “are usually those associated with a person’s productive life, reflecting the time period when he or she achieved significance.”

While prominent theater developer Raymond Syufy built the theater, it was one of dozens of theaters constructed by his company and it does not appear to illustrate his primary achievements. Arguably, Raymond Syufy’s most notable achievement was his triumph over the major film producers in 1949 and 1950, a victory that greatly expanded his independent business in theater development in the 1950s, the 1960s, and beyond. The Century 24 Theater was part of his company’s expansion but does not appear to be an exceptional representation of Syufy’s significance.

For the reasons discussed above, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

**Criterion 3 (Design/Construction)**

Under this criterion, properties may be eligible if they “embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction . . . represent the work of a master . . . possess high artistic values, or . . . represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.”
The subject property was one of many domed movie theaters designed by Vincent Raney for Syufy Enterprises in the 1960s through the 1980s. Raney had a long and prolific career designing a variety of building types including service stations, office buildings, and commercial buildings in addition to movie theaters. Though he designed hundreds of buildings, many of which are notable examples of design, a full understanding of the breadth and significance of his work has yet to be developed as his productive career spanned into the 1990s. Though his body of work may receive more academic attention as his buildings reach the 50-year mark, Raney has not yet been recognized as a “figure of generally recognized greatness” in his field; therefore, the subject property does not appear to be exceptionally significant as the work of a master.

A structure is eligible “as a specimen of its type or period of construction if it is an important example (within its context) of building practices of a particular time in history.” The subject property is less than 50 years old, and while the domed movie theater is a locally distinctive and recognizable building, sufficient time has not passed to determine the significance of this style type within the context of architectural history. According to Criteria Consideration G: a property under 50 years of age “can be evaluated only when sufficient historical perspective exists to determine that the property is exceptionally important. The necessary perspective can be provided by scholarly research and evaluation, and must consider both the historic context and the specific property’s role in that context.” Though some preliminary study and recognition of these domed theaters as notable works of architecture exists, the information available is not adequate to justify listing at the state level for exceptional significance under Criterion 3.

When evaluating potential historic resources under Criteria Consideration G, “it is necessary to identify other properties within the geographical area that reflect the same significance or historic associations and to determine which properties best represent the historic context in question.” Comparative analysis of similar properties in the wider Bay Area and the immediate surroundings indicates that many of Raney’s domed theaters have been demolished in recent years. However, a small number exist and remain in relatively good condition in San Jose, including the Century 24 Theater. Archival research indicates that the cluster of theaters, commonly referred to as Century 21, 22 and 23, located adjacent to the Winchester Mystery House in San Jose and across I-280 from the Century 24, are historically significant. This grouping of five Century theaters includes the Century 21 dome theater that was the flagship theater built by the Raney/Syufy partnership. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal (Heather David May 30, 2013) indicated that due to its historic significance there is the possibility that the Century 21 Theater may be retained and reused.

Because more significant examples exist in relatively close proximity to the Century 24 theater, and the subject property is not the first or the last of these theaters in the region, exceptional importance for the Century 24 theater is not warranted.

For the reasons discussed above, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

**Criterion 4 (Information Potential)**

Criterion 4 applies to archaeological resources and consequently is not evaluated in this report.
3.4.2 - Integrity Evaluation

Evaluation of potential historic resources is a two-part process. A property must meet one or more of the criteria for significance, and possesses historic integrity. The Century 24 Theater was not found to display a level of exceptional significance necessary for listing on the CRHR; therefore, evaluation of the building’s integrity is unnecessary.

3.4.3 - City of San Jose

Though properties may not exhibit a level of significance warranted for listing on the NR or the CRHR, local criteria often present a broader range of options to allow for recognition of notable properties at the local level. Within its General Plan, the City of San Jose has established a set of criteria for the establishment of historic districts and cultural resource designations (see Appendix D Regulatory Framework). However, the City of San Jose’s General Plan Goals and Policies do not address properties that have not yet reached the standard 50 year age threshold; therefore, the subject property was evaluated using the two most applicable criteria, and age is not considered a factor for eligibility.

The Century 24 building was evaluated under two of the City of San Jose’s criteria:

- **LU-14.2**: Give high priority to the preservation of historic structures that contribute to an informal cluster or a Conservation Area; have a special value in the community; are a good fit for preservation within a new project; have a compelling design and/or an important designer; etc.

- **LU-14.4**: Discourage demolition of any building or structure listed on or eligible for the Historic Resources Inventory as a Structure of Merit by pursuing the alternatives of rehabilitation, re-use on the subject site, and/or relocation of the resource.

As mentioned previously, the most important cluster of dome theaters is located across I-280 from the Century 24. This grouping of five Century theaters are generally intact, most are in active use, and the Century 21 dome among the cluster was the flagship theater built by the Raney/Syufy partnership. Because these more significant examples of dome theaters exist near the Century 24 Theater, and the subject property is not the first or the last of these theaters in the region, exceptional importance of the subject property is not justified.

3.4.4 - Conclusion

The Century 24 Theater does not appear to exhibit the level of exceptional significance necessary to warrant listing on the NR, CRHR or a local listing. In addition, although the theater retains a good degree of physical integrity, there are other dome theaters across I-280 that are better examples of the Raney/Syufy dome theaters, including the flagship Century 21 theater. Therefore, the Century 24 Theater does not appear potentially eligible for listing as a cultural resource at the NR, CRHR, 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 three historic resources have been recorded within a 0.50-mile radius of the project area. As of this date, a response has not been received from the NAHC.

Results of the evaluation indicate that the Century 24 Theater does not appear to exhibit the level of exceptional significance necessary to warrant listing on the NR or the CRHR. In addition, although the theater retains a good degree of physical integrity, there are other nearby theaters that are better examples of historically significant dome theaters. Therefore, Century 24 Theater does not appear to be eligible for listing as a historically significant resource at the local level.

4.2 - Recommendations

4.2.1 - Cultural Resources Recommendations

No prehistoric resources were discovered during the course of the pedestrian survey. The Century 24 Theater was evaluated and found not to meet the eligibility criteria for listing on the NR, the CRHR or local listings. The theater building itself was recorded on the appropriate DPR forms; therefore, no further archaeological work is recommended.

Based on the results of the record searches and pedestrian survey, FCS considers the project area to have a low sensitivity for prehistoric and historic resources, and archaeological monitoring 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 archeologist 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 Section15064.5 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.
SECTION 5: REFERENCES


Selness, NA. July 19, 2013. Email response to inquiry about use of Century Almaden 3 and 4 as Cornerstone Church.


Photograph 1: Photograph 1: Century 21 Theatre; 3161 Olsen Drive San Jose, opened in 1964

Photograph 2: Photograph 2: Century 22 Theatre; 3162 Olin Avenue, opened in 1966
Photograph 3: Century 23 Theatre; 3164 Olsen Drive, opened 1968.

Photograph 4: Overview of Century 24 Theatre; 741 S. Winchester Blvd., opened 1968; facing west.
SyWest Development – 741 S. Winchester Project
Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment

Photograph 5: Overview from Century 24 Theatre; facing east.

Photograph 6: Overview from Century 24 Theatre; facing west.
Photograph 7: Overview from Century 24 Theatre; facing north.

Photograph 8: View from Century 24 Theatre to Toys R Us building; facing south.
Photograph 9: View of small shops south of Century 24 Theatre; facing south.

Photograph 10: View of Century 24 Theatre’s east elevation; facing west.
Photograph 11: View of Century 24 Theatre, detailing metal staircase; facing northwest

Photograph 12: Century 24 Theatre; northwest elevation.

Photograph 14: Interior of Century 24 Theatre.
Photograph 15: Century 25 Theatre, 1694 Saratoga Avenue, opened 1969.

Photograph 16: Cornerstone Community Church (formerly Century Almaden 3 & 4 Theatres).
B.1 - Native American Heritage Commission
Sacred Lands File Search
June 20 2013

Carrie Wills
2633 Camino Ramon
San Ramon, CA 94583

Fax: 925-830-2715

Number of Pages 2

Re: Winchester Dome 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 (918) 373-3713.

Sincerely,

Debbie Pilas-Treadway
Environmental Specialist III
Native American Contacts
Santa Clara County
June 20, 2013

Jakki Kehl
720 North 2nd Street
Patterson, CA 95363
(209) 892-1060

Katherine Erolinda Perez
PO Box 717
Linden, CA 95236
canutes@verizon.net
(209) 887-3415

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Valentin Lopez, Chairperson
PO Box 5272
Galt, CA 95632
vlopez@amahmutsun.org
916-743-5833

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Edward Ketchum
35867 Yosemite Ave
Davis, CA 95616
aerieways@aol.com

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94062
irenezwierlein@gmail.com
(650) 851-7747 - Home
650-400-4806 cell preferred
(650) 851-7489 - Fax

Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band
Jean-Marie Feyling
19350 Hunter Court
Redding, CA 96003
jmfgmc@ebcglobal.net
530-243-1633

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28
Hollister, CA 95024
ams@indiancanyon.org
831-837-4238

Amah/Mutsun Tribal Band
Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94062
irenezwierlein@gmail.com
(650) 851-7747 - Home
650-400-4806 cell preferred
(650) 851-7489 - Fax

The Ohlone Indian Tribe
Andrew Galvan
PO Box 3152
Fremont, CA 94539
chochenyo@AOL.com
(510) 882-0527 - Cell
(510) 687-9393 - Fax

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
PO Box 360791
Millpitas, CA 95036
muwekma@muwekma.org
408-205-9714
510-581-5194

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

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 7050.9 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Winchester Dome project, Santa Clara County.
B.2 - Native American Information Request Representative Letter
June 20, 2013

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28 Hollister, CA 95024

Subject: Proposed Winchester Dome Theater Project, Santa Clara County

Dear Ann Marie Sayers:

At the request of the City of San Jose, Michael Brandman Associates is conducting a Cultural Resources Assessment for a proposed project within the City of San Jose, CA. The project site is located on the northeast corner of S. Winchester Boulevard and Riddle Road in the City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, California. The project is bounded by residential uses to the north and west, and commercial uses to the south and east.

The proposed project consists of demolishing and redeveloping an existing Century 24 dome theatre on the northeast corner of Riddle Road and S. Winchester Boulevard. The applicant is proposing to develop a 20,700 square foot theatre and maintain associated parking and landscaping throughout the project site. The project area was surveyed on April 29, 2013, and no prehistoric resources or features were found.

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, MBA has consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC response letter indicated that there may be additional information to be gained from individual tribal members and/or tribal organizations. MBA is sending this letter to give you the opportunity to provide any additional knowledge 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 D. Wills

Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA
Senior Scientist, Archaeology
FirstCarbon Solutions
2633 Camino Ramon, Suite 460
San Ramon, CA 94583
Phone 925.830.2733 office
Cell 925.788.9097

Enclosures: Aerial Map of Project Area
Appendix C: Personnel Qualifications
Overview

- 20+ Years Experience
- Master’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward
- Bachelor’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward
- Registered Professional Archaeologist #11138

Carrie D. Wills, RPA, MA, 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. She has extensive experience conducting field research, evaluating sites and features for historic significance and preparing reports that comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. Her experience includes evaluating and assessing historic structures and resources for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. 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.

Ms. Wills has been fortunate enough to work in various parts of the world on fascinating projects. She worked in caves in Belize to determine the distances the ancient Mayans were able to travel into the caves and for what purpose(s). She worked in conjunction with Yale University at Machu Picchu in Peru photographing the ruins for a computer-generated, hands on visual presentation that traveled throughout the United States. She worked with David Hurst Thomas, curator of North American Archaeology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, conducting excavations at Mission San Marcos, outside Santa Fe, New Mexico. In addition, she has extended her growth in the field of archaeology by assisting a local underwater archaeologist with archival research that led to the discovery and salvage of the sunken 1852 ship the Rome within the streets of downtown San Francisco.

Related Experience

Historic American Buildings Survey Documentation – Larkspur 16.8-Acre Project, City of Larkspur, Marin County. Serving as project archaeologist, conducted a field survey, records and map review, and historic building evaluation for more than 20 buildings and structures associated with the circa 1920–1980 Niven Nursery in the City of Larkspur. The existing buildings and greenhouses that retained their historic integrity were evaluated for historic significance, recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and documented to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) standards. Additionally, two prehistoric sites were previously recorded and archaeologically tested within the project area, and although neither of the sites was found during the pedestrian survey, to ensure site protection, construction monitoring was recommended during all ground-disturbing activities in these areas.

Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment – DSRSD Central Dublin Recycled Water Distribution and Retrofit Project, City of Dublin, Alameda County, California. As project archaeologist/manager, conducted a cultural resource investigation that included record search reviews, historic map reviews, and a limited field survey of the proposed Central Dublin Recycled Water Distribution and Retrofit Project Area of Potential Effect (APE) that fulfilled the protocols associated with Section 106 of NHPA. The results of the
investigation were submitted to archaeological staff at the Bureau of Reclamation and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of effect.

**Lake Solano Regional Park Visitor’s Center Project, County of Solano.** As project archaeologist, Ms. Wills conducted a cultural resource investigation that included record search reviews and a pedestrian field survey. As the project had a federal nexus, the work included a comprehensive report that met the criteria in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The lead agency was the Bureau of Reclamation which has specific procedures that must be followed when unanticipated human remains or cultural resources are discovered. In addition to complying with the Bureau of Reclamation procedures, the results of the research and field survey were submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for concurrence with the stated recommendations.

**KB Home Monte Vista, Historic American Buildings Survey, City of San Jose.** Served as project manager for the KB Home Monte Vista Project. Conducted Historic American Buildings Survey Level III documentation for a large multi-structure canning facility, Del Monte Plant #3, in San Jose. Tasks included producing over 200 large-format, black and white photographs of exterior and interior views of the existing structures. The MBA historic report augments the photographic documentation by placing the structures within the appropriate historic context and addressing both the architectural and historical aspects of the site’s significance. Specifically, the historical report focused on the Plant’s contribution to the growth of the canning industry in San José. The plant was also assessed for historic significance and found to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a District along with two other local Del Monte canneries. MBA coordinated with state, federal, and city agencies including, but not limited to, City of San Jose Department of Planning and the National Park Service HABS/Historic American Engineering Record coordinator.

**Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment/HABS Documentation – St. Regis Napa Valley Project, City of Napa, Napa County.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of a historic structure in the County of Napa. Also served as the project archaeologist. Following the evaluation of the historic significance of the building and recording it to HABS standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Dixon Veterans Memorial Hall Project and the Benicia Veterans Memorial Hall Project, County of Solano.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of two historic structures in the County of Solano. After evaluating and recording the buildings to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Solano County Free Library Center Project, County of Solano.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of an historic structure in the County of Solano. Also served as the senior project archaeologist. After evaluating and recording the building to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Suisun Veterans Memorial Building Project, Suisun City.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of an older structure in the City of Suisun City. After evaluating and recording the building to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Cultural Resources Assessment – Zone 3A, Line D Capacity Improvements Project and Zone 5, Line A West Levee Improvements Projects, County of Alameda.** Served as project manager and senior archaeologist, conducting a cultural resource assessment for the Zone 3A Line D Capacity Improvements Project, Hayward, and the Zone 5 Line A West Levee Improvements Project, Union City. The assessment consisted of record
searches, review of historic literature, and more than 20 historic aerials to provide an understanding of development within the project areas and a historical context for the projects.

**Off-road Vehicle Park, City of Bakersfield.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted an intensive field survey of 2,500 acres outside the City of Bakersfield. The project area included rolling hills, large flat valleys, and steep ravines. The survey resulted in discovery of over 150 prehistoric resources including bedrock mortars, grinding slicks, and rock art. The resources were recorded and evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. Following the evaluation, a comprehensive report detailing the findings was produced.

**Bel Lago Project, City of Moreno Valley.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a site specific field assessment of the Kerr Ranch and recorded 23 extant buildings and structures on Department of Parks and Recreation forms; both Primary and Building, Structure and Object forms. Detailed descriptions and measurements were taken as part of the assessment process and each building and structure was evaluated individually for listing to the California Register of Historical Places or local registers or landmarks.

**Westlake Shopping Center, City of Daly City.** As senior project archaeologist for this major refurbishing effort for a shopping center located in Daly City, assessed the shopping center for historic significance under CEQA Section 150.64 by reviewing historic maps, photos, and record and archival search results obtained from the Northwest Information Center and the Daly City Planning Department. Scope included conducting a visual appraisal of the existing buildings, structures, and signage.

**San Demas Project, City of Sacramento.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation for a built environment covering one city block in downtown Sacramento. As this was a built environment, there was no native ground surface to be surveyed; the investigation consisted of comprehensive research to determine the possibility of historic structures.

**Cabrillo Corners Commercial Project, City of Half Moon Bay.** As cultural resources specialist, conducted a record search at the Northwest Information Center and a pedestrian field survey of the proposed project area that borders Pilarcitos Creek in Half Moon Bay to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development.

**Gustine Municipal Airport Project, County of Merced.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of a 45-acre parcel located in Merced County to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to improvements to the Airport.

**Scheiber/White Projects, County of El Dorado.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted record searches and field investigations for a 226-acre parcel and a 286-acre parcel of undeveloped land and completed Phase I Reports detailing the record search and field survey results.

**Protzel Project, County of El Dorado.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation for a 35-acre parcel of land. The field survey resulted in discovery of a site that contained both prehistoric and historic components located adjacent to one another.

**Miller Ranch Property, City of Lincoln.** As senior project archaeologist for this 130-acre residential development, reviewed record search results from the North Central Information Center, Sacramento and conducted a pedestrian field survey. A negative survey report was prepared detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.
**Fahren’s Creek Development Project, County of Merced.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation on a parcel of undeveloped land, a portion of which was immediately adjacent to Fahren’s Creek. A negative survey report was prepared detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**McBride R.V. and Self Storage Project, City of Chino.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of a 21.15-acre parcel of land to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development. Prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Brehm Communities, City of Chino.** As senior project archaeologist for this 35-acre residential development, conducted a record search at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center and a modified field survey. Performed a visual assessment from various vantage points rather than a typical pedestrian survey and prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Albers Barnes & Kohler LLP’s Palm Ranch Dairy Project, County of Kern.** As senior project archaeologist, was responsible for CEQA compliance issues related to cultural resources on a 120-acre parcel. Conducted a Phase I survey to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources within the project area, resulting in the discovery of artifactual material on the ground surface. Conducted a Phase II testing program to determine the presence or absence of subsurface cultural resources, resulting in inconclusive findings. Provided mitigation measures to protect any previously undiscovered resources during project excavation activities.

**Albers Barnes & Kohler LLP’s Bonanza Farm Dairy Project, County of Kern.** As cultural resources specialist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of two 200-acre parcels to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development. Prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Montezuma Wetlands Project, County of Solano.** Served as project manager for Solano County’s Montezuma Wetlands Project. Provided technical direction of a 4,700-acre archeological survey in Solano County, resulting in recording and subsurface testing of 12 sites. Co-authored the technical report that included extensive impacts and mitigation measures.

**Arizona Pipeline Reconditioning Project, Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona.** Project manager for a 45 mile pipeline replacement project located along an existing pipeline route in southern Arizona. Project tasks included archival and record searches, pedestrian field survey and a comprehensive report detailing the findings. Various types of historic resources were recorded during the course of the field survey and recommendations were provided as part of a larger environmental studies report produced for the project.

**Costco’s Warehouse Project, City of San Francisco.** Served as project manager for Costco’s Warehouse Project. Surveyed, excavated, and monitored the proposed site, located in downtown San Francisco, for a new Costco store. Supervised lab procedures and analysis of over 1,400 artifacts.

**Mills Associates’ Tassajara Valley Project, County of Solano.** As project manager, provided technical direction of a 2,500-acre archeological survey that resulted in recording and subsurface testing of 14 historic and one prehistoric archeological site. Analyzed artifacts and prepared technical reports.

**Future Urban Areas, Mundie and Associates, County of Contra Costa.** As field director, conducted a 4,500-acre archeological survey that resulted in recording of 11 historic archeological sites, including the previously unrecorded historic town sites of West Hartley, Empire, and Star Mine associated with the Mount Diablo coalfield developments of 1850-1885. Recorded features including foundations, privies, cisterns, basements,
and dumps. Hundreds of surface artifacts were examined. Also directed artifact analysis and prepared technical reports.

**Military Projects**

**Cultural Resources Overview Project, Concord Naval Weapons Station.** Served as project manager for the Cultural Resource Overview Project at Concord Naval Weapons Station. Tasks included review of archival records and record search results for previously recorded sites within the Station. In addition, more than 500 World War II buildings and structures were evaluated for National Register of Historical Places eligibility and documented on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms. An archaeological site prediction model was developed to determine the likelihood of the presence of cultural resources within specific areas of the Station. An extensive context document was prepared to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the Naval Weapons Station in terms of its historic presence within Contra Costa County and the City of Concord. Following assessment of the Station and its historic components, a Cultural Resource Overview Report for the 13,000-acre facility was developed.

**NAVFAC Centerville Beach and Point Sur Projects, Counties of Humboldt and Monterey.** Served as project archaeologist with responsibilities including a review of archival and site records prior to pedestrian field surveys at each of the locations. Following the surveys, documentation on Department of Parks and Recreation forms was prepared for each of the World War II buildings/structures located within the Station boundaries. Subsequent efforts included development and submittal of a historic context report and structural assessments of the buildings to determine National Register of Historic Places eligibility status. Prepared a preliminary Historic and Archeological Resource Protection Plan evaluating known archeological site locations and preparing maps depicting areas of archaeological sensitivity.

**Civil Engineering Laboratory Archaeological and Historic Resources Assessment Project, Port Hueneme.** Served as project archaeologist for the CBC Port Hueneme Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Archaeological and Historic Resources Assessment Project. The cultural resource evaluation included review of archival records and historic Port Hueneme documents at the base, review of previously recorded sites records from the South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU, Fullerton, and research at Ventura Historical Society. Architectural documentation was prepared for nine World War II buildings on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and a single prehistoric site located within the base was assessed. A historic context report was developed and each of the buildings/structures was individually evaluated for National Register of Historic Places eligibility. Following assessment and documentation, an EIR/EIS technical report including a detailed historic setting, an overview of each of the types of buildings within the project area, an impacts assessment section, and appropriate mitigation for the impacts was prepared.

**Navy Construction Battalion Center Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection Plan Project, Port Hueneme.** Served as project manager/archaeologist for the Port Hueneme Navy Construction Battalion Center Overview; Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection Plan Project. The project tasks included archival research of Battalion Center documents a record search review at the South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU, Fullerton, and a pedestrian field survey. Subsequent to the archival research, architectural documentation of 130 World War II buildings/structures was completed on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms. The forms typically included DPR Primary forms for each building or structure although in some instances, e.g., for large non-descript warehouse structures, a representative building was documented and identical buildings were listed on the form as having identical attributes. In addition to the Primary forms, a Building, Structure, Object (BSO) form providing additional descriptive and evaluative information was completed when appropriate. Following the archival research for previously recorded cultural resource sites and the field survey, an archaeological site prediction model was developed for the Battalion Center. Following documentation, a historic context for the Battalion Center was prepared. In addition, each
building was assessed for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility and a Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection (HARP) Plan was prepared.

**H Street Extension Project, Lockheed Missiles and Space Company Property.** The project consisted of an extension of H Street within the western portion of the Lockheed Missiles and Space Company facilities. Archaeological efforts were part of mitigation for construction within a National Register listed prehistoric shell mound. As project archaeologist, the work included pre-construction site testing using various means including shovel and backhoe investigations, surface collection for the entire project area, and a Phase III data recovery program in coordination with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). Disposition of human remains found within the site was decided upon an agreement with the MLD. A construction-monitoring program was conducted during initial grading activities at the site to ensure protection of previously unknown cultural resources and/or additional human remains.

**Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate Historic Resources Assessment Project, City of Rohnert Park.** As project manager, conducted an archival records review at various repositories as well as a record search at the Northwest Information Center in Rohnert Park for previously recorded cultural resource sites. Conducted a field survey and general site reconnaissance of the project area. Subsequent to the archival research and survey, documentation of ten World War II buildings/structures was completed on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms. The buildings and structures were evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, one prehistoric archaeological site was assessed within the project area. A preliminary Historic and Archeological Resource Protection Plan was prepared evaluating known archeological site locations with maps depicting areas of archaeological sensitivity. A historic context was prepared for the project area and a technical report detailing all of the research, field survey, building and structure evaluations, and the assessment of the prehistoric site was provided to the client.

**Energy, Utilities & Pipelines**

**Santa Cruz Water District’s Pipeline Project, County of Santa Cruz.** Served as resource team leader for this project that proposed modifications to the current operation and maintenance of an existing pipeline through implementation of the Santa Cruz North Coast Pipeline Rehabilitation Project. Reviewed compliance issues related to cultural resources found along four major waterways in Santa Cruz County and prepared a CEQA Initial Study to determine environmental impact associated with project implementation. Also provided necessary details to aid in the decision-making process for the project’s next phase.

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Relicensing Project, County of Kern.** As resource team leader, reviewed cultural resources to meet the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in preparation of a new FERC license application. Directed the Section 106 review and prepared the preliminary draft of the license application, evaluated project impacts, and authored the Historic Properties Management Plan and a Programmatic Agreement.

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Relicensing Project, Kilarc-Cow Creek.** As resource team leader, provided NHPA Section 106 compliance review in preparation of a new FERC license application. Following the survey effort, prepared the preliminary draft of the license application, evaluated the project impacts, prepared a comprehensive report, and finalized the Historic Properties Management Plan and a Programmatic Agreement.

**Calypso Project Environmental Impact Statement, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.** Served as resource team leader for Tractebel North America, Inc.’s Calypso Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a new natural gas pipeline extending from the Exclusive Economic Zone in the Atlantic Ocean to Port Everglades. Conducted the
NHPA Section 106 review of both offshore and onshore cultural resources and prepared the preliminary drafts of the third-party EIS for the jurisdictional portion of the pipeline.

**Rock Creek Hydroelectric Project, Oregon.** Served as project archaeologist for Oregon Trail Electric Consumer Cooperative’s Rock Creek Hydroelectric Project. Conducted a reconnaissance survey and evaluation of archaeological and historic resources to meet the requirements of NHPA Section 106.

**Patriot Natural Gas Pipeline Project, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina.** Served as resource team leader for a project consisting of the Mainline Expansion and Patriot Extension three states. The Mainline Expansion involved improvement along East Tennessee Natural Gas Company’s existing pipeline in Tennessee and Virginia, including approximately 187 miles of new pipeline, replacement of old pipeline, additional compression at existing facilities, and five new compressor stations. The Patriot Extension involves approximately 100 miles of new pipeline in Virginia and North Carolina, including three new meter stations. Provided third-party review of cultural resources reports and prepared third-party EIS.

**Northwest Transmission Line Project, Oregon and Washington.** Served as project archaeologist for Wallula Generation, LLC’s Northwest Transmission Line Project. Conducted a 28-mile reconnaissance survey in Oregon and Washington along the Columbia River, evaluated and recorded archaeological sites, and completed appropriate forms for submittal to Washington

**El Paso Energy's and Broadwing Communications' Fiber Optic Line, Texas and California.** Served as resource team leader for a proposed fiber-optic transmission line reaching from El Paso, Texas, to Los Angeles, California. Prepared a Proponent’s Environmental Assessment demonstrating CEQA compliance that was submitted with an application to the California Public Utilities Commission.

**Fiber Optic Project, Cities of San Jose, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.** Served as project manager for a Level Three Communications Fiber Optic Project. Conducted cultural resources studies and supervised construction monitoring to address CPUC mitigation measures during the "city build" portions of the project in San Jose, San Francisco, and the Los Angeles Basin. Prepared workbooks for each construction spread in each city to address potential cultural resources impacts and necessary mitigation required to preclude significant impacts.

**Fiber Network Project, Northern and Southern California.** Served as project manager for 360 Networks’ Fiber Network Project. Responsible for all aspects of project management for this linear project spanning the length of California, including coordination, budget, consultation, and compliance issues.

**Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline, State of California.** As field supervisor for Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline’s Concord-to-Colton Project, performed records search and intensive archaeological survey of a corridor stretching from Fresno, through Bakersfield and Mojave, to San Bernardino. Recorded and evaluated for eligibility for listing on National Register of Historic Places more than 150 historic properties.

**CPUC Alturas Transmission Line Project, California and Nevada.** As archaeological monitor, documented compliance with mandated mitigation measures during the construction of this high-voltage power line reaching from Alturas, California, to Reno, Nevada.

**Mine Reclamation Plans and Environmental Analysis**

**Abandoned Mine Inventory Project, Washington Bureau of Land Management.** As project manager, managed a five-person survey crew who conducted an intensive archaeological survey of 1,700 acres of difficult terrain and conditions in the City of Spokane. Recorded over 100 mining features and archaeological
properties on appropriate State of Washington forms and prepared Determination of Eligibility forms for submittal to Washington’s State Historic Preservation Officer.

**Black Diamond Mine Project, Merced County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record search and pedestrian field survey for approximately 29 acres of a 136 acre parcel of land in Merced County. During the field survey, a cemetery with headstones dating back to the mid-1800s was discovered. Although the cemetery had a fence completely around it, it is often the case with cemeteries of this age that burials are located outside the defined cemetery area. Thus, archival research was conducted to determine the actual age and the size of the cemetery as it grew over the years. Recommendations for procedures to be followed if the proposed project moved forward were presented to the County of Merced in the form of an Initial Study report.

**KRC Aggregates Quarry Expansion Project, San Joaquin County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record searches and a pedestrian field survey for approximately 340 acres that would be utilized for aggregate resource extraction. Approved mine land reclamation in accordance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act would begin immediately following the completion of aggregate extraction. The field survey resulted in recordation of 4 historic resources and the preparation of a comprehensive report meeting the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Valley Rock Quarry Project, San Joaquin County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record searches and a pedestrian field survey of approximately 315 acres in San Joaquin County. Although no resources were recorded for this project, a small prehistoric site had been previously recorded near the project’s southern border. As the boundaries for this prehistoric site were rather vague, the field survey transects were narrowed to 3 meters in the southern boundary area to determine the presence or absence of the site within the project area. No evidence of the prehistoric site was found. The findings of the record searches, the field survey, and the search for the prehistoric site were detailed in an Initial Study report and presented to San Joaquin County.

**Environmental Impact Reports for General Plan Updates**

**General Plan Update, County of Monterey.** As senior project archaeologist, assisted in updating the General Plan with new policies including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources. Tasks included a review of existing policies and suggestions for alternatives and updates relevant to current trends. Worked closely with Monterey County staff, agency personnel, and sub-consultants to ensure a high quality, timely Plan Update.

**Trails Specific Plan Project, City of Livermore.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted archival and record searches, including review of the 2000 North Livermore Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report and the 2003 City of Livermore General Plan Update Master Environmental Assessment that specifically focuses on cultural resources within the proposed project area. Conducted a 235-acre pedestrian survey to determine the significance of previously recorded cultural resources and the presence or absence of previously unknown cultural resources, resulting in the recording of five historic resources using California Department of Parks and Recreation forms with context analysis and detailed maps. Prepared a comprehensive report including a detailed setting section with impacts and mitigation measures to ensure protection of significant cultural resources.

**Educational Facility Environmental Analysis**

**Delta View and Kit Carson Schools Project, Kings County Office of Education.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted archaeological and historical resource assessment at two proposed telecommunication tower sites located at two school sites. Conducted a record search at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center and pedestrian surveys at both schools to determine the presence or
absence of cultural resources. Determined negative survey results, and prepared a report detailing the record search and survey results that was presented to the Kings County Office of Education.

**High Desert Power Plant Project, County of San Bernardino.** As project manager, conducted an approximately 2,000-acre field inventory of block and linear project areas located near the City of Victorville. Recorded and evaluated more than 30 historic and prehistoric sites.

**Maya Caves Project, Punta Gorda, Belize, Central America.** As excavation team member, worked two field seasons examining prehistoric cave deposits. Conducted surveys and excavations, analyzed and cataloged artifacts, and prepared technical report sections.

**Professional Affiliations**

- Society for Historical Archaeology
- Society for California Archaeology
- Register of Professional Archaeologists  #11138
Overview

Kathleen Crawford has over 26 years of experience in the preparation of a wide range of historical and architectural projects. She meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Architectural History and History (36 CFR Part 61). She has extensive experience with 19th- and 20th-century architecture in California and has prepared over 12,000 historic and architectural assessments of structures in California for a variety of historical projects conducted for various types of city, state, and federal agencies. The majority of these projects required compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Ms. Crawford has extensive experience in the implementation of Section 106 in reference to historic buildings from all historic periods and architectural styles. The vast majority of these projects required preparation of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms for submittal to the State Historic Preservation Office. She has prepared several Historic American Building Survey (HABS) surveys and documentation over the years and has worked with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties in the course of the historic and architectural evaluations. In addition, Ms. Crawford has participated in the production of numerous cultural resources reports and assessments, environmental impact reports, and historic building surveys of potential historic districts in California, Arizona, and Kentucky. She has been a Lecturer in the History Department at San Diego State University since 1989, and her extensive teaching experience in U.S. History has aided her understanding of the historical assessment and evaluation process.

HISTORIC AND HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL WORK EXPERIENCE

Sole proprietor of historical projects consulting service with clients including:

**Michael Brandman and Associates, Irvine, California. 2001–Present**

Ms. Crawford meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards as an Architectural Historian and has prepared over 750 Section 106 Compliance Reports for Historical and Architectural Assessments for Cell Tower sites in California, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico. All projects required Section 106 compliance level assessments and preparation of DPR 523 forms for the project sites and submittal to the State Historic Preservation Office for concurrence with the findings of effect. Clients include AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon, Cingular. Assessments include 19th- to 20th-century historic buildings (civic, hospitals, private residences, businesses, churches, schools), cemeteries, structures, telephone poles, water tanks, and steel lattice towers. Over 75 of the projects have taken place in Northern California in Alameda, San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Jose counties.

*Selected projects include:*

**Standard Aero Buildings, Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).** Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1940s Airport Structures for Cell Tower construction, January 2011


**HABS Survey of Niven Nursery, Larkspur.** Preparation of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation of circa 1940s Niven Nursery, Larkspur, California, July 2011

**Independent Order of Odd Fellows Cemetery, Sacramento.** Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1890s National Register-eligible historic Sacramento cemetery – January 2011
Leamington Hotel, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1920s National Register-eligible hotel in downtown Oakland – July 2010

East Bay Alliance Chinese Church, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1940s church complex – September 2010

Piedmont Apartments, Oakland. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s apartment complex, Oakland – December 2010

Oakland Coliseum, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1960s sports stadium – May 2010

Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1900 National Register-listed landmark historic hotel for cell tower construction, November 2010

University of San Jose Stadium, San Jose. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1950s sports stadium – July 2010

University of Santa Clara, Swig Hall, San Jose. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1960s residence hall – May 2010

Swedish American Hall, San Francisco. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1890s National Register-eligible building for proposed cell tower placement – May 2010

Seton Medical Center, San Francisco. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1950s Seton Medical Center for cell tower construction – August 2010

United Pipe Foundry, Union City. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s historic water tank on historic foundry property – August 2010

Palo Alto Apartment Complex, Palo Alto. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1950s apartment complex – October 2010

Petaluma Hotel, Petaluma. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1920s hotel in National Register-listed historic downtown business district – May 2011

Paramount Studios, Los Angeles. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of several buildings on Paramount Studios lot that dated to earliest development of the Paramount Studios Corporation in the 1920s – April 2010

St. Mary’s Hospital, Tucson, Arizona. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s hospital in Tucson – July 2011

Historic Hotel, Elko, Nevada. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s hotel in Elko, Nevada – October 2010

Sunwest Building, Roswell, New Mexico. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of potentially circa 1950s National Register-eligible building in Roswell, New Mexico – December 2010

KP Environmental LLC, Tempe, Arizona and Carlsbad, California. 2011

Borrego Springs, California. Preparation of Cultural Resources Report for CA-SDI-20016 and Historic Assessment of former circa 1940s DiGiorgio Fruit Corporation property in Borrego Springs, California for County of San Diego – October 2011

Hell, California. Preparation of Cultural Resources Report and Historic Assessment of Hell, California for historic documentation of circa 1950s P-33-18794 archaeological site for County of Riverside – September 2011
C&S Environmental Services. 1999–2007

**Federal Aviation Administration, Quieter Home Program.** Historical and Architectural Assessment of approximately 1,000 circa 1910–1960 historic homes in Point Loma and San Diego for sound retrofitting program conducted by the Federal Aviation Administration. State of California DPR 523 forms were prepared for each property for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historical Resources Board.

**Ogden Environmental and Energy Services, Inc.**
- 1990–1997, Senior Historian
- 1997–2001, Historical Consultant

Responsible for all phases of research, analysis and preparation of cultural resources reports, environmental impact reports, and historic building surveys for compliance with federal, state, and local agencies and regulations. Section 106 compliance assessments were conducted for all properties and preparation of DPR 523 forms were completed for all properties. Selected projects included:

- **San Diego Naval Training Center** – Preparation of National Register nomination for property including approximately 400 buildings
- **Chollas Heights Radio Station** – Preparation of Historic American Buildings Survey for radio station for approximately 100 buildings
- **Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 300 buildings
- **Long Beach Naval Station and Shipyard** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 750 buildings
- **Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton** – Preparation of History of Air Station
- **Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii** – Preparation of History of Air Base
- **Naval Air Station, Guam** – Preparation of Base Closure Documentation for approximately 150 structures
- **San Diego Naval Air Station, Coronado** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of selected air base facilities
- **Naval Air Station, El Centro** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of air base properties, including approximately 100 buildings
- **San Diego Naval Station, 32nd Street** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 350 buildings
- **Caltrans** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for approximately 200 properties in San Diego and Riverside counties
- **Kentucky Department of Transportation (KDOT)** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments of approximately 100 properties in Louisville, Kentucky
- **Miramar Naval Air Station** – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 250 buildings

**Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law, San Diego, California. 1988–Present**

Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for over 800 circa 1880–1965 properties in San Diego, La Jolla, and County of San Diego. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural
assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Scott Moomjian, Attorney at Law, San Diego, California. 1993–Present
Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for over one hundred circa 1880–1965 properties in San Diego, La Jolla, and County of San Diego. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Archaeos, Incirca, San Diego, California. 1999–2009
Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments of properties in San Diego, Chula Vista, Orange County, and Riverside County dating from 1900–1960. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Wright and L'Estrange, Robert Wright, Attorney at Law, San Diego, California. 2004–2008
Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for properties in San Diego County. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Matthew Peterson, Attorney at Law, San Diego, California. 2003–2004
Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for properties in San Diego County. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Island Architects, La Jolla, California. 2004
Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for properties in San Diego County. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for Properties in San Diego; Historical assistance with Naval Training Center Historic District issues.

County of San Diego, San Diego, California. 1990
Preparation of Historic Survey of Sweetwater/Bonita area for over 300 properties. These projects required preparation of historic and architectural assessments, preparation of DPR 523 forms, and final reports for submittal to County of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historic Resources Board.

Jennings, Engstrand and Henrickson law firm, San Diego, California. 1986
Preparation of research for San Diego County water rights case for successful presentation to U.S. Supreme Court.
MUSEUM EXPERIENCE:

Women’s Museum of California, San Diego, California. 2011

**Historical Consultant.** Preparation of Research and Exhibit Panels for 1911–2011 Women’s Suffrage Exhibit

Coronado Historical Association, Coronado, California. 2009–2010

**Historical and Architectural Consultant** conducting research for:
- 2009–2010 Annual Historic Home Tours
- “Wings of Gold, 100 Years of Naval Aviation” exhibit
- “Coronado We Remember” exhibit, 2009–2010.

Coronado Historical Association, Coronado, California. 2010

**Interim Registrar and Archivist**

La Jolla Historical Society, La Jolla, California. 2006

**Archivist** for historical collection


**Assistant Education Coordinator.** Responsible for all phases of Education Department activities including teaching anthropology courses, preparation of newsletter, lecture and film series, trips, and overall programs for museum visitors.


**Assistant Curator of Collections.** Responsible for all phases of collection management and administration, research and exhibition for 20,000+ piece collection of San Diego history displayed in four local museums; supervision and management of Facade Easement Program for donation of historic building facades to Society; served as Museum Registrar, which included documentation and management of all curatorial files, archival materials, object documentation, photograph collection, and art collection; supervision of volunteer program, student interns, and preparation of visitor materials and tours.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

**History, Anthropology and Political Science Lecturer.** 1987–Present

San Diego State University – 1989–Present
- Early/Modern World History
- Early/Modern U.S. History
- Early/Modern Latin American History
- Early/Modern Western Civilization

University of San Diego – 1987–2006
- Early/Modern World History
- Early/Modern U.S. History
- Renaissance History
Early/Modern Western Civilization
History of San Diego
Historian’s Methods

United States International University – 1990–2000
The American Presidency
Introduction to Political Science
Early/Modern History of Asia
Early/Modern Western Civilization
Early/Modern World History
Intercultural Communication
American Culture

Early/Modern History of Women in Western Civilization
Early/Modern Western Civilization
Early/Modern World History
Early/Modern Latin American History

Cuyamaca College – 1995–1996
United States History, Early and Modern

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:

San Diego Historical Society – Volunteer in Education Department, Planning programs, assistance with newsletter and docent training, 1987–1996.

San Diego Museum of Man – Volunteer in Education Department, Planning programs, assistance with newsletter and docent training, 1993–1996.


University of San Diego – Co-Chair of Native American Arts Festival, annual festival held on university campus showcasing Native American art and culture, 2003–2005.


Confucius Institute – Board Member/San Diego State University

San Diego State University – Volunteer, Prepared grant for Dean Paul Wong, for funding for ethnomusic teacher in Music Department. Grant was for Artist in Residence Program in the department, 2007.

San Diego State University – Mentor to students from China brought to SDSU as part of Chinese Studies Institute, Fall 2007–Spring 2008

PUBLICATIONS:


San Diego Transit Corporation – Preparation of 100th Anniversary of corporation, 1986.

**EDUCATION:**

University of San Diego

**Master of Arts, History, 1987**

- Valedictorian/Summa cum laude
- Thesis: History of San Diego Transit Corporation

**Bachelor of Arts, History, 1984**

- California and Latin American emphasis
- Magna cum laude

**Bachelor of Arts, Anthropology, 1984**

- California and Latin American emphasis
- Magna cum laude

Grossmont College

**Associate of Arts, General, 1982**

- With Honors
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), Section 106 of 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).

Additionally, cities and counties have developed Goals and Policies within their General Plans that address preservation and protection of historic and archaeological resources existing within the city or county.

The following City of San Jose, federal and 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 (NR) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or if it is identified as a unique archaeological resource.

City-Level Evaluation Processes

City of San Jose Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan

Historic Preservation Goals and Policies

Goal LU-13—Landmarks and Districts

- Preserve and enhance historic Landmarks and districts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity and contribute toward a sense of place.

Policies—Landmarks and Districts

- LU-13.1: Preserve the integrity and fabric of candidate or designated Historic Districts.
- LU-13.2: Preserve candidate or designated landmark buildings, structures and historic objects, with first priority given to preserving and rehabilitating them for their historic use, second to preserving and rehabilitating them for a new use, or third to rehabilitation and relocation on-site. If the City concurs that no other option is feasible, candidate or designated landmark structures should be rehabilitated and relocated to a new site in an appropriate setting.
- LU-13.3: For landmark structures located within new development areas, incorporated the landmarks structures within the new development as a means to create a sense of place, contribute to a vibrant economy, provide a connection to the past, and make more attractive employment, shopping, and residential areas.
• **LU-13.5:** Evaluate areas with a concentration of historically and/or architecturally significant buildings, structures, or sites and, if qualified, preserve them through the creation of Historic Districts.

• **LU-13.6:** Ensure modifications to candidate or designated landmark buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and/or appropriate State of California requirements regarding historic buildings and/or structures, including the California Historical Building Code.

• **LU-13.7:** Design new development, alterations, and rehabilitation/remodels within a designated or candidate Historic District to be compatible with the character of the Historic District and conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, appropriate State of California requirements regarding historic buildings and/or structures [including the California Historic Building Code] and to applicable historic design guidelines adopted by the City Council.

• **LU-13.8:** Require that new development, alterations, and rehabilitation/remodels adjacent to a designated or candidate landmark or Historic District be designed to be sensitive to its character.

• **LU-13.9:** Promote the preservation, conservation, rehabilitation, restoration, reuse, and/or reconstruction, as appropriate, of contextual elements (e.g., structures, landscapes, street lamps, street trees, sidewalk design, signs) related to candidate and/or landmark buildings, structures, districts, or areas.

• **LU-13.10:** Ensure City public works projects [streetlights, street tree plantings, sidewalk design, etc.] promote, preserve, or enhance the historic character of Historic Districts.

• **LU-13.11:** Maintain and update an Historic Resources Inventory in order to promote awareness of these community resources and as a tool to further their preservation. Give priority to identifying and establishing Historic Districts.

• **LU-13.12:** Develop and encourage public/public and public/private partnerships as a means to support, expand, and promote historic preservation.

• **LU-13.13:** Foster the rehabilitation of buildings, structures, areas, places, and districts of historic significance. Utilize incentives permitting flexibility as to their uses; transfer of development rights; tax relief for designated landmarks and districts; easements; alternative building code provisions for the reuse of historic structures; and financial incentives.

• **LU-13.14:** Advocate for the continuation and appropriate expansion of Federal and State tax and/or other incentives for the rehabilitation and/or restoration of historically or architecturally significant buildings, structures, areas, and/or places.

• **LU-13.15:** Implement City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes to ensure the adequate protection of historic resources.

• **LU-13.16:** Alert property owners, land developers, and the building industry to historic preservation goals and policies and their implications early in the development process.

**Actions—Landmarks and Districts**

• **LU-13.17:** Amend the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance to specify that a Contributing Structure to a City Historic District is eligible for consideration of a Mills Act contract and to require Historic Preservation Permits and/or Adjustments for modifications to buildings, structures, and/or sites in a National Register Historic District.
• **LU-13.18:** Explore establishing a grant program for historic preservation, potentially partnering with Preservation Action Council San Jose, History San Jose, or other organizations.

• **LU-13.19:** Continue to identify landmarks, landmark districts and Conservation Areas on the Land Use/Transportation Diagram as Areas of Historic Sensitivity.

• **LU-13.20:** Explore funding options and techniques to proactively conduct additional historic surveys and to maintain and update the City’s Historic Resources Inventory. As funding allows, undertake comprehensive area-wide surveys of the City to identify potential Historic Districts, Cultural Landscapes at the City’s edge, and significant buildings and/or structures, including Traditional Cultural Properties.

• **LU-13.21:** Implement strategic General Plan and zoning changes as indicated by federal, state or municipal “Historic” or “Conservation Area” designations, in order to maintain neighborhood vitality and character and to preserve the integrity of historic structures located within those neighborhoods. To preserve predominantly single-family historic neighborhoods, rezone residential structures located in these areas to a single-family zoning designation.

• **LU-13.22:** Require the submittal of historic reports and surveys prepared as part of the environmental review process. Materials shall be provided to the City in electronic form once they are considered complete and acceptable.

• **LU-13.23:** Maintain a file of historic survey reports by location by the City of San Jose to make the information retrievable for research purposes.

• **LU-13.24:** For vacant lands at the edge of the Urban Growth Boundary in the Almaden, Alviso, and Coyote Planning Areas, require investigation during the development review process to determine whether significant Cultural Landscapes or Traditional Cultural Properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places may be affected by the project and then require, if needed, that appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the project design.

**Goal LU-14—Historical Structures of Lesser Significance**

• Preserve and enhance historic structures of lesser significance (i.e., Structures of Merit, Identified Structures, and particularly Historic Conservation Areas) as appropriate, so that they remain as a representation of San Jose’s past and contribute to a positive identity for the City’s future.

**Policies—Historic Structures of Lesser Significance**

• **LU-14.1:** Preserve the integrity and enhance the fabric of areas or neighborhoods with a cohesive historic character as a means to maintain a connection between the various structures in the area.

• **LU-14.2:** Give high priority to the preservation of historic structures that contribute to an informal cluster or a Conservation Area; have a special value in the community; are a good fit for preservation within a new project; have a compelling design and/or an important designer; etc.

• **LU-14.3:** Design new development, alterations, and rehabilitation/remodels in Conservation Areas to be compatible with the character of the Conservation Area. In particular, projects should respect character defining elements of the area that give the area its identity. These defining characteristics could vary from area to area and could include density, scale, architectural consistency, architectural variety, landscape, etc.
• **LU-14.4:** Discourage demolition of any building or structure listed on or eligible for the Historic Resources Inventory as a Structure of Merit by pursuing the alternatives of rehabilitation, reuse on the subject site, and/or relocation of the resource.

• **LU-14.5:** Continue and strengthen enforcement programs, such as those addressing vacant buildings, to promote the maintenance and survival of all classes of the city’s historic and cultural resources.

• **LU-14.6:** Consider preservation of Structures of Merit and Contributing Structures in Conservation Areas as a key consideration in the development review process. As development proposals are submitted, evaluate the significance of structures, complete non-Historic American Building Survey level of documentation, list qualifying structures on the Historic Resources Inventory, and consider the feasibility of incorporating structures in to the development proposal, particularly those structures that contribute to the fabric of Conservation Areas.

• **LU-14.7:** Ensure City public works projects (street lights, street tree planting, sidewalk design, etc.) promote, preserve, or enhance the historic character of Conservation Areas.

• **LU-14.8:** Perform modifications to the exterior of any building or structure located in a Conservation Area in a manner consistent with any and all design guidelines approved or accepted by the City Council for the preservation of historic buildings or structures.

**Actions—Historic Structures of Lesser Significance**

• **LU-14.9:** Amend applicable design guidelines and City policies to add flexibility in the development review process (for example, with regulations related to parking, independently accessible private open spaces, requirement for units to be attached, etc.) to encourage the preservation, conservation, rehabilitation, reuse, or relocation of historic resources consistent with the character and needs of the surrounding properties and uses.

**Goal LU-15 Public Awareness**

• Increase public awareness and understanding of the history of San Jose, historic preservation, and its importance to the economic and cultural vitality of the City.

**Policies—Public Awareness**

• **LU-15.1:** Encourage widespread public participation in the identification and designation of historically or culturally significant buildings, structures, sites, areas, and/or places to update and maintain the City’s Historic Resources Inventory.

• **LU-15.2:** Foster a community sense of stewardship and personal responsibility for all historic and cultural resources.

• **LU-15.3:** Encourage public accessibility and/or use of City Landmark, California Register, and National Register buildings, structures, areas, places, and sites, even if only for temporary or special events.

• **LU-15.4:** Educate/inform the public of the importance of San Jose’s strong historic connections to past industry. To serve as a link between San Jose’s present and past. Preserve historical resources from agriculture to high-tech whenever possible, feasible, and appropriate.
**Actions—Public Awareness**

- **LU-15.5:** Work with neighborhood groups and historic preservation advocacy groups on events, materials, and efforts to educate the public on the positive benefits of historic preservation generally and in specific neighborhoods.
- **LU-15.6:** Expand resources such as historic maps, historic markers, or self-guided walking tours as a means to promote and celebrate historic preservation in San Jose.

**Goal LU-16 Public Awareness**

- Preserve, conserve, and/or rehabilitate historic structures as a means to achieve the City of San Jose’s environmental, economic, and fiscal sustainability goals.

**Policies—Sustainable Practices**

- **LU-16.1:** Integrate historic preservation practices into development decisions based upon fiscal, economic, and environmental sustainability.
- **LU-16.2:** Evaluate the materials and energy resource consumption implications of new construction to encourage preservation of historic resources.
- **LU-16.3:** Encourage sustainable energy, water, and material choices that are historically compatible as part of the preservation, conservation, rehabilitation, and/or reuse of historical resources.
- **LU-16.4:** Require development approvals that include demolition of a structure eligible for or listed on the Historic Resources Inventory to salvage the resource’s building materials and architectural elements to allow re-use of those elements and materials and avoid the energy costs of producing new and disposing of old building materials.
- **LU-16.5:** Utilize the aesthetic and cultural qualities of historic resources of all types as means of promoting San Jose as a place to live, work and visit consistent with the City’s economic development goals.

**Actions—Sustainable Practices**

- **LU-16.6:** Explore the revision of the Construction and Demolition Diversion Deposit (CDDD) program to eliminate the deposit requirement for projects proposing rehabilitation of a historic landmark, a property in a Historic District, or the conservation of more than 75% of a Structure of Merit or structure in a Conservation Area.
- **LU-16.7:** Work with agencies, organizations, property owners, and business interests to develop and promote heritage tourism opportunities as an economic development tool.

**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 §106...
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 NR. 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 NR 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 NR 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 NR, 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 NR 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 NR. 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 NR 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 NR. 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 archeological site to determine if it meets the criteria for listing in the CR. If an archeological 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 archeological 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.

**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:
DPR Forms
B1. Historic Name: Century 24 Dome Theater
B2. Common Name: Century 24
B3. Original Use: Movie Theater
B4. Present Use: Movie Theater
B5. Architectural Style: Modern, with a geodesic dome design.

B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

Constructed in 1968, the Century 24 theater was one of several geodesic domed theaters designed for Raymond Syufy of Syufy Enterprises (later Century theaters) by San Francisco architect Vincent G. Raney. Syufy erected several domed theaters in many western cities from the 1960s through the mid-1980s, and Raney designed all of the Syufy Century theaters through the early 1990s.

The building has a concrete foundation, concrete block and stucco exterior and a concrete, dome-shaped roof structure. The main entrance on the east elevation includes pairs of metal and glass double doors flanked by floor to ceiling metal and glass window sections. The entrance area includes concrete pillars which support a metal overhang and marquee style roof system. The roof section supported by the pillars extends around the edge of the dome roof system and forms a horizontal detail element. A metal staircase provides access to the overhang and lower roof area. This section of the elevation contains four dormer style windows. Signage is present on the exterior of the building. The interior of the structure was originally a one-theater viewing system. The building’s interior was altered in 1973 by the construction of a wall down the center of the interior of the theater, creating two separate theaters.

B7. Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: N/A Original Location: N/A

B8. Related Features: None

B9a. Architect: Vincent G. Raney
b. Builder: Raymond Syufy

B10. Significance: Theme: Entertainment Area: San Jose, CA

Period of Significance: Property Type: Theater Applicable Criteria:

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES (CRHR)

The CRHR uses generally the same guidelines as the NRHP (developed by the National Park Service); as such, selected language from those guidelines will be quoted below to help clarify the evaluation discussion.

To be potentially eligible for individual listing on the CRHR, a structure must usually be more than 50 years old, must have historic significance, and must retain its physical integrity. The subject building was constructed in 1968 (currently 45 years old) and therefore does not meet the age requirement. Because the property is less than fifty years old, it will be evaluated below under Criterion G for exceptional importance.

Criterion 1 (event)

As stated by the National Park Service (NPS), this criterion “recognizes properties associated with single events, such as the founding of a town, or with a pattern of events, repeated activities, or historic trends, such as the gradual rise of a port city’s prominence in trade and commerce.” When considering a property for significance under this criterion, the associated event or trends “must clearly be important within the associated context: settlement, in the case of the town, or development of a maritime economy, in the case of the port city. Moreover, the property must have an important association with the event or historic trends”

The Century 24 Dome Theater was constructed in July of 1968. Though the Dome Theater was built during a time of local San Jose expansion, research does not show that the theater is exceptionally significant for its individual role in the expansion of San Jose. As such, the theater does not appear to exhibit a level of significance that
would warrant listing at the state level under this criterion.

The film industry followed its market and established several multiplex movie theaters in the 1960s and 1970s. Though the Century 24 theater is associated with this pattern of development, it was not the first or last of its type to be constructed, other dome theaters were being constructed in other parts of California. Therefore, the subject property does not appear to exhibit a significant, or exceptional, level of significance for association with a pattern of theater development in the 1960s.

For the reasons discussed above, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

Criterion 2 (person)
This criterion applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented. The NPS defines significant persons as “individuals whose activities are demonstrably important within a local, state, or national historic context. The criterion is generally restricted to those properties that illustrate (rather than commemorate) a person's important achievements. The persons associated with the property must be individually significant within a historic context.” The NPS also specifies that these properties “are usually those associated with a person's productive life, reflecting the time period when he or she achieved significance.”

While prominent theater developer Raymond Syufy built the theater, it was one of dozens of theaters constructed by his company and it does not, in and of itself, appear to illustrate his primary achievements. Arguably, Raymond Syufy's most notable achievement was his triumph over the major film producers in 1949 and 1950, a victory that greatly expanded his independent business in theater development in the 1950s, the 1960s and beyond. The Century 24 Theater was part of his company's expansion, but does not appear to be an exceptional representation of Syufy's significance.

For these reasons, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

Criterion 3 (design/construction)
Under this criterion, properties may be eligible if they “embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, ...represent the work of a master, ...possess high artistic values, or...represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.”

The subject property was one of many domed movie theaters designed by Vincent Raney for Syufy Enterprises in the 1960s through the 1980s. Raney had a long and prolific career designing a variety of building types including service stations, office buildings, and commercial buildings in addition to movie theaters. Though he designed hundreds of buildings, many of which are notable examples of design, a full understanding of the breadth and significance of his work has yet to be developed as his productive career spanned into the 1990s. Though his body of work may receive more academic attention as his buildings reach the 50 year mark, Raney has not yet been recognized as a “figure of generally recognized greatness” in his field, and therefore the subject property does not appear to be exceptionally significant as the work of a master.

A structure is eligible “as a specimen of its type or period of construction if it is an important example (within its context) of building practices of a particular time in history.” The subject property is less than 50 years old, and while the domed movie theater is a locally distinctive and recognizable building, sufficient time has not passed to determine the significance of this style type within the context of architectural history. According to Criteria Consideration G: a property under 50 years of age “can be evaluated only when sufficient historical perspective exists to determine that the property is exceptionally important. The necessary perspective can be provided by scholarly research and evaluation, and must consider both the historic context and the specific property's role in that context.” Though some preliminary study and recognition of these domed theaters as notable works of architecture exists, the information available is not adequate to justify listing at the state level for exceptional significance under Criterion 3.
When evaluating potential historic resources under Criteria Consideration G, “it is necessary to identify other properties within the geographical area that reflect the same significance or historic associations and to determine which properties best represent the historic context in question.” Comparative analysis of similar properties in the Bay Area and immediate surroundings indicates that many of Raney’s domed theaters have closed, and in some cases have been demolished in recent years. However, a small number are still extant, including the Century 24 Theater in San Jose. Research suggests that the most important cluster of these theaters is located near the Winchester Mystery House in San Jose; across I-280 from the Century 24. This grouping of five Century theaters are generally intact, most are in active use, and the Century 21 dome among the cluster was the flagship theater built by the Raney/Syufy partnership. Because more significant examples exist in the Bay Area, and the subject property is not the first or the last of these theaters in the region, exceptional importance of the subject property is not justified.

For the reasons discussed above, the Century 24 Theater does not appear eligible for listing on the CRHR as an exceptionally significant resource under this criterion.

Criterion 4 (information potential)
Criterion 4 applies to archaeological resources and consequently is not evaluated in this report.

INTEGRITY EVALUATION
Evaluation of potential historic resources is a two-part process. A property must meet one or more of the criteria for significance, and possesses historic integrity. Since the Century 24 Theater was not found to display a level of exceptional significance necessary for listing on the CRHR, and evaluation of the building’s integrity is unnecessary.

City of San Jose General Plan
Though properties may not exhibit a level of significance warranted for listing on the NRHP or the CRHR, local criteria often present a broader range of options to allow for recognition of notable properties at the local level. The City of San Jose has established a set of criteria for the establishment of historic districts and cultural resource designations. However, the most important cluster of dome theaters is located across I-280 from the Century 24. This grouping of five Century theaters are generally intact, most are in active use, and the Century 21 dome among the cluster was the flagship theater built by the Raney/Syufy partnership. Because these more significant examples of dome theaters exist near the Century 24 Theater, and the subject property is not the first or the last of these theaters in the region, exceptional importance of the subject property is not justified.

CONCLUSION
The Century 24 Theater does not appear to exhibit the level of exceptional significance necessary to warrant listing on the NRHP or the CRHR. In addition, although the theater retains a good degree of physical integrity, there are other nearby theaters that are better historically significant examples of dome theaters. Therefore, Century 24 Theater does not appear potentially eligible for listing as a cultural resource at the local level.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)
HP6. 1 story commercial building- domed Movie Theater

*B12. References:
Cinema Treasures, May 2013. Movie Theaters in San Jose, CA.

B13. Remarks:
*B14. Evaluator: Carrie D. Wills, MBA/FCS, 2366 Camino Ramon, Ste. 460, San Ramon, CA 94583

*Date of Evaluation: 4/29/2013
**P1. Other Identifier:** Syufy, Century 24 Theater

**P2. Location:** ☑️ Not for Publication ☑️ Unrestricted  ☑️ County: Contra Costa

  - **USGS 7.5' Quad:** San Jose West, CA  **Date:** 1959; photorevised 1980  **T 7S; R 1W; Sec 23; M.D. B.M.**
  - **Address:** 741 South Winchester Boulevard  **City:** San Jose  **Zip:** 95128
  - **UTM:** Zone: 11  0592893mE/ 4130296mN (Google Earth)
  - **Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)  **Elevation:** 147 ft;
    From the intersection of I-880 and I-280, drive west on I-280 approximately 0.80 mile to Moorpark Avenue, turn left and drive approximately 0.08 mile, turn right onto S. Winchester Boulevard and drive south 0.10 mile; theater will be on the right side of South Winchester Boulevard approximately 400 feet west of the road.

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

  Century 24 Theater:
  The structure consists of a one-story, circular shaped, asymmetrical, Modern style, movie theater building located in a mixed commercial and residential neighborhood. The theater structure is sited within a shopping center complex. The building is in good condition and no major exterior alterations were noted. The property includes a large parking lot area with mature palm trees placed at intervals around the property. The building occupies an area that is approximately 200 feet north-south by 500 feet east-west and rises to an elevation of approximately 200 feet. Further construction history and architectural details follow on the Building, Structure, Object form.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** HP6. 1 story commercial building- dome Movie Theater

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

**P5b. Description of Photo:** View of east elevation; facing west

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

**P7. Owner and Address:** Private owner

**P8. Recorded by:** Carrie D. Wills, MBA/FCS Inc.  2366 Camino Ramon, Ste. 460 San Ramon, CA 94520

**P9. Date Recorded:** 4-29-2013

**P10. Survey Type:** Reconnaissance

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment
  Winchester Dome Theater Project
  City of San Jose, Santa Clara, 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):