ATTACHMENT 1:

CONFIDENTIAL

INTRODUCTION
As requested and authorized, Archaeological Resource Service has conducted an archaeological evaluation of the parcel described below. The following basic tasks were accomplished as part of this project:

1. A check of the information on file with our office and the Regional Office of the California Historical Resources Information System, to determine the presence or absence of previously recorded historic or prehistoric sites;
2. A check of appropriate historic references to determine the potential for historic or prehistoric era archaeological deposits;
3. Contact with the Native American Heritage Commission to determine the presence or absence of listed Sacred Lands within the project area;
4. Contact with all appropriate Native American organizations or individuals designated by the Native American Heritage Commission as interested parties for the project area to gather additional information regarding the presence or absence of sacred places;
5. A surface reconnaissance of all accessible parts of the project area to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits;
6. Preparation of appropriate parts of Form DPR-523, the reporting form for historic properties, for each identified property.
7. Preparation of a report describing the work accomplished and the results of the research, and making appropriate recommendations for further action, if warranted.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposed project would develop a seven story, 80 unit multifamily apartment block within the subject property. Parking will be beneath the structure, which will occupy essentially the entire parcel. The proposed project is a redevelopment of the property, which has been used commercially for several decades. The APE for archaeology for this project is the property boundary.

PROJECT LOCATION
The project area is located at 750 West San Carlos Street, San Jose, Santa Clara County, California. The parcel consists of less than 0.5 acres of recently burned commercial structure on paved land bounded by dense urban development.
The project area lies in the Mexican era land grant of Los Coches within unsectioned land of Township 7 South, Range 1 East, Mt. Diablo Base and Meridian. The Universal Transverse Mercator Grid coordinates to the approximate center of the project area, as determined by measurement from the USGS 7.5’ San Jose West, California Quadrangle Map (1961, photorevised 1968 and 1973) are:

4131395 Meters North, 597010 Meters East, Zone 10

FIGURE 1 -- THE EVALUATED PROJECT

This is the proposed multistory building that will occupy the property. The parking diagram at the left shows the relation of the building footprint and the property boundary.

REGULATORY SETTING

This project is undertaken to meet federal standards for an historic properties inventory. The intent of the archaeological investigation has been to identify any properties potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, and to make recommendations appropriate to the further evaluation of identified sites, buildings, structures or objects identified by the project. No potential historic properties have been identified in or near the Area of Potential Effect, which is interpreted to be the property boundary for archaeology. No buildings, structures or objects eligible for evaluation have been identified within, or adjacent to, the property under investigation.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The undertaking will be subject to a Section 106 review under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. The NHPA directs federal agencies to take into account the effects of proposed activities on historic properties and give the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment. Historic
properties are properties that are included in the National Register of Historic Places or that meet the criteria for the National Register.

In order to be included or qualify for the National Register a property, structure or site must possess significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering or culture, and must be associated with an important historic context and retain historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance. The resource should possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and meet any of the following criteria:

a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; or

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

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

The historic properties evaluation described herein will attempt to identify all recorded cultural resources within the project area and evaluate their potential eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

As of July 2015, two new classes of California cultural resources have been defined. Tribal cultural resources and Tribal cultural landscapes can be any of a variety of cultural sites as defined by the individual tribe. These resources, once identified, are treated as significant resources under CEQA. It is not clear what treatment is required under federal regulations.

**SACRED LANDS INVENTORY / NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION**

The California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) works to identify, catalogue, and protect places of special religious or social significance, graves, and cemeteries of Native Americans per the authority given the Commission in Public Resources Code 5097.9. A check with the NAHC was done to determine if there are sites listed in the Sacred Lands file located within or near to the current project area.
The Native American Heritage Commission responded indicating that no Native American Sacred Sites are reported within or near the project area. The NAHC provided a list of appropriate Native American tribes and organizations to contact for further information. No response has yet been received from those queries. Under federal guidelines the permitting agency will consult appropriate Native American tribes directly as part of the approval process. The only purpose of this inquiry has been to identify potential historic properties within the APE.

RESULTS OF LITERATURE CHECK

Prior to undertaking the field inspection, pertinent archaeological survey reports, site records, historic accounts and ethnographic documents were reviewed. A search was conducted using ARS base maps and the information on file with the Northwest Information Center of the Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS). These literature searches were conducted to determine the extent of prehistoric and historic activity in the project area. This review consisted of examined and recorded surveys previously conducted within a one-mile radius of the present

Figure 3 -- The Project Location On The USGS San Jose West Quadrangle Map

The project area is outlined in blue. Earlier Twentieth Century maps show a rail spur through the project area. The purple tint indicates that the burned out building was added to the map during a photorevision in 1968 or 1973.
The literature search indicates that no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites have been recorded previously within or immediately adjacent to the project area.

**PREHISTORIC**

The project area was prehistorically occupied by a group referred to in much of the literature as Costanoan. The word ‘Costanoan’ comes from the Spanish word ‘costa’ which means “coastal” and was used by Spanish priests to mean “coastal people.” The Costanoan people were not a united group; instead the word refers to the language family from which the separate languages spoken by each tribelet belong. Today many of the descendants of these tribes call themselves Ohlone rather than Costanoans, referring to a coastal village by that name near Princeton in San Mateo County.

The language family was made up of eight distinctly different languages spoken by some fifty separate tribelets, each with a population of approximately 200 people. Each tribelet was politically separate and had its own permanent villages and seasonal camps for hunting and fishing (Levy 1978: Brown 1973). The Native American population who lived in this general area during the pre-contact period is associated with the tribelet group known as the Mutsun Ohlone (Levy 1978; Heizer 1978).

The territory claimed by the Costanoans extended from the southern shore of the Carquinez Strait to Big Sur and from the Pacific Coast inland for twenty to thirty miles according to ethnographer Richard Levy (Levy 1978). Since these people lived in a relatively small area and...
had access to roughly the same types of food and tool (making) materials, there were common practices by which they can be described.

Based on linguistic studies it is believed that the ancestors of the Costanoans moved into the area around 500 A.D. (Levy 1978). However the archaeological record has provided dates as great as 9960 +/- 500 years before present from a site near Coyote Creek, thus showing aboriginal occupation of the area for approximately ten thousand years (Moratto 1984:110 cited in Evans 2009; Hildebrandt and Mikkelsen 1991, 1993).

When the Franciscan missionaries arrived in the area in the 1770's, they documented that there were approximately 10,000 Costanoan people. According to mission records, the Costanoan tribelet organization was gone by 1810 and by 1832 only about 2,000 individuals are reported to have survived (Cook 1943).

Based on linguistic studies it is believed that the ancestors of the Costanoans moved into the area around 500 A.D. (Levy 1978). However the archaeological record has provided dates as great as 9960 +/- 500 years before present from a site near Coyote Creek (Moratto 1984:110). When the Franciscan Missionaries arrived in the area in the 1770's, they documented that there were approximately 10,000 Costanoan people. According to mission records, the Costanoan tribelet organization was gone by 1810 and by 1832 only 2,000 individuals survived (Cook 1943).

Many prehistoric sites have been identified in the greater area. Often sites are located along the sides of waterways such as Los Gatos Creek, Guadalupe River and Coyote Creek. Sites in the area vary in size and type with some sites consisting of small flakes scatters, some are extensive burial grounds, and some are village sites with associated house depressions and habitation refuse. Due to the relative flatness of the Santa Clary Valley floor and floods over the past several thousand years, a buildup of alluvial soil has covered many prehistoric archaeological sites, often completely obscuring any evidence of such sites. As a consequence, surface evaluations cannot always detect buried sites.

**ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING**

Several historically known ethnic groups are reported to have lived in territories contiguous to the San Francisco Bay. Kroeber (1925:Fig.22) places the Coast Miwok on the Marin Peninsula with the Costanoans occupying the San Francisco Peninsula and the territories across the bay to the east, and the Wintun (Patwin) living to the northeast along the Napa River to its mouth in the northeastern portion of San Pablo Bay.
OHLINEAN OR COSTANOAN

Linguistically the Costanoan languages belong to the Penutian language family, which also includes the various Wintun and Patwin, Yokuts, and Maidu languages (see Barrett 1908, 1908a; Kroeber 1904, 1908). The Costanoans colonized the San Francisco Peninsula and the east bay from the Golden Gate and the Carquinez Strait south to the southernmost reaches of the San Francisco Bay. The other Costanoan groups occupied territories that extended as far south as the Sur and Salinas Rivers (Levy 1978:485, Fig. 1).

What little is known of Ohlonean culture comes to us from several diverse sources. The first instance of European contact seems to have been initiated in late 1769 when Gaspar de Portola “discovered” the San Francisco Bay, the initiating event of European conquest of the area. With the entry of the Spanish into the area came a concerted effort to convert the Native population to Catholicism that led to the demise of native cultures as well as the extinction of some native peoples.

The early accounts of the material culture of the indigenous peoples of the bay area list many biodegradable products. Goerke (1983) synopsizes Father Santa Maria’s account of the everyday objects used by the indigenous peoples. These include feathers used as hair adornment and woven into jackets, wooden staves decorated with feathers, feather nets, women’s clothing made of deer and other skins, baskets, wooden combs, shell decorated “hairnets”, strung shell, bows and arrows, and reed boats (Goerke 1983:4; Galvin 1971:19-31). The use of body paints is indicated, and tattooing may have been practiced: “One alone of the young men had several dark blue lines painted from the lower lip to the waist and from the left shoulder to the right, in such a way as to form a perfect cross” (Galvin 1971:21, 30-31).
Certainly tattooing is a known practice of the historically known Costanoan peoples (Levy 1978:493; see also Kelly 1978:Fig.4 for evidence of tattooing among the Coast Miwok). Much of the material culture of the area’s inhabitants, historic and prehistoric, may not have survived in the archaeological record.

The hills and valleys were home to mammalian species that provided food, clothing, and other products. Mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), elk (*Cervus canadensis*), grizzly bear (*Ursus chelan*) and/or black bear (*Uarctos americanus*), lagomorphs (*Sylvilagus* sp., *Lepus californicus*), mountain lion (*Felis concolor*) and other cats (*Felis* spp.), dog (*Canis* spp.), and rodents (e.g., *Neotoma* spp., *Otospermophilus* spp., *Scirius* spp.) were among the animals hunted. Birds such as the mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), robin (*Turdus migratorius*), and California quail (*Lophortyx californicus*) were taken by bone and cord bolas or by trap (Levy 1978:491; Kelly 1978), but according to Levy (1978:491) waterfowl were the most important birds in the Costanoan diet. Levy (1978) lists Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), snow goose (*Chen caerulescens*), white-fronted goose (*Anser albifrons*), American widgeon, pintail, mallard, green-winged teal and shoveler (*Anas* spp.), and American coot (*Fulica americana*) as important prey species which were taken by netting them or luring them with tule or stuffed bird skin decoys. The bow-and-arrow constituted a part of the hunting technology. Both unbacked and sinew backed bows ranging from 3 to 4½ feet long were used to launch arrows fitted with obsidian or bone points. Other stone tools included obsidian bifaces, hide scrapers, knives, manos and
metates, mortars and pestles, net sinkers, anchors and pipes (Kelly 1978:417-418; Levy 1978:493). Levy (1978) says only that a variety of sedimentary and metamorphic rocks were used for non-flaked stone tools without mention of what types of rock were used for specific purposes, but indicates that locally available cherts and obsidian obtained in trade were used for flaked stone tools.

The processing of vegetal foods was important work. Acorns and buckeyes were made edible in much the same way. After removal of the hard exterior the nut meat was pulverized in a mortar (basketry, wood, and stone mortars of various types were used). The resulting meal was then subjected to a leaching process to remove the tannins, rendering the meal edible. Mush or gruel, as well as “bread”, could then be prepared. Grass and other seeds could be ground with a mano and metate for use in cooking. The preparation of some seeds involved a roasting process in which the seeds were tossed with live coals in specially made baskets. Greens and laurel nuts were eaten raw or cooked. Berries and other fleshy fruits were collected and eaten raw. Edible roots were known and exploited for food, but it is not clear whether they were cooked or not. All food preparation that required boiling was done in water tight baskets made especially for that purpose. The boiling method involved heating rocks and dropping them into the basket of food to be boiled, e. g., acorn mush, removing the cooled rocks and replacing them with new hot rocks until the food was properly cooked (Broadbent 1970:60-61; Kelly 1978:416-417; Levy 1978:491, 493).

Economically important plant foods included the fruit of coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia), valley oak (Q. lobata), California black oak (Q. kelloggii), tanbark oak (Lithocarpus densiflora), buckeye (Aesculus californica) California laurel (Umbellularia californica), and hazelnuts (Corylus cornuta). Seeds that were roasted before consumption included dock (Rumex sp.), tarweed (Madia sp.), chia (Salvia columbariae), and digger pine (Pinus sabiniana). Edible berries that were consumed included blackberries (Rubus ursinus), elderberries (Sambucus sp.), strawberries (Fragaria sp.), manzanita berries (Arctostaphylos sp.), gooseberries (Ribes sp.), madrone berries (Arbutus menziesii), grapes (Vitis californica), and toyon berries (Heteromeles arbutifolia). Wild onions (Allium spp.), cattail roots (Typha latifolia), amole (Chlorogalum pomeridianum), hog fennel (Lomatium californicum), and wild carrot (Daucus pusillus) are some of the roots that were eaten (Levy 1978:491).

Houses were simply constructed domes or cones of thatch over a frame of poles. The account that Kroeber (1925) quotes in his discussion of the Coast Miwok describes a round semi
subterranean house pit with a low conical structure built over it, but one of Kelly’s informants denies any kind of excavation to build a house (Mannion and Mannion 1970:78). The structure was then covered with dirt to insulate it and possibly to keep water out; no mention is made of thatch. There was a smoke hole in the center of the roof, and the hearth was placed in the center of the floor. Entry to the structure was through the smoke hole. Some type of vegetal material, described as “rushes”, was spread over the floor around the hearth for a sleeping mat (Kroeber 1925:276). Costanoan houses are similarly described (Levy 1978:492). Thatching materials included tule, grass, alfalfa, and ferns, all of which can be identified through phytolith and/or pollen analysis.

There were probably two types of dwelling, one for summer use and one for winter. Construction was generally men’s work, but women could, and did, build houses if the men were busy. The house of a deceased man was burned along with all of his possessions except his dance regalia, which would have been buried (Mannion and Mannion 1970:79, 91). According to Broadbent (1972:62) houses were also burnt when they became “flea infested.” Clusters of houses, what the Spaniards called rancherias, were winter villages (Mannion and Mannion 1970:79) and were probably built on high ground away from the shore (Levy:1978:492). Some villages are reported to have had assembly houses or dance areas in their centers (Levy 1978:492). Other types of structures built by the Costanoan peoples include sweathouses, dance houses, menstrual huts, and puberty huts, the latter two being associated exclusively with girls and women. Dance houses were constructed with two doors, one at either end of the structure (Mannion and Mannion 1970:81; cf. Kroeber 1925:447, Fig. 39), and might be distinguishable where posthole patterns can be seen. Sweathouses seem to have been variable in size from small ones 6 to 8 feet in diameter with a 1½ foot deep pit to large ones the size of a dance house and 4 to 5 feet deep. Entry was through a roughly 7 foot long entryway and not through the smoke hole in the roof as was the case with dwellings, probably giving the structure a keyhole-shaped outline. Some sweathouses were individually owned while others
appear to have been community facilities (Kelly 1978:417; Levy 1978:492; Mannion and Mannion 1970:79-80).

**HISTORIC**

The project area is located southwest of old San Jose, and northwest of Willow Glen in the Mexican era land grant of Rancho de los Coches. The Rancho of Los Coches meaning “Ranch of The Pigs,” was established in 1844 when granted to a Santa Clara Mission Indian named Roberto. Roberto sold it to Antonio Sunol in 1847, and it was patented to Sunol as 2,219 acres in 1857 by the United States. Sunol divided the ranch keeping a third for himself, giving a third to his daughter and her husband (Paula and Pedro Sainsevain), and selling a third to Henry Morris Naglee (Arbuckle and Rambo, 1968; 22). The rancho has since been subdivided into very small lots.

Willow Glen was established in 1868, when W.C. Greiger began planting cherry orchards in an area that was then referred to as Los Gatos Creek in the Willows. His cherry orchards were so successful that “other farmers joined Greiger and planted cherries, the area then became known as “The Cherries.” After the turn of the century, the area was renamed Willow Glen,” (Payne, 1987).

In the 1920’s there were a number of disputes over the new railroad line routing. Southern Pacific Railroad (SP) originally had plans to route the railroad directly through the middle of the unincorporated district of Willow Glen, whose residents diligently fought the project for three years. The case was taken to the Supreme Court “where it was dismissed on procedural grounds. By this time the SP had purchased land which allowed it to skirt around Willow Glen.” (Douglas, 1993) This is the present location of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which lies directly adjacent to the project area.

Historic archaeological sites in the region can consist of trash deposits, building foundations, and structures greater than 45 years of age. No historic sites have been previously recorded on or immediately adjacent to the parcel.
RESULTS OF SURFACE EXAMINATION

The historic properties inventory has resulted in a negative finding. A negative result indicates that no artifacts or potentially significant cultural features were observed.

All open ground within the project area was examined, but very little soil could be found. The burned out building occupies about half of the property and paved parking covers the rest. Small patches of soil were observed around the edge of the property, particularly toward the railroad right of way, and in near the building. Only the expected naturally occurring alluvial soil was observed during the investigation.

CONCLUSIONS

No prehistoric features or artifacts were observed. Additionally, no indications of the presence of historic era archaeological features were observed. The presence of asphalt pavement has reduced the reliability of the observations, leaving a possibility that archaeological resources lie beneath the surface. Archaeological features have not been reported in nearby investigations, and no artifacts or culturally modified soils have been reported in the vicinity. It is highly likely that no archaeological features are present in the project area.
Although no surface evidence of prehistoric or historic materials were observed during the study, there is always a slight potential that buried cultural materials or isolated artifacts could be found. There is a moderate potential of buried historic building foundations, and other debris, being encountered. In the event that a concentration of artifacts are discovered during grading or deep excavation, it is recommended that the work be temporarily suspended until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the discovered materials, assess their significance, and develop a program to reduce future physical impacts from the following construction.

Native American burial sites in the Santa Clara Valley are often obscured by alluvial deposits. In the case that human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a “Most Likely Descendant” can be designated. Procedures dealing with human remains are determined by law.
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APPENDIX 1—SIGNIFICANCE IN THE EVALUATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES AS HISTORIC PROPERTIES

To be significant an archaeological site must qualify for registration as an “historic resource” the following criteria must be met for this listing:

An archeological 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 (PRC § 5020.1(j)) or if it meets the criteria for listing on the California Register (14 CCR § 4850). CEQA provides somewhat conflicting direction regarding the evaluation and treatment of archeological sites. The most recent amendments to the CEQA Guidelines try to resolve this ambiguity by directing that lead agencies should first evaluate an archeological site to determine if it meets the criteria for listing in the California Register. If an archeological site is an historical resource (i.e., listed or eligible for listing in the California Register) potential adverse impacts to it must be considered, just as for any other historical resource (PRC § 21084.1 and 21083.2(l)). If an archeological site is not an historical resource, but meets the definition of a “unique archeological resource” as defined in PRC § 21083.2, then it should be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section.

If an archaeological site does not qualify for listing, the directive is clear. The Public Resources Code states:

(4) If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the Initial Study or EIR, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.
APPENDIX 2 – PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR CONSULTANTS

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards
The minimum professional qualifications in archeology are a graduate degree in archeology, anthropology, or closely related field plus:
1. At least one year of full-time professional experience or equivalent specialized training in archeological research, administration or management;
2. At least four months of supervised field and analytic experience in general North American archeology; and
3. Demonstrated ability to carry research to completion.

In addition to these minimum qualifications, a professional in prehistoric archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the prehistoric period. A professional in historic archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the historic period.