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Management Summary

Purpose and Scope: Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) was retained by the San Mateo County Parks Department to perform a cultural resources study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (Project) in San Mateo County, California. This study included a cultural resources records search, Native American scoping, archival research, and a cultural resources field survey and evaluation. The project site includes approximately 5.4 acres centered along Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35, immediately west to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir in unincorporated San Mateo County. All activities were conducted in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and applicable local regulations.

Dates of Investigation: Staff at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), located at Sonoma State University, conducted a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search in December 2016. The results of a search of the Sacred Lands Files from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) were received on December 20, 2016. Letters were sent to identified Native American groups and individuals on December 21, 2016. An intensive-level cultural resources survey of the project site was conducted an intensive cultural resources pedestrian survey of the project area on January 4, 2017.

Summary of Findings: Background research identified 19 previous studies within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. Of these, one included portions of the project site. Background research further identified five previously recorded built environment resources. None of these are on the project site; all are located immediately adjacent to the north. The resources include the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (LCSD) and four properties that are associated with the LCSD’s development and subsequent operation. The LCSD has been previously determined eligible, with concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criteria A/1 and C/3. The remaining four properties were determined ineligible for NRHP and CRHR. Background research failed to identify any archaeological resources within the direct project site or a 0.5-mile radius.

As a result of the intensive-level survey, one built environment resource, a segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35, was recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms. Originally developed as a private road in support of the construction of the adjacent LCSD and later incorporated into the California state highway system, the park was evaluated for historic significance and recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR; it is therefore not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Recommendations: No historical, archaeological or tribal cultural resources were identified within the project site, and thus the Project would result in no impact to cultural and tribal cultural resources. Rincon does not recommend further cultural resources work for the proposed Project at this time. Nevertheless, the following measures should be implemented to reduce potential impacts to unanticipated archaeological and tribal cultural resources: cease all construction work in the event that unanticipated buried cultural deposits are encountered and contact a qualified archaeologist; follow...
Native American consultation procedures if a previously unidentified cultural resource is determined to be of Native American origin by the qualified archaeologist; and contact the San Mateo County Coroner if human remains are discovered.
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1 Introduction

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) was retained by Bellecci Associates and the San Mateo County Parks Department to perform a cultural resources study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (Project) in the Highlands-Baywood Park area of San Mateo County, California. This study included a cultural resources records search, Native American scoping, archival research, and a cultural resources field survey and evaluation. All activities were conducted in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and all applicable local regulations.

1.1 Project Description

The Complete the Gap Trail Project (Project) will be part of the 17.5-mile Crystal Springs Regional Trail (CSRT) system that connects the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The project site is located along the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir in San Mateo County, California; west of Interstate (I) 280 from the community of Highlands-Baywood Park (Figures 1 and 2). The CSRT serves a variety of users, including hikers, joggers, equestrians, and cyclists. Most of the CSRT has been completed; this project consists of an 800 foot segment which connects the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail.

The project would consist of a Class I bikeway on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard with a 10 foot wide paved/gravel trail. The trail would be bordered by a barrier on the east side and a chain-link fence on the west.
Figure 1 Project vicinity

Imagery provided by National Geographic Society, ESRI and its licensors © 2016. San Mateo Quadrangle, T05S R05W S01. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.
Figure 2 Project Location
2 Regulatory Setting

This section discusses applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards governing cultural resources, which must be adhered to before and during implementation of the proposed Project.

2.1 Federal

The proposed Project does not have a federal nexus; therefore, compliance with reference to the NHPA and other federal laws is provided here for informational purposes only. Projects that involve federal funding or permitting (i.e., have a federal nexus) must comply with the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 470f). Cultural resources are considered during federal undertakings chiefly under Section 106 of the NHPA through one of its implementing regulations, 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native Americans are considered under Section 101(d)(6)(A) of the NHPA. Other relevant federal laws include the Archaeological Data Preservation Act of 1974, American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989.

The National Register of Historic Places was established by the NHPA of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment” (CFR 36 CFR 60.2). The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it:

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 significant in our past; or
C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of installation, or represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values, or represents 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.

In addition to meeting these criteria, a property must retain historic integrity, which is defined in National Register Bulletin 15 as the “ability of a property to convey its significance” (National Park Service 1990). In order to assess integrity, the National Park Service recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, considered together, define historic integrity. To retain integrity, a property must possess several, if
not all, of these seven qualities, which are defined in the following manner in National Register Bulletin 15:

1. **Location** – the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred
2. **Design** – the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property
3. **Setting** – the physical environment of a historic property
4. **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
5. **Workmanship** – the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory
6. **Feeling** – a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time
7. **Association** – the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property

### 2.2 State

As the lead agency for the proposed Project, the San Mateo County Parks Department must comply with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21084.1). A historical resource is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); a resource included in a local register of historical resources; or an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a][1-3]).

A resource shall be considered historically significant if it:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, if a project can be demonstrated to cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that resources cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC, Section 21083.2[a], [b], and [c]).

PRC, Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an 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:

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; or
3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

As of July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 of 2014 (AB 52) was enacted and expands CEQA by defining a new resource category, “tribal cultural resources.” Assembly Bill 52 establishes that “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3). PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and meets either of the following criteria:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. AB 52 requires that lead agencies “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

2.3 Local

Although the County of San Mateo does not have a historic preservation ordinance with criteria for local designation, the General Plan, which was adopted in 1986, is implemented through the following goals and policies for historical and archaeological resources (County of San Mateo 1986, Chapter 5):

**Goals and Objectives**

5.1 Historic Resource Protection. Protect historic resources for their historic, cultural, social and educational values and the enjoyment of future generations.

5.2 Rehabilitation of Historic Structures. Encourage the rehabilitation, preservation and use of historically significant structures.

5.3 Protection of Archaeological/Paleontological Sites. Protect archaeological/paleontological sites from destruction in order to preserve and interpret them for future scientific research, and public educational programs.
5.4 Historical Resources Inventory. Encourage the development of inventories of historical resources which have national, State and Countywide significance.

5.5 Planning and Historic Preservation. Integrate historical preservation into the planning process of the County.

5.6 Increase Public Awareness. Develop increased public awareness of the County’s heritage to foster widespread support and understanding for the need to preserve historical resources.

General Policies

5.10 Educational Programs. Encourage cooperative educational programs by educational and historic groups.

5.11 Recognition of Historic Resources. A) Identify high priority resources in the comprehensive inventory and apply for their designation as State Point of Historic Interest, State Historical Landmark, or inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. B) Establish historic districts for areas which include concentrations of historic resources found in the comprehensive inventory.

5.12 Rehabilitation of Historic Structures. Encourage the rehabilitation and recycling of historic structures.

5.13 Use of Innovative Techniques. Encourage the use of innovative techniques such as density transfer, facade easements, etc., to protect historic structures.

5.14 Registration of Significant Archaeological/Paleontological Sites. Recommend State and/or national register status for significant archaeological/paleontological sites.

Regulation of Development

Protection of Historical Resources

5.15 Character of New Development. A) Encourage the preservation and protection of historic resources, districts and landmarks on sites which are proposed for new development. B) Ensure that new development in historic districts is compatible in bulk, height, material and design with that of the historic character and qualities of the district. C) Encourage the use of the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines and standards for rehabilitation of historic structures by: (1) those undertaking the rehabilitation of historic structures, and (2) those responsible for the architectural review and permit approval.

5.16 Demolition of Resources. Discourage the demolition of any designated historic district or landmark.

5.17 Designation of Historic Resources. Establish criteria and procedures for the designation of County landmarks and districts. Include a provision requiring approval to alter, demolish or relocate designated landmarks or districts.

5.18 Development of County Historic Sites. Develop County-owned historic sites in park and recreation areas in accordance with the performance criteria and development standards contained in Appendix D of this Chapter.
5.19 Economic Use. A) Encourage compatible and adaptive residential, commercial or public uses of historic structures as a means for their protection. B) Permit commercial uses such as crafts, stores, bookshops and art shops if they preserve and enhance the resource.

Protection of Archaeological/Paleontological Resources

5.20 Site Survey. Determine if sites proposed for new development contain archaeological/paleontological resources. Prior to approval of development for these sites, require that a mitigation plan, adequate to protect the resource and prepared by a qualified professional, be reviewed and implemented as a part of the project.

5.21 Site Treatment. A) Encourage the protection and preservation of archaeological sites. B) Temporarily suspend construction work when archaeological/paleontological sites are discovered. Establish procedures which allow for the timely investigation and/or excavation of such sites by qualified professionals as may be appropriate. C) Cooperate with institutions of higher learning and interested organizations to record, preserve, and excavate sites.
# 3 Cultural Setting

## 3.1 Prehistory

During the twentieth century, many archaeologists developed chronological sequences to explain prehistoric cultural changes within all or portions of northern California (Jones and Klar 2007; Moratto 1984). The Project lies within the San Francisco Bay Area archaeological region (Milliken et al. 2007; Moratto 1984). Following Milliken et al. (2007), the prehistoric cultural chronology for the San Francisco Bay Area can be generally divided into five periods: the Early Holocene (8,000-3,500 B.C.), Early (3,500-500 B.C.), Lower Middle (500 B.C.-A.D. 430), the Upper Middle (A.D. 430-1050), and the Late Period (A.D. 1050-Contact).

Early Paleoindian groups likely lived in the area prior to 8,000 B.C., however, no evidence for that period has been discovered in the area to date (Milliken et al. 2007). Because sea level was much lower prior to 8,000 B.C., it is likely that any such sites may now be underwater. For this reason, the terminal Pleistocene to earliest Holocene Period (ca. 11,700-8,000 B.C.) is not discussed here.

The earliest intensive study of the archaeology of the San Francisco Bay Area began with Nels C. Nelson of the University of California, Berkeley, between 1906 and 1908. He documented over 425 shell mounds along the shores of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma counties. Nelson was the first to identify the Bay Area as a discrete archaeological region (Moratto 1984; Nelson 1909).

### 3.1.1 Early Holocene (8,000-3,500 B.C.)

The Early Holocene Period in the San Francisco Bay Area is characterized by a mobile forager pattern and the presence of millingslabs, handstones, and a variety of leaf-shaped projectile points, though evidence for this period is limited. It is likely that Holocene alluvial deposits buried many prehistoric sites in the area (Moratto 1984; Ragir 1972). Sites such as CA-CCO-696 and CA-CCO-637 in Contra Costa County are two of just a few sites dating to this period. The earliest evidence for the Early Holocene Period comes from CA-CCO-696 at Los Vaqueros Reservoir (Milliken et al. 2007).

### 3.1.2 Early Period (3,500-600 B.C.)

The Early Period saw increased sedentism from the Early Holocene as indicated by new ground stone technologies (introduction of the mortar and pestle), an increase in regional trade, and the earliest cut-bead horizon. The first documentation of the mortar and pestle, dating to 3,800 B.C., comes from CA-CCO-637 in the Los Vaqueros Reservoir area. By 1,500 B.C., mortars and pestles had almost completely replaced millingslabs and handstones. A shift to a sedentary or semi-sedentary lifestyle is marked by the prevalence of mortars and pestles, ornamental grave associations, and shell mounds. The earliest cut beads are represented by rectangular *Haliotis* (abalone) and *Olivella* (snail) beads from several sites, including CA-CCO-637, CA-SCL-832 in Sunnyvale, and CA-ALA-307 in Berkeley (Milliken et al. 2007).
advent of the mortar and pestle indicates a greater reliance on processing nuts such as acorns. Faunal
evidence from various sites indicates a diverse diet based on mussel and other shellfish, marine
mammals, terrestrial mammals, and birds (D’Oro 2009).

3.1.3 Lower Middle Period (500 B.C.-A.D. 430)
The Lower Middle Period saw numerous changes from the previous period. Rectangular shell beads,
common during the Early Period, disappear completely and are replaced by split-beveled and saucer
Olivella beads. Haliotis ornaments, bone tools, bone ornaments, and basketry awls indicating coiled
basketry manufacture appeared. Mortars and pestles continued to be the dominant grinding tools
(Milliken et al. 2007). Evidence for the Lower Middle Period in the Bay Area comes from sites such as the
Emeryville shell mound (CA-ALA-309) and Ellis Landing (CA-CCO-295). CA-ALA-309 is one of the largest
shell mounds in the Bay Area and contains multiple cultural sequences. The lower levels of the site,
dating to the Middle Period, contain flexed burials with bone implements, chert bifaces, charmstones,
and oyster shells (Moratto 1984).

3.1.4 Upper Middle Period (A.D. 430-1050)
Around A.D. 430, Olivella saucer bead trade networks established during earlier periods collapsed and
over half of known sites occupied during the Lower Middle Period were abandoned. Olivella saucer
beads were replaced with Olivella saddle beads. New items appear at sites, including elaborate,
decorative blades, fishtail charmstones, new Haliotis ornament forms, and mica ornaments. Sea otter
bones became more frequent than in earlier periods (Milliken et al. 2007). Analysis of CA-ALA-309
indicates a shift from oysters to clams. Subsistence analysis at various sites dating to this period indicate
a diverse diet that included various species of fish, mammal species, bird species, shellfish, and plant
resources that varied by location within the Bay Area (Hylkema 2002).

3.1.5 Late Period (A.D. 1050-Contact)
The Late Period saw an increase in social complexity, indicated by differences in burials, and an increased
level of sedentism relative to preceding periods. Small, finely worked projectile points associated with
bow and arrow technology appear around A.D. 1250. Olivella shell beads disappeared and were replaced
with clamshell disk beads. The toggle harpoon, hopper mortar, and magnesite tube beads also appeared
during this period (Milliken et al. 2007). This period saw an increase in the intensity of resource
exploitation, correlative with population increases (Moratto 1984). Many of the well-known sites of
earlier periods, such as the Emeryville shell mound (CA-ALA-309) and the West Berkeley site (CA-ALA-
307) were abandoned, possibly due to fluctuating climates and droughts that occurred throughout the
Late Period (Lightfoot and Luby 2002).

3.2 Ethnographic Background
The project site is situated within a region historically occupied by the Costanoan (also known as the
Ohlone) (Kroeber 1925). The term Costanoan is a linguistic designation for populations that spoke one of
eight Costanoan languages. These languages are part of the Utian language family which is a member of
the Penutian linguistic stock. Linguistic research has grouped these languages into four branches: 1) the
Karkin branch located in Carquinez Strait area; 2) the Northern Costanoan branch which consists of the
Chochenno, Ramaytush, Tamyen, and Awaswas languages; 3) the Soledad (Cholon) branch; and 4) the Southern Costanoan branch, consisting of the Rumsen and Mutsun languages (Mithun 2001:535).

The Costanoan were organized into numerous tribelets. Each tribelet’s territory contained a main village and smaller satellite villages. The villages were typically situated along a river or stream for easy access to water (Levy 1978:487). The tribelets functioned as political units that were structured by similarities in language and ethnicity, each holding claim to a designated portion of territory. Milliken (1995:229) was able to conduct a detailed examination of mission records, marriage patterns, and dialect variation seen in personal names and delineated 43 separate political entities (tribelets) in the San Francisco Bay, Santa Cruz, and inland area, with another six or so tribelets in the south Monterey Bay and Carmel Valley region. In general, Costanoan territory extended between the Carquinez Strait and San Pablo Bay on the north, southward along the coast beyond Monterey Bay to Carmel Valley, and inland to the coast range (Levy 1978:485). Neighboring groups included the Coast Miwok to the north, the Miwok and Northern Valley Yokuts to the east, and the Salinan and Esselen to the south.

Costanoan groups came into contact with European culture at the beginning of Spain’s land exploration and settlement of Alta California in A.D. 1769. During the late 1700’s and early 1800’s, traditional lifeways were drastically altered when the Spanish placed their capital at Monterey, built forts at Monterey and San Francisco, and established seven Franciscan missions to convert native peoples to Christianity and the European way of life. During this time, large-scale epidemics swept through the mission population and remaining Costanoan villages (Milliken 1995). It is estimated that the combined Costanoan population decreased from a pre-contact total of 10,000 down to 2,000 by the end of the mission period in 1834 (Levy 1978:486). During the mission period, the dwindling Costanoan population also intermarried with other interior tribes at the missions, mixing their cultural identities.

During the late 1800s, several multi-ethnic Native American communities began to appear in Costanoan territory. The best known of these were located in Pleasanton, Monterey, and San Juan Bautista. However, even these groups continued to shrink as young people married into other groups and moved away. Estimates of the total remaining population of people with recognizable Costanoan descent were fewer than 300 in 1973 (Levy 1978:487).

Descendants of the Costanoan united in 1971 to form a corporate entity known as the Ohlone Indian Tribe. This entity was successful in obtaining title to the Ohlone Indian Cemetery where their ancestors who died at Mission San José are buried (Levy 1978:487). Since that time, other descendants of Costanoan tribelets, notably the Rumsen and Mutsun groups, have organized political and cultural heritage organizations that are active locally and statewide. All are concerned with revitalizing aspects of their culture, learning the language through notes collected by anthropologist John Harrington, and preserving the natural resources that played a vital role in traditional culture.

In addition, some Costanoan groups (namely the Amah-Mutsun Band of Mission Indians, Costanoan Band of Carmel Mission Indians, Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, and the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe) are seeking federal recognition of their tribe, petitioning the Bureau of Indian Affairs with reconstructed tribal histories and genealogies.
3.3 History

The Post-European contact history for California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish Period (1769–1822), the Mexican Period (1822–1848), and the American Period (1848–present).

3.3.1 Spanish Period (1769-1822)

Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo in 1542 led the first European expedition to observe what was known by the Spanish as Alta (upper) California. For more than 200 years, Cabrillo and other Spanish, Portuguese, British, and Russian explorers sailed the Alta California coast and made limited inland expeditions, but they did not establish permanent settlements (Bean 1968; Rolle 2003). In 1769, Gaspar de Portolá and Franciscan Father Junipero Serra established the first Spanish settlement in Alta California at Mission San Diego de Alcalá. This was the first of 21 missions erected by the Spanish between 1769 and 1823. In addition to the missions four presidios and three pueblos (towns) were established throughout the state (State Lands Commission 1982). During his expedition, de Portola traveled to Sweeney Ridge in present day Pacifica (San Mateo County) and was the first European to identify San Francisco Bay. Following this discovery, San Pedro Valley Mission Outpost (1786-1793) of Mission Dolores was constructed in Pacifica.

During this period, Spain also deeded ranchos to prominent citizens and soldiers, though very few in comparison to the subsequent Mexican Period. To manage and expand their herds of cattle on these large ranchos, colonists enlisted the labor of the surrounding Native American population, often forcibly (Engelhardt 1927a; Reséndez 2016). The missions were responsible for administering to the local Indians as well as converting the population to Christianity (Engelhardt 1927b). The influx of European settlers brought the local Native American population in contact with European diseases which they had no immunity against, resulting in a catastrophic reduction in native populations throughout the state (McCawley 1996).

3.3.2 Mexican Period (1822-1848)

The Mexican Period commenced when news of the success of the Mexican Revolution (1810-1821) against the Spanish crown reached California in 1822. This period saw the privatization of mission lands in California with the passage of the Secularization Act of 1833. This Act enabled Mexican governors in California to distribute mission lands to individuals in the form of land grants. Successive Mexican governors made more than 700 land grants between 1833 and 1846, putting most of the state’s lands into private ownership for the first time (Shumway 2006). About 22 land grants (ranchos) were located in San Mateo County. The project site is located on the Rancho Cañada de Raymundo land grant originally given to Raymundo in 1840 and then to John Coppinger in 1841 (Hoffman 1862).

The Mexican Period ended in early January 1848, following several decisive battles against the United States. On January 10, leaders of the Pueblo of Los Angeles surrendered peacefully after Mexican General Jose Maria Flores withdrew his forces. Shortly thereafter, newly appointed Mexican Military Commander of California Andrés Pico surrendered all of Alta California to US Army Lieutenant Colonel John C. Fremont in the Treaty of Cahuenga.
3.3.3 American Period (1848-Present)

The American Period officially began with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, in which the United States agreed to pay Mexico $15 million for the conquered territory, which included California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming. Settlement of southern California continued to increase during the early American Period. Many ranchos in the county were sold or otherwise acquired by Americans, and most were subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns.

The discovery of gold in northern California in 1848 led to the California Gold Rush (Guinn 1977; Workman 1935:26) and California’s population grew exponentially. During this time, San Francisco became California’s first true city, growing from a population of 812 to 25,000 in only a few years (Rolle 2003). By 1853, the population of California exceeded 300,000. Thousands of settlers and immigrants continued to pour into the state, particularly after the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869. By the 1880s, the railroads had established networks throughout northern California, resulting in fast and affordable shipment of goods, as well as a means to transport new residents to the booming region (Dumke 1944).

3.3.4 Crystal Springs Reservoir

The San Mateo County area was mainly agricultural in the first half of the 19th century until the Gold Rush brought an influx of newcomers to Northern California starting in 1848. Subsequently, roads were created, and industries such as logging, whaling and dairy farms developed. San Mateo County was established in 1856 (Harris and Zogg 2010). The area came to be known for the lavish country homes of San Francisco’s elite as early as the mid-1800s and continued into the first three decades of the 20th century. A railroad between the cities of San Francisco and San Jose was completed in 1864, and in 1870, the railroad was absorbed into the larger Southern Pacific Railroad system. The advancements in transportation furthered the development of large estates and land subdivision (ESA and Orion 2009).

The communities on the Peninsula grew steadily but slowly at first. However, after the 1906 earthquake, thousands of people moved to San Mateo County, with the towns of San Mateo and Burlingame being major beneficiaries of this growth (ESA and Orion 2009; Wickert 1990). Hillsborough was generally established as a country club community in the late 19th century and maintained itself as an enclave of well-to-do residents in the early decades of the 20th century, with grander homes than the suburbs of Burlingame and San Mateo. By the 1920s and 1930s, the emphasis in development changed to more moderate homes, rather than extravagant estates. A growing affluent middle class and a post-war building boom were partly responsible for the breakup of many large estates for land subdivision in the 1940s and 1950s, continuing into the 1970s (Wickert 1990).

The growing population of San Francisco and other Peninsula communities, as well as the industrialization of San Francisco in the 19th century, created a large demand for water, advancing the need to develop the infrastructure for a regional water system. Two water companies, the San Francisco Water Works and the Spring Valley Water Company, were organized in San Francisco in 1857 and 1858, respectively. The early sources of water were local springs and creeks, which proved inadequate for the growing city. In 1864 the Spring Valley Water Company built a dam to impound the water of Pilarcitos Creek and brought the water to San Francisco through a system of flumes and pipes. The two
aforementioned water companies merged in 1865, becoming a single company that would monopolize the water system of San Francisco for approximately the following fifty years (Shoup 1989).

During the mid-1870s, the water company decided that the entire Crystal Springs Valley needed to be utilized to develop water storage facilities. The Crystal Springs area was still rural at the time, and the Upper Crystal Springs Dam, an earthen dam, was constructed between 1875 and 1877. The second dam in the valley, the Lower Crystal Springs Dam soon followed. Its construction began in 1886 and it was completed in 1890. The dam is significant due to the fact that its builder, Hermann Schussler, a German- and Swiss-trained engineer, pioneered construction techniques which later came into more general usage. These included the washing of the sand and aggregates used in the cement, the precise measurement of each raw material which made up the concrete, the placing of the mixed concrete within 15 minutes, the hand ramming of the concrete, water curing, and the intricate arrangement of the concrete in large interlocking blocks (Shoup 1989).

After the completion of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, the City of San Francisco acquired Spring Valley Water Company’s watershed lands in 1930. Thereafter, the water system was administered by the recently-formed San Francisco Water Department (Demouth 2008; Shoup 1989). As part of the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed, much of the lands immediately surrounding the Crystal Springs Reservoir remained an open space, eventually becoming an important local recreational resource for the communities of the Peninsula. With the development of State Route 92 and Interstate 280 the area also became a major transportation corridor, as nearby Hillsborough and the surrounding cities continued to grow into the decades after World War II.

3.4 Environmental Setting

The project site is located on the east side of Crystal Springs Reservoir (Figure 2) in an area dominated by a coast live oak woodland community of oak, bay, madrone, poison oak, and dusky footed wood rat. The reservoir itself fills a geographic low created by the trace of the San Andreas Fault, which separates two distinct geomorphic assemblages (fault-bounded packages of unique stratigraphy): the Pacifica Assemblage (to the west) and the Woodside Assemblage (to the east) (Brabb and Pampeyan 1983; Brabb et al. 1998; Graymer et al. 2006). The project area is within the Woodside Assemblage, an assortment of Jurassic to Cretaceous sedimentary and metamorphic units underlain largely by Pliocene to Recent sediments (Brabb et al. 1998). The project site is on the west-facing slope of Plugas Ridge, a local outcropping of greenish-gray to bluish-green sheared serpentinite (Brabb et al. 1998; Graymer et al. 2006).
4 Background Research

4.1 Records Search

Rincon requested a review of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) to identify previously conducted cultural resources work within the project site and a 0.5-mile radius around it, as well as previously recorded cultural resources within or near the project site. The CHRIS search included a review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list. Rincon received the results of the records search on December 20, 2016.

4.1.1 Previous Cultural Resources Studies

The NWIC identified 19 previous studies within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. One of these included a portion of the project site (S-027930; Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Relationship to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-006425</td>
<td>David Chavez</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Citywide Archaeological Investigations, City of San Mateo, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010740</td>
<td>Laurence H. Shoup</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report for Lower Crystal Springs Dam and Skyline Boulevard Highway Bridge (#35C 004 3), San Mateo County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Relationship to Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036313a</td>
<td>Randy S. Wiberg</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Technical Report, Extended Archaeological Survey, Crystal Springs Pipeline No. 2, Segments 2 and 3 Between Sites 8 and 9, City of San Mateo and Town of Hillsborough</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037015</td>
<td>Kimberly Demuth</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Historical Resources Evaluation Report, Crystal Springs Dam Bridge Replacement Project</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037241</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris, Maureen Zogg, and Christopher Caputo</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report, proposed replacement of Metal Beam Guardrails (MBGR) at various locations in San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037241a</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Request for Determination of Eligibility for Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, Southern Pacific Railroad Dumbarton Cutoff, Southern Pacific Railroad Dumbarton Bridge, Southern Pacific Railroad Newark Slough Bridge, Alameda and San Mateo Counties, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037241b</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris and Maureen Zogg</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail Upgrade Project at Various Locations across San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

The NWIC records search additionally identified 5 previously recorded cultural resources, none of which are on the project site (Table 2).
### Table 2: Previously Recorded Resources within 0.5-miles of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recorder(s) and Year(s)</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Status*</th>
<th>Relationship to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-41-001375</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era structure</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Bridge</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>2S2</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-001376</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era structure</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Dam</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002274</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era structure</td>
<td>Crystal Springs Pumping Station</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002275</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era structure</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Dam Outlet Towers Nos. 1 and 2</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002276</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era structure</td>
<td>Vista Point Scenic Area</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002277</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic-era district</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Dam Historic District</td>
<td>Harvey 2008</td>
<td>6Y</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Northwest Information Center 2016*

*2S2 – Individual property determined eligible for NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in CRHR.*

*6Y – Determined ineligible for NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CRHR or Local Listing.*

The Lower Crystal Springs Dam (LCSD) (41-001376) and its associated resources have been recorded and evaluated for historical significance during various previous assessments, most recently in 2008 as part of the LCSD Bridge Replacement Project (Demuth 2008). Constructed between 1886 and 1890, the LCSD is significant for its direct associations with the historical development of water storage and conveyance for the rapidly growing San Francisco area. The LCSD has been previously determined eligible, with concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer, for listing in the NRHP and is listed in the CRHR under Criteria A/1 and C/3. In addition, the structure is a California Point of Historical Interest and has been recognized as a California Historic Civil Engineering Landmark by the American Society of Engineers (Demouth 2008:5).

A number of additional resources associated with the LCSD were also recorded and evaluated for individual and collective historical significance as part of the potential LCSD Historic District (41-002277). These include the LCSD Bridge (41-001375), the Crystal Springs Pump Station (41-002274), Outlet Towers Nos. 1 and 2 (41-002275), the Vista Point Scenic Area (41-002276), and the LCSD Water Conveyance System (41-002279).
Located atop the LCSD, the LCSD Bridge was built in 1923-1924 and previously determined ineligible for the CRHR and ineligible for the NRHP with SHPO concurrence on two separate occasions, in 1989 and 1997. The bridge was also found ineligible as a contributor to any existing or potential historic districts.

The Crystal Springs Pump Station, built in 1913 with additions in 1933, was recommended ineligible for the NRHP by L.H. Shoup in 1996/1997; however, this recommendation was never submitted to the SHPO and the FHWA never formally completed a determination of eligibility (Demouth 2008). In 2008, the pump station was recommended eligible for the NRHP for its association with the expansion of water capacity by the Spring Valley Water Company, for its intact and distinctive Classical-Revival architectural style, and for its association with noted Bay area architect Willis Polk. In 2009, ICF Jones and Stokes recommended the Crystal Springs Pump Station Pump as ineligible for the NRHP and CRHR, due to lack of historical and architectural significance.

The Lower Crystal Springs Dam Outlet Towers Nos. 1 and 2, respectively constructed in 1891 and 1931-1932, were evaluated in 2008 by David Harvey for Entrix Inc., who recommended both towers ineligible for the NRHP due to a loss of integrity and the appearance of having been externally modified. They also were found not to be contributors to the LCSD historic district (Demouth 2008). In 2009, ICF Jones and Stokes found the Crystal Springs Outlet Structure No. 1 to be a contributing feature to the LCSD because it was planned, designed and constructed as part of a singular effort to create functioning reservoir facilities for urban water supply. Outlet Structure No. 1 was found eligible for the NRHP for innovative design and engineering. The Crystal Springs Outlet Structure No. 2 was found eligible for the CRHR under criterion 3 (ICF Jones and Stokes 2009).

The Vista Point Scenic Area, developed in 1923 and modified in 1929, was evaluated by David Harvey for Entrix Inc. in 2008 and found ineligible for the NRHP. While associated with the development of Skyline Boulevard as a scenic roadway in the 1920s, its design, materials and workmanship have been degraded through inappropriate repairs and site changes. The Vista Point Scenic Area is not directly associated with the historic development of the LCSD and its associated water conveyance facilities.

The LCSD Water Conveyance System, an enclosed wooden structure likely built in the late 19th century, was evaluated in 2011 by Wiberg and Psota for Holman and Associates, and found eligible for the CRHR under criterion 4 for its potential to yield information important in history.

The LCSD Historic District was recorded and evaluated by David Harvey for Entrix in 2008. The district, as a whole, was determined ineligible for the NRHP and the CRHR, due to a lack of historical associations of the properties, a lack of connection to the development of water distribution capacity in the San Francisco region, a lack of cohesion among resources, and a larger number of non-contributing resources in the district.

4.2 Native American Scoping

Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project site and a 0.5-mile buffer surrounding it. The purpose of the SLF search is to identify lands or resources important to Native Americans, and to assess the potential for project-related development to impact tribal cultural resources. The NAHC responded on December 20, 2016, stating that the SLF search was returned with negative results. However, the NAHC noted that the absence of
specific site information in the SLF does not negate the possibility of important cultural resources existing within the project area. The NAHC also provided a list of Native American individuals and tribal organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the area. Letters were sent via email to the five Native American individuals identified by the NAHC on December 21, 2016 (Appendix B).

Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista responded on December 22, 2016 stating that the area is sensitive and suggesting Rincon contact Mark Hylkema, the Santa Cruz District Archaeologist and Tribal Liaison for California State Parks, for further consultation. Rincon contacted Mr. Hylkema on January 5, 2017 in compliance with Chairperson Zwierlein’s request. Mr. Hylkema responded on January 9, 2017 stating that he is aware of two archaeological near the project site, but not within it, and offering to forward along his MA thesis and notes. Rincon responded in the affirmative.

At the time of completion of this report, no additional responses were received.
5 Methods

5.1 Field Survey

Rincon Archaeologist Kyle Brudvik, M.A., Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) conducted an intensive cultural resources field survey of the project site on January 4, 2017. The field survey consisted of walking as much of the shoulder of Route 35 and accessible off-shoulder, tree-covered slopes (east and west of the road) as possible to examine all areas of exposed ground surface for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, ceramics, fire-affected rock [FAR]), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Ground disturbances such as burrows, cut banks, drainages, and wood rat nests were visually inspected. The field survey also included a visual inspection of any built environment features, including the roadway and adjacent LCSD. Mr. Brudvik documented the fieldwork using field notes and digital photographs. Copies of the field notes and digital photographs from both surveys are on file with Rincon’s Oakland office.

5.2 Archival Research

Archival research was completed between December 2016 and January 2017. Research methodology focused on the review of a variety of primary and secondary source materials relating to the history and development of the property. Sources included, but were not limited to, historical maps, aerial photographs, and written histories of the area. The following repositories, publications, and individuals were contacted to identify known historical land uses and the locations of research materials pertinent to the project site:

- Mark Hylkema, Santa Cruz District Archaeologist and Tribal Liaison for California State Parks
- Noah Stewart, Senior Environmental Planner, Caltrans District 4
- Historic aerial photographs from the U.C. Santa Cruz Digital Collections
- Historic United States Geological Survey topographic maps
- San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library
- Caltrans Digital Collections
- Online Archive of California
- Calisphere, University of California
- Digital Public Library of America
- Other sources as noted in the references list
6 Findings

6.1 Archaeological Resources

The project site is within a roadway situated within a relatively undeveloped area, west of a major highway (280; Figure 2). At the time of the survey the project site was largely covered by staged equipment and plastic-covered sediment piles, presumably excavated from the nearby dam construction project (Figures 4 and 5). As a result, visibility was variable, nearing 0 percent in paved areas with patches of low visibility (approximately 2 percent) in grassy and under-canopy areas interspersed with areas of moderately good visibility (approximately 25 percent) in areas with little vegetation or patchy dirt cover, for example in some places along the road shoulder. No evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological materials was identified during the pedestrian survey.

6.2 Built Environment/Historical Resources

As a result of the intensive-level architectural survey, one built environment resource, Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35, was recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Series forms and evaluated for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. Described in greater detail below, this linear resource is a segment of a larger two-lane road that runs approximately 54 miles from Highway 17 in Santa Clara County to State Route 1 in San Francisco. The complete set of DPR 523 Series forms for Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 can be found in Appendix C of this report. One utility tower was also identified in the northwest section of the project site. However, review of historic aerial photographs confirms that the tower was constructed after 2000; therefore, it was not recorded or evaluated for significance as a result.

6.2.1 Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35

The recorded segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 is a two-lane road that is located in unincorporated San Mateo County. Following a general northwest-southeast alignment, it is situated along a tree-covered hillside that slopes downward from Interstate 280 to the east to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to the west (Figure 3). The segment begins at the Lower Crystal Springs Dam to the north and extends approximately 850 feet to the south, where it intersects a paved bike path that extends to the southwest. Approximately 25 feet wide, the graded roadbed is paved in asphalt-concrete and features a short paved shoulder that is bordered by gravel on either side. Road markings include painted shoulder lines and a centerline consisting of Bott dots, as well as adjacent mile markers, speed limit, and signage on metal poles. Portions of the roadway have cracked and been repaired with tar and the northern end of the segment is currently disjoined from the Lower Crystal Springs Dam due to an ongoing bridge replacement project (Figure 4). A full condition assessment could not be completed however, as the roadway was largely covered by construction equipment at the time of the field survey (Figure 5).
Figure 3 Southern terminus of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 segment, facing south

Figure 4 Northern terminus of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 segment, facing north
6.2.1.1 Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 History

The subject segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 appears to have been initially developed by the Spring Valley Water Company in the late 19th century as a private service road for the LCSD. A historic map from 1896 identifies the road extending south from the LCSD and following a slightly more rounded alignment than the present-day segment (U.S. Geological Survey 1896). The differing alignment is further supported by a circa 1891 photograph, which depicts the original wood dam bridge (constructed in 1891) connected to the adjacent roadway further to the west than its current location (Figure 6).
By the early 1920s, the original wood bridge was in poor condition and in need of replacement. The bridge was overseen by the California Highway Commission by this time and a request for proposals to complete the project was released in the summer of 1923 (Shoup 1989:11). Construction of the new bridge was not only spurred by the need to replace the original wood structure, but also by the development of Skyline Boulevard, which was planned to cross over the LCSD. As discussed in 2008:

Planning began for Skyline Boulevard began in 1919 with the route of the scenic highway between San Francisco and the Los Gatos-Santa Cruz highway to the south in the Santa Cruz mountains. The boosters for the scenic highway envisioned the road as a means to generate economic development of vast amounts of San Mateo County real estate and as a boon to tourism with the increased leisure use of the automobile after World War I. Unfortunately the northern section of the highway never reached its full potential. For a long time it was graveled but not paved, making for unpleasant driving conditions for weekend tourists. The highway was originally to be routed over the mountain range west of Crystal Springs Reservoir. But the Spring Valley Water Company, fearful of the potential fire danger in mountain watershed, persuaded the state and county to locate it along the foothills east of the reservoir and across the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (Demouth 2008).

Completed in early 1924, the multi-span curved concrete bridge was supported on multi-column bents and built directly atop the LCSD. As seen in a circa 1924 photograph and as discussed in previous
documentation of the adjacent LCSD (Demouth 2008), the subject segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 was originally topped with crushed stone (Figure 7). The alignment appears to be consistent with the present-day road, indicating was it was most likely realigned as part of the bridge construction and the road’s incorporation into Skyline Boulevard.

Figure 7 Circa 1924 photograph of the replacement concrete LCSD bridge (Source: Caltrans Digital Collections)

Progress on Skyline Boulevard lagged after 1925 as the California Highway Commission, running short on funds, diverted resources to other highway projects (Schwind and the Skyline Historical Society 2014). Development continued of the highway continued through the 1930s as the project received intermittent funding from bonds and support from federal programs. Originally designated State Route 55, it was subsequently renumbered State Route 5 and ultimately State Route 35 following a statewide renumbering of highways in the early 1960s (California Division of Highways 1964:12).

In the years since its development, Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 has been bifurcated in certain areas as a result of construction of the adjacent Interstate 280 and surrounding suburban residential development. In addition to its realignment in the early 1920s, alterations to the subject segment include its paving with asphalt at an unknown date, partial widening, the addition of adjacent modern roadway signage, and most recently its disconnection from the 1923-24 bridge, which at the time of the survey was demolished and in the process of being replaced.
6.2.1.2 Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 Evaluation

Coordination with staff at Caltrans District 4 and the NWIC failed to identify any previous documentation that included a historic resource evaluation of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35. Caltrans previously completed extensive historic resources documentation in support of the adjacent LCSD Bridge Replacement Project, which included recordation and evaluation of the LCSD and its associated infrastructure (Shoup 1989; Demouth 2008). Although the development of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 is discussed within this documentation, the historic-era road is not individually recorded or evaluated, and coordination with Caltrans staff confirmed that roads are not typically recorded unless there is evidence they may be historically significant (Stewart 2017). Two resources recorded as part of the LCSD Bridge Replacement Project, the LCSD Bridge (P-41-003175) and the Vista Point (P-41-00276), are associated not only with the development of the LCSD, but also with Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35. Both of these resources were found ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR due to a lack of significant associations.

In considering the individual significance of the subject segment, it is a portion of a larger two-lane highway that was originally constructed in the late 19th century as a private road for the LCSD before being incorporated into the California state highway system in the early 1920s. Due to a lack of integrity, however, it does not appear eligible for NRHP or CRHR listing for any potential significant associations with events (Criterion A/1), or its embodiment of distinctive architectural or engineering characteristics (Criterion C/3). Although the subject segment may have been developed to support construction of the LCSD, it has substantially altered since this time through its realignment and resurfacing, and demolition of the original, adjacent wood bridge. The road therefore does not possess sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association from this period to convey any potential significant associations with the early development of the LCSD.

Similarly, any potential significance the subject segment has for its association with or as a representation of 1920s-era highway design in California cannot be conveyed due to a lack of integrity. The original road surface consisted of gravel, which has since been replaced with asphalt concrete, and historic photographs indicate the roadbed was partially widened, resulting in a loss of integrity of materials and workmanship. Further, the subject segment was developed in conjunction with the adjacent 1923-24 LCSD Bridge, which was recently demolished, negatively affecting the segment’s integrity of feeling, association, and setting.

Archival research also does not indicate that the subject segment is associated with any significant individuals (Criterion B/2) or that it has the potential to yield important information (Criterion D/4).
7 Conclusions

7.1 Project Impacts Assessment

CEQA (Section 21084.1) requires that a lead agency determine whether a project may have a significant effect on cultural resources. Impacts to significant cultural resources that affect the characteristics of the resource that qualify it for the CRHR or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed on or eligible for the CRHR are considered a significant effect on the environment.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2[a], [b], and [c]).

In terms of historical resources, these impacts could result from “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[b][1], 2000). Material impairment is defined as demolition or alteration “in an adverse manner [of] those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[b][2][A]).

The potential for the proposed project to result in impacts to cultural resources is based on the CEQA thresholds of significance outlined in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. They are as follows:

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?
- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?
- Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
- Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
- Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

Significance thresholds for impacts to tribal cultural resources are also included in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and are as follows:

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
  a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

### 7.1.1 Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

The approximately 800-foot project alignment has been previously developed and the site contains roadway-related infrastructure, such as pavement. It is likely that surface soils have been scattered across the surface of the site during initial construction and grading of the area, and that the proposed project improvements are unlikely to occur at soil depths below those which have been previously disturbed, negating the usefulness of subsurface archaeological testing. No archaeological resources of Native American origin or tribal cultural resources have been identified as a result of the cultural resources records search, Native American scoping, local historic group consultation, or cultural resources survey.

### 7.1.2 Built Environment/Historical Resources

The segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 that is located within the project site is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR and, therefore, is not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Background research and the field survey also failed to identify any other historical resources on the project site. Although one historical resource, the LCSD, is located immediately adjacent to the project site to the north, the project would not result in material impairment of this resource. The LCSD is significant as an architecturally innovative engineering prototype for future large water storage dams. Features that convey this significance are primarily the curved, wall structure constructed of interlocking, irregular-shaped concrete blocks and the four spillway bays (Demuth 2008:11). The 1920s-era bridge that sat atop the dam, and that connected to the recorded segment Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35, was previously determined neither eligible nor a contributing element to the LCSD and was demolished and in the process of being replaced at the time of the current survey. The minimal alteration of the adjacent roadway through the addition of a bike lane would not negatively impact any of the character-defining features of the LCSD or result in its material impairment. As a result, the project would not result in a significant adverse impact on the environment as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

### 7.2 Recommendations

No historical, archaeological or tribal cultural resources were identified within the project site, and thus the Project would result in no impact to cultural and tribal cultural resources. Rincon does not recommend further cultural resources work for the proposed Project at this time. Rincon recommends implementation of the following measures to reduce potential impacts to unanticipated archaeological and tribal cultural resources, including human remains. Impacts to archaeological and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with adherence to these mitigation measures.
7.2.1 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area should be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (NPS 1983) (hereafter qualified archaeologist) should be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA and cannot be avoided by the Project, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted to mitigate any significant impacts to historical resources.

7.2.2 Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources

In the event that a previously unidentified cultural resource is determined to be of Native American origin, the qualified archaeologist will consult with San Mateo County Parks to begin or continue Native American consultation procedures. If a discovery is determined to be a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA (after consultation with San Mateo County Parks), the resource should be avoided, if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, a mitigation plan should be prepared and implemented in accordance with state guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups.

7.2.3 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities; if human remains are found, State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
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Appendix A
Records Search Results Summary
### Report List

#### 16-0933 Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-006425</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>David Chavez</td>
<td>Citywide Archaeological Investigations, City of San Mateo, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-010740</td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Laurence H. Shoup</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report for Lower Crystal Springs Dam and Skyline Boulevard Highway Bridge (#35C 004 3), San Mateo County, California</td>
<td>Archaeological/Historical Consultants</td>
<td>41-001375, 41-001376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Report List
#### 16-0933 Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036313a</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Kimberly Demuth</td>
<td>Historical Resources Evaluation Report, Crystal Springs Dam Bridge Replacement Project</td>
<td>Entrix, Inc.</td>
<td>41-001375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036313b</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris, Maureen Zogg, and Christopher Caputo</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report, proposed replacement of Metal Beam Guardrails (MBGR) at various locations in San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 4</td>
<td>01-001783, 41-000100, 41-000233, 41-000255, 41-002167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-036313d</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris and Maureen Zogg</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail Upgrade Project at Various Locations across San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>41-000012, 41-000081, 41-000302, 41-000313, 41-000314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037015</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris, Maureen Zogg, and Christopher Caputo</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail Upgrade Project at Various Locations across San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>41-000012, 41-000081, 41-000302, 41-000313, 41-000314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037015b</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris and Maureen Zogg</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail Upgrade Project at Various Locations across San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>41-000012, 41-000081, 41-000302, 41-000313, 41-000314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037015c</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris and Maureen Zogg</td>
<td>Extended Phase I Testing at CA-SMA-97 for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail 1-5 Upgrade Project, San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-01, PM 1.20, EA: 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>41-000012, 41-000081, 41-000302, 41-000313, 41-000314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037260</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Harris and Maureen Zogg</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Metalbeam Guardrail Upgrade Project at Various Locations across San Mateo County, California, 04-SMA-VarVar, EA 04-0A8721</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 4</td>
<td>41-000100, 41-000233, 41-000255, 41-002167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-037889</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Brad Brewster</td>
<td>Historic American Engineering Record Lower Crystal Springs Dam</td>
<td>Enviornmental Science Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-038139</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>ICF Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>Final Crystal Springs/San Andreas Transmission Upgrade Project, Archaeological Survey and Architectural Inventory and Evaluation Report for Section 106 Compliance</td>
<td>ICF Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-038343</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Randy Wiberg</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvements Project: Historic Flume Structure Identified in Discharge Pools 1 and 2</td>
<td>Holman &amp; Associates</td>
<td>41-002279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary No.</td>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attribute codes</td>
<td>Recorded by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-001375</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Name - Lower Crystal Springs Bridge 35C-43;</td>
<td>Structure, Element of</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP19 (Bridge)</td>
<td>1996 (Laurence H. Shoup, Archaeological/Historical Consultants); 1998 (Clarence Caesar); 2008 (David Harvey, ENTRIX, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - Skyline Blvd Bridge;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - Lower Crystal Springs Dam and Bridge;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP PRN - FHWA 970421A;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP PRN - DOE 41-97-0003-0000;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP Property Number - 068327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-001376</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Name - Lower Crystal Springs Dam;</td>
<td>Structure, Element of</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP19 (Bridge); HP21 (Dam)</td>
<td>1996 (Laurence Shoup, Archaeological/Historical Consultants); 2008 (David Harvey, ENTRIX, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP PRN - DOE 41-89-0002-0000;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP PRN - FHWA 890822B;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - SPHI-SMA-003;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP Property Number - 068328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002274</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Name - Crystal Springs Pumping Station; Caltrans - LCSD #3</td>
<td>Building, Element of</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP09 (Public utility building)</td>
<td>2008 (David Harvey, ENTRIX, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002277</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Name - Lower Crystal Springs Dam Historic District; Caltrans -</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP19 (Bridge); HP21 (Dam); HP22 (Lake/river/reservoir); HP29 (Landscape</td>
<td>2008 (David Harvey, ENTRIX, Inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCSD HD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>architecture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-002279</td>
<td>CA-SMA-000395H</td>
<td>Resource Name - Lower Crystal Springs Dam Water Conveyance System</td>
<td>Site, Element of</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>AH06 (Water conveyance system)</td>
<td>2011 (R. Wibert, S. Psota, Holman &amp; Associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Native American Scoping Documentation
December 20, 2016

Kyle Brudvik
Rincon Consultants

Sent by: kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com

RE: Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo

Dear Mr. Brudvik,

Attached is a list of tribes that have cultural and traditional affiliation to the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above. I suggest you contact all of those listed, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult, as may be required under particular state statutes. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

The NAHC also recommends that project proponents conduct a record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) at the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) to determine if any tribal cultural resources are located within the area(s) affected by the proposed action. The SFL, established under Public Resources Code section 5094, are sites submitted for listing to the NAHC by California Native American tribes. The SFL, established under Public Resources Code section 5094, are sites submitted for listing to the NAHC by California Native American tribes. A record search of the SLF was completed for the APE referenced above with negative results. Please note records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of tribal cultural resources. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of tribal cultural resources.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these tribes, 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 via email: frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Contacts

December 20, 2016

Coastanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
Tony Cerda, Chairperson
244 E. 1st Street, CA 91766
Ohlone/Costanoan
rumsen@aol.com
(909) 524-8041 Cell
(909) 629-6081

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road, Woodside, CA 94062
Ohlone/Costanoan
amahmutsuntribal@gmail.com
(650) 400-4806 Cell
(650) 332-1526 Fax

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
P.O. Box 360791, Milpitas, CA 95036
Ohlone / Costanoan
muwekma@muwekma.org
(408) 314-1898
(510) 581-5194

The Ohlone Indian Tribe
Andrew Galvan
P.O. Box 3152, Fremont, CA 94539
Ohlone/Costanoan
Bay Miwok
Chochenyo@AOL.com
(510) 882-0527 Cell
Plains Miwok
(510) 687-9393 Fax
Patwin

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson
P.O. Box 28, Hollister, CA 95042
Ohlone/Costanoan
amrs@indiancanyon.org
(831) 637-4238

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 597.94 of the Public Resource Section 597.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessments for Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo.
December 21, 2016

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of
Mission San Juan Bautista
Irenne Zwierlein, Chairperson
789 Canada Road
Woodside, CA 94602

Sent via email to: amahmutsuntribal@gmail.com

RE: Cultural Resources Study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo County, California

Dear Chairperson Zwierlein:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources study for the proposed Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (project) in San Mateo County, California. The project will be part of an eventual 17.5-mile CSRT system that stretches from the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The current project completes an approximately 800’-long gap to connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail, located at the southernmost part of Sawyer Camp Trail of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (see attached map). The Crystal Springs Dam Bridge will be completed by Fall 2017. The current project is the remaining segment to provide contiguous trail from San Bruno Avenue to Highway 92 and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this project, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site. The results stated that a search of the SLF was completed with “negative results” and recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

If you have knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the project area, please contact me in writing at the above address or kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com or at 510-671-0176. Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

Kyle Brudvik, MA, RPA
Paleontologist/Geoarchaeologist/Archaeologist

Enclosure: Project Location Map
December 21, 2016

Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
Tony Cerda, Chairperson
244 E. 1st Street
Pomona, CA 91766

Sent via email to: rumsen@aol.com

RE: Cultural Resources Study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo County, California

Dear Chairperson Cerda:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources study for the proposed Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (project) in San Mateo County, California. The project will be part of an eventual 17.5-mile CSRT system that stretches from the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The current project completes an approximately 800’-long gap to connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail, located at the southernmost part of Sawyer Camp Trail of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (see attached map). The Crystal Springs Dam Bridge will be completed by Fall 2017. The current project is the remaining segment to provide contiguous trail from San Bruno Avenue to Highway 92 and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this project, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site. The results stated that a search of the SLF was completed with “negative results” and recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

If you have knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the project area, please contact me in writing at the above address or kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com or at 510-671-0176. Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

Kyle Brudvik, MA, RPA
Paleontologist/Geoarchaeologist/Archaeologist

Enclosure: Project Location Map
December 21, 2016

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

Sent via email to: ams@indiancanyon.org

RE: Cultural Resources Study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo County, California

Dear Chairperson Sayers:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources study for the proposed Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (project) in San Mateo County, California. The project will be part of an eventual 17.5-mile CSRT system that stretches from the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The current project completes an approximately 800’-long gap to connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail, located at the southernmost part of Sawyer Camp Trail of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (see attached map). The Crystal Springs Dam Bridge will be completed by Fall 2017. The current project is the remaining segment to provide contiguous trail from San Bruno Avenue to Highway 92 and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this project, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site. The results stated that a search of the SLF was completed with “negative results” and recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

If you have knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the project area, please contact me in writing at the above address or kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com or at 510-671-0176. Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

Kyle Brudvik, MA, RPA
Paleontologist/Geoarchaeologist/Archaeologist

Enclosure: Project Location Map
December 21, 2016

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the
San Francisco Bay Area
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson
PO Box 360791
Milpitas, CA 95036

Sent via email to: muwekma@muwekma.org

RE:   Cultural Resources Study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo County, California

Dear Chairperson Cambra:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources study for the proposed Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (project) in San Mateo County, California. The project will be part of an eventual 17.5-mile CSRT system that stretches from the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The current project completes an approximately 800’-long gap to connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail, located at the southernmost part of Sawyer Camp Trail of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (see attached map). The Crystal Springs Dam Bridge will be completed by Fall 2017. The current project is the remaining segment to provide contiguous trail from San Bruno Avenue to Highway 92 and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this project, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site. The results stated that a search of the SLF was completed with “negative results” and recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

If you have knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the project area, please contact me in writing at the above address or kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com or at 510-671-0176. Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

Kyle Brudvik, MA, RPA  
Paleontologist/Geoarchaeologist/Archaeologist

Enclosure: Project Location Map
December 21, 2016

The Ohlone Indian Tribe
Andrew Galvan
PO Box 3152
Fremont, CA 94539

Sent via email to: chochenyo@aol.com

RE: Cultural Resources Study for the Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project, San Mateo County, California

Dear Mr. Galvan:

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources study for the proposed Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project (project) in San Mateo County, California. The project will be part of an eventual 17.5-mile CSRT system that stretches from the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The current project completes an approximately 800’-long gap to connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail, located at the southernmost part of Sawyer Camp Trail of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail in the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed (see attached map). The Crystal Springs Dam Bridge will be completed by Fall 2017. The current project is the remaining segment to provide contiguous trail from San Bruno Avenue to Highway 92 and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this project, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site. The results stated that a search of the SLF was completed with “negative results” and recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

If you have knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the project area, please contact me in writing at the above address or kbrudvik@rinconconsultants.com or at 510-671-0176. Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kyle Brudvik, MA, RPA
Paleontologist/Geoarchaeologist/Archaeologist

Enclosure: Project Location Map
Appendix C
Resource Records
Resource Name or #: Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35

P1. Other Identifier:
*P2. Location:  ☐ Not for Publication  ☑ Unrestricted  *a. County: Santa Barbara
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
  *b. USGS 7.5’ Quad: San Mateo  Date: T 5 S; R 5 W; ¼ of ¼ of Sec ; M.D.  B.M.
c. Address: Skyline Boulevard  City: Unincorporated San Mateo County
  d. UTM: Zone: ;  mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:

From the southern point of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam, the recorded segment extends approximately 850 feet to the south.

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The recorded segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 is a two-lane road that is located in unincorporated San Mateo County. Following a general northwest-southeast alignment, it is situated along a tree-covered hillside that slopes downward from Interstate 280 to the east to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to the west. The segment begins at the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (LCSD) to the north and extends approximately 850 feet to the south, where it intersects a paved bike path that extends to the southwest. Approximately 25 feet wide, the graded roadbed is paved with asphalt-concrete and features a short paved shoulder that is bordered by gravel on either side. Road markings include painted shoulder lines and a centerline consisting of Bott dots, as well as adjacent mile markers, speed limit, and other signage on metal poles. Portions of the roadway have cracked and been repaired with tar and the northern end of the segment is currently disjoined from the LCSD due to an ongoing bridge replacement project. A full condition assessment could not be completed however, as the roadway was largely covered by construction equipment at the time of the field survey.

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP37. Highway/trail

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

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

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #)
Southern terminus of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 segment, facing south, January 4, 2017.

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  ☑ Historic  ☐ Prehistoric  ☐ Both
Main building, 1926; additional buildings 1954-1955 and 1990s.

P7. Owner and Address: Unknown

P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)
Steven Treffers
Rincon Consultants, Inc.
180 N. Ashwood
Ventura, CA 93003

P9. Date Recorded: January 4, 2017

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
Intensive

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.")
County of San Mateo, Complete the Gap Trail Planning Project: Cultural Resources Study (Rincon Consultants 2017).

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):
*Resource Name or #: Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35

*Map Name: USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle, San Mateo

*Scale: 1:24,000  *Date of Map: 1993
Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35

L1. Historic and/or Common Name: Skyline Boulevard
L2a. Portion Described: ☐ Entire Resource ☒ Segment ☐ Point Observation  ☐ Designation:
   b. Location of point or segment: (Provide UTM coordinates, decimal degrees, legal description, and any other useful locational data. Show the area that has been field inspected on a Location Map.)

The subject segment begins at the southern point of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (LCSD) in unincorporated San Mateo County and extends approximately 350 feet to the south.

L3. Description: (Describe construction details, materials, and artifacts found at this segment/point. Provide plans/sections as appropriate.)
The subject property is a segment of a two-lane road that is paved in non-original asphalt that is cracking in areas and patched with tar. It features a centerline consisting of Bott dots and painted shoulder lines, and is bordered by a short gravel shoulder on either side. With the exception of metal signage, no additional features, artifacts, and/or archaeological sites/deposits appear to be associated with the segment.

L4. Dimensions: (In feet for historic features and meters for prehistoric features)
   a. Top Width ± 25 feet
   b. Bottom Width ± 25 feet
   c. Height or Depth ± 6 inches
   d. Length of Segment ± 850 feet

L5. Associated Resources:
The subject segment was realigned in 1923-24 as part of the development of a no longer extant bridge atop the LCSD.

L6. Setting: (Describe natural features, landscape characteristics, slope, etc., as appropriate.)
Following a general northwest-southeast alignment, it is situated along a tree-covered hillside that slopes downward from Interstate 280 to the east to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to the west. It follows a general northwest-southeast alignment that slopes slightly to the south.

L7. Integrity Considerations: Originally constructed circa 1891, the subject segment was realigned to its current alignment in 1923-24. It was originally topped with crushed stone, but has since been widened and paved with asphalt. In addition, the LCSD bridge it was initially connected to was recently demolished.

L8a. Photograph, Map or Drawing

Northern terminus of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 segment, facing north, January 4, 2017

L8b. Description of Photo, Map, or Drawing
(View, scale, etc.)

L9. Remarks:

L10. Form Prepared by: (Name, affiliation, and address)
Steven Treffers
Rincon Consultants, Inc.
180 N. Ashwood
Ventura, CA 93003

L11. Date: January 20, 2017
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD
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*NRHP Status Code: 6Z

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35

B1. Historic Name: Skyline Highway; Skyline Boulevard
B2. Common Name: Skyline Boulevard; State Route 35
B3. Original Use: Private road
B4. Present Use: State highway

*B5. Architectural Style: N/A

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Initially constructed circa 1891 to support development of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (LCSD); realigned to current alignment in 1923-24 as part of its incorporation into the California State Highway System and construction of the adjacent LCSD

*B7. Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date:
Original Location:

*B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect: Unknown
B9b. Builder: Unknown

*B10. Significance:

Theme: Engineering and technological history
Area: San Mateo County

Period of Significance: ca. 1891; 1923-24
Property Type: Road/Highway
Applicable Criteria: N/A

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

The subject segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 appears to have been initially developed by the Spring Valley Water Company in the late 19th century as a private service road for the LCSD. A historic map from 1896 identifies the road extending south from the LCSD and following a slightly more rounded alignment than the present-day segment (U.S. Geological Survey 1896). The differing alignment is further supported by a circa 1891 photograph, which depicts the original wood dam bridge (constructed in 1891) connected to the adjacent roadway further to the west than its current location (Snodgrass 1891).

By the early 1920s, the original wood bridge was in poor condition and in need of replacement. The bridge was overseen by the California Highway Commission by this time and a request for proposals was released in the summer of 1923 (Shoup 1989:11) to complete the project. Construction of the new bridge was not only spurred by the need to replace the original wood structure, but also by the development of Skyline Boulevard, which was planned to cross over the LCSD. As discussed in 2008:

Planning began for Skyline Boulevard began in 1919 with the route of the scenic highway between San Francisco and the Los Gatos-Santa Cruz highway to the south in the Santa Cruz mountains. The boosters for the scenic highway envisioned the road as a means to generate economic development of vast amounts of San Mateo County real estate and as a boon to tourism with the increased leisure use of the automobile after World War I. Unfortunately the northern section of the highway never reached its full potential. For a long time it was graveled but not paved, making for unpleasant driving conditions for weekend tourists. The highway was originally to be routed over the mountain range west of Crystal Springs Reservoir. But the Spring Valley Water Company, fearful of the potential fire danger in mountain watersheds, persuaded the state and county to locate it along the foothills east of the reservoir and across the Lower Crystal Springs Dam (Demouth 2008).

See continuation sheet, p. 5.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

*B12. References:


See continuation sheet, p. 5.

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Steven Treffers; Rincon Consultants, Inc.
*Date of Evaluation: January 20, 2017

(This space reserved for official comments.)
B10. Significance, continued:
Completed in early 1924, the multi-span curved concrete bridge was supported on multi-column bents and built directly atop the LCSD. As seen in a circa 1924 photograph and as discussed in previous documentation (Demouth 2008) the subject segment of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 was originally topped with crushed stone. The alignment appears to be consistent with the present-day road, indicating was it was most likely realigned as part of the bridge construction and the road’s incorporation into Skyline Boulevard.

Progress on Skyline Boulevard lagged after 1925 as the California Highway Commission, running short on funds, diverted resources to other highway projects (Schwind and the Skyline Historical Society 2014). Development continued of the highway through the 1930s as the project received intermittent funding from bonds and support from federal programs. Originally designated State Route 55, it was subsequently renumbered State Route 5 and ultimately State Route 35 following a statewide renumbering of highways in the early 1960s (California Division of Highways 1964:12).

In the years since its development, Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 has been bifurcated in certain areas as a result of the construction of the adjacent Interstate 280 and surrounding suburban residential development. In addition to its realignment in the early 1920s, alterations to the subject segment include its paving with asphalt at an unknown date, partial widening, the addition of adjacent modern roadway signage, and most recently its disconnection from the 1923-24 bridge, which at the time of the survey was demolished and in the process of being replaced.

Coordination with staff at Caltrans District 4 and the NWIC failed to identify any previous documentation that included a historic resource evaluation of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35. Caltrans previously completed extensive historic resources documentation in support of the adjacent LCSD Bridge Replacement Project, which included recordation and evaluation of the LCSD and its associated infrastructure (Shoup 1989; Demouth 2008). Although the development of Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35 is discussed within this documentation, the historic-era road is not individually recorded or evaluated, and coordination with Caltrans staff confirmed that roads are not typically recorded unless there is evidence they may be historically significant (Stewart 2017). Two resources recorded as part of the LCSD Bridge Replacement Project, the LCSD Bridge (P-41-003175) and the Vista Point (P-41-00276), are associated not only with the development of the LCSD, but also with Skyline Boulevard/State Route 35. Both of these resources were found ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR due to a lack of significant associations.

In considering the individual significance of the subject segment, it is a portion of a larger two-lane highway that was originally constructed in the late 19th century as a private road for the LCSD before being incorporated into the California state highway system in the early 1920s. Due to a lack of integrity however, it does not appear eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources for any potential significant associations with events (Criterion A/1), or its embodiment of distinctive architectural or engineering characteristics (Criterion C/3). Although the subject segment may have been developed to support the construction of the LCSD, it has substantially altered since this time through its realignment and resurfacing, and the demolition of the original, adjacent wood bridge. The road therefore does not possess sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association from this period to convey any potential significant associations with the early development of the LCSD.

Similarly, any potential significance the subject segment has for its association with or as a representation of 1920s-era highway design in California is unable to be conveyed due to a lack of integrity. The original road surface consisted of gravel, which has since been replaced with asphalt concrete, and historic photographs indicate the roadbed was partially widened, resulting in a loss of integrity of materials and workmanship. Further, the subject segment was developed in conjunction with the adjacent 1923-24 LCSD Bridge, which was recently demolished, negatively affecting the segment’s integrity of feeling, association, and setting. Archival research also does not indicate that the subject segment is associated with any significant individuals (Criterion B/2) or has the potential to yield important information (Criterion D/4).

B12. References, continued:

Snodgrass, Ken. Lower Crystal Springs [photograph]. On file in the San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library. 1891.

Stewart, Noah (Branch Chief, Built Resources/Architectural History, Caltrans District 4). Personal communication with Steven Treffers [via email]. January 18, 2017.