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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Overview and Project Background

This Addendum to the College Park Demolition Project (“Project”) Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) evaluates the acquisition and demolition of additional single family residences within the Project area. The MND evaluated the demolition of ten single-family residences on property owned by California State University Chico (“University”). The current University Master Plan designates the Project area as the site of future student housing and associated parking. The MND also evaluated an interim parking use for the Project site, consisting of 250 parking spaces on a gravel surface. The parking spaces would be used by a mix of staff, faculty, and students (and will offset the loss of 140 nearby spaces the University formerly leased from the Chico Unified School District). The Project was approved and the MND was adopted in January 2018.

The proposed revision to the approved Project would include the demolition of eleven additional single family homes. The homes are located on the same four blocks evaluated previously. The number of parking spaces would not increase, but the incorporation of the additional properties will allow for a more efficient parking area with better access.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an environmental analysis of all projects that are not exempt from CEQA and that may have an effect on the environment. The University, acting as the lead agency, prepared an Initial Study and determined that a MND, tiered from the 2005 Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be the appropriate CEQA document. The University found that the Project, with implementation of previously adopted Master Plan mitigation measures applicable to the Project, and site-specific mitigation measures identified in the tiered MND, would not result in a significant effect on the environment. The MND was circulated for public review from November 1, 2017, to November 30, 2017 (SCH No. 2017112004). The Notice of Determination filed with the State Clearinghouse on January 22, 2018.

To address the proposed revisions to the approved Project, the University, acting as lead agency, determined that an Addendum was the appropriate environmental document under CEQA because the proposed changes would not meet the conditions requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR or MND, per Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines. As required by Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, the determination to not prepare a Subsequent EIR or MND (per Section 15162) must be supported by substantial evidence. This evidence is contained within this document and in the administrative record for the Project (located at the Facilities Management & Services office, 400 W. First Street, Chico, California 95929).
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2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Location

2.1.1 University Campus

The Project is adjacent to the central campus located in the City of Chico, California (see Figure 1, Regional Map). The University’s main campus is 119 acres and is generally bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way on the west; by West Sacramento, Legion, and Mansion Avenues on the north; by the Esplanade, Children’s Park, Salem, and Normal Streets on the east; and by West Second and West Third Streets on the south (see Figure 2, Vicinity Map). The campus is northwest of downtown Chico and north of Chico’s Historic District. To the north, west, and south, residential land uses surround the campus.

The University campus is located on state land under the jurisdiction of the Trustees of the California State University. Streets and private property surrounding the campus in all directions are under the jurisdiction of the City of Chico (City).

2.1.2 Project Site

The Project site consists of four blocks in the College Park neighborhood north of the campus (see Figure 2, Vicinity Map). The Project site is bordered by the University campus on the west side (Esken and Konkow Halls) and south (University Stadium), West Sacramento Avenue to the north, and Chico High School to the east. The parcels are located on Stadium Way, Warner Street, La Vista Way, and Brice Avenue (see Figure 3, Site Map). There are 26 total parcels in the Project area. Five of those parcels were acquired and cleared over a period of time prior to implementation of the College Park Demolition Project. Ten parcels were analyzed as part of the College Park Demolition Project. The University now wishes to acquire and demolish the eleven remaining homes and incorporate the Project area into the campus, as envisioned in the 2005 Master Plan. Table 1 identifies the location (address and parcel number) and size of each parcel, and the date each house was built. The total Project area (excluding public streets) is approximately 4.25 acres. The new acquisition area considered in this Addendum is 1.87 acres.

Table 1
College Park Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Built Date (per County Assessor)</th>
<th>Parcel Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-006-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-010-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-005-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-004-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1
College Park Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Built Date (per County Assessor)</th>
<th>Parcel Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>627 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-008-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-003-000</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-007-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-013-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-016-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620 La Vista</td>
<td>Previously Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-015-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632 La Vista Way</td>
<td>Previously Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612 Stadium Way</td>
<td>003-120-008-000</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 Stadium Way</td>
<td>003-120-010-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Stadium Way</td>
<td>003-120-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-130-011-000</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-017-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-012-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-011-000</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-007-000</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-006-000</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925 Warner Street</td>
<td>Previously Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 West Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>Previously Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 West Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>Previously Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 West Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>003-120-002-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Butte County Assessor’s Office
Note: Shaded rows indicate the parcels identified for acquisition and demolition in the MND. Parcels previously acquired by the University are noted in italics.

2.2 Demolition

The same demolition process that was described and analyzed in the Project MND would be implemented for the additional properties. Demolition of all residential units and accessory structures would include the following actions: removal of all recyclable materials such as copper pipes and copper wiring; abatement of materials containing regulatory levels of lead, asbestos, and universal wastes (e.g., fluorescent light tubes) that contain such materials; breaking up the buildings and foundations; and then removal of the crumbled buildings. Asbestos abatement and demolition notification shall be consistent with the Asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP). Dust control shall be maintained consistent with the Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) Rule 205. The University may also make the buildings available (through auction or other mechanism) for relocation to qualified persons.

All existing on-site utilities including water, sanitary sewer, gas, electricity, and communication services would be removed. Utility removal would include, but not be limited to, removal of
existing underground pipe, conduit, wire, structures, vaults, poles, footings, boxes, transformers, etc. Capping and removal of proprietary utility lines would be coordinated with the utility owner.

Existing landscaping will be removed and green waste will be diverted to an appropriate facility.

2.3 Interim Use

The site will be graded and a layer of gravel installed as the vehicle parking surface. The number of parking spaces analyzed in the Project MND, 250 parking spaces, will not be increased. By incorporating the additional parcels, the internal flow, and external access, to these parking spaces will be improved.

The University currently previously had access to 140 parking spaces on land near the Project site owned by Chico Unified School District. The College Park parcels will provide replacement parking spaces, and alleviate parking shortages in existing University lots and reduce overflow parking in residential neighborhoods. The parking spaces will be used by a mix of staff, faculty, and students.

Lighting and Landscaping

Per the original Project, lighting will be installed in the interim parking areas as needed for student safety. Reconstruction of some sidewalk may be required for driveway access. The interim parking surface will be gravel.

2.4 Utilities and Energy Use

Water

The parcels are served by existing waterlines, and served by the California Water Service Company. The parking lots would not need a regular domestic water supply. Hose bibs may be provided in some areas for maintenance purposes.

Wastewater

The parcels are served by the existing City of Chico sewer lines. No wastewater would be generated by the parking lots, and no service laterals are required.

Stormwater

The parcels are served by the existing stormwater infrastructure. The Project site is part of the Lindo Channel stormwater drainage basin.
Energy, Steam, and Chilled Water

The parcels are currently served by PG&E. Electrical service would be required for the proposed parking lot lighting. Gas service is available but will be disconnected prior to demolition and is not required for the interim use. The parcels would not be served by the campus central plant for steam, chilled water, or electrical service.

Solid Waste

If trash and recycling receptacles are provided at the interim parking lots, they would be collected as part of the campus solid waste service.

2.5 Project Approvals

The original Project, which included the acquisition and demolition of ten residential units, has been approved and implementation has begun. The University would approve the revised Project to allow for acquisition and demolition of the eleven additional units.

Table 2
Project Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizing Jurisdiction or Agency</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State University (Campus Building Official)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and Interim Use Construction</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of the State Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Compliance</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Notice of Intent to Comply with NPDES Construction General Permit</td>
<td>Enforce Construction General Permit Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte County Air Quality Management District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Rule Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chico (Public Works Department)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Connections; Right-of-Way Encroachment (sidewalk)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

The potential environmental effects of the proposed revisions to the approved Project are described below. The potential to for the revised Project to result in a new significant impact, or substantially increase the severity of an impact previously identified in the MND is discussed. Per the analysis below, and the whole of the administrative record, there is no substantial evidence that the revised Project would result in a new significant impact, or would substantially increase the severity of a previously identified impact.

Aesthetics

The Project MND found aesthetic impacts to be less than significant. The Project site is surrounded by roadways, walkways, and the University campus athletic fields, buildings, and parking facilities to the west and south. As the Project site is located in a developed area and is not near a designated scenic vista or scenic highway, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource.

As the Project involves demolition of existing buildings, changes to the visual character and quality of the Project site would result. During demolition, materials from demolished structures would be visible on the Project site. Once these materials are removed, the site would be graded and a layer of gravel would be installed for the interim vehicle parking surface. There are existing parking lots on all sides of the Project site, including two University student housing lots to the west, Chico High School parking to the east, and a parking lot at College Drive and Warner Street. Therefore, parking is not a new visual feature in the Project area. Furthermore, the number of sensitive viewers is limited (consisting of homes north of West Sacramento Avenue with limited views. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in new or increased impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Agricultural Resources

The MND determined there are no agricultural resources located within the Project vicinity. The Project revisions would not affect agricultural resources and no new or increased impacts would occur.

Air Quality

The MND found that air quality impacts for the Project would be less than significant with implementation of Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2-1. The proposed demolition and interim use is consistent with the 2005 Master Plan (which would include permanent student housing and additional parking, compared with the interim use). The revised Project would not result in new or increased impacts requiring additional mitigation measures.
Biological Resources

The MND found potentially significant impacts to special status and native migratory birds and special-status bat species. These potential impacts are related to the presence of trees and structures which may serve as nesting habitat. Implementation of Project-specific Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, requiring pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures, would reduce the potential impact to less than significant. These measures would apply to the revised Project, and would avoid potential impacts to these species related to demolition of structures or removal of trees.

Cultural Resources

The Cultural Resources Report for the Project included an evaluation of archaeological resources. Northeast Information Center records indicate that no archaeological or built environment resources have been previously recorded within the proposed Project vicinity, including the additional parcels. The intensive pedestrian survey failed to identify any archaeological resources. In consideration of the severity of past disturbance to native soils, the topographic setting, and the negative inventory results, the likelihood of encountering unanticipated significant subsurface archaeological deposits or features is considered low.

Consistent with Master Plan EIR mitigation, a historic evaluation of all structures to be demolished was conducted. This evaluation was revised to include all additional structures to be acquired and demolished. This revised evaluation is included as Appendix A to this Addendum. Per the findings of the evaluation, no historic resources would be affected by the revised Project, and therefore no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur as a result of the revised Project.

Geology and Soils

The MND found no impacts related to geology or soils. As the additional parcels are within the Project vicinity and within the same geographic unit, the Project revisions would not result in new or increased impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The MND found that impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be less than significant. Demolition of the additional houses, while a source of GHG emissions, would be relatively minor.¹ The number of parking spaces would not increase relative to the approved

¹ The Butte County Air Quality Management District does not have specific thresholds for GHG emissions, and defers to the lead agency (BCAQMD 2014). CSU Chico has adopted a Climate Action Plan (2011) which establishes GHG operational reduction goals for 2020 and 2030 but does not specify demolition or construction thresholds. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, which is located in the same air basin as Butte County – the Sacramento Valley Air Basin, uses a “screening threshold” of 53 dwelling units to indicate the size of a project that would require project-specific emissions modeling to determine the potential significance of GHG emissions. It is reasonable to assume that the demolition-only of 21 units would result in substantially less GHG emissions than the construction and operation of 53 dwelling units.
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Project, therefore mobile sources of GHG emissions (automobiles parking in the proposed interim lot) would not increase relative to the approved Project. Therefore, no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The MND found impacts related to hazardous conditions and materials to be less than significant. No hazardous sites were identified within the Project vicinity. Due to the age of the houses to be demolished, it is likely that lead and/or asbestos may be present within the houses. As with the approved Project, the demolition is required to adhere to applicable local and state standards to address the proper removal and disposal of these materials. Therefore, no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The MND found potentially significant impacts to water quality that would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. The Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-3 of the 2005 Master Plan EIR and would be subject to the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities. The revised Project would increase the total area, but would still be subject to the Best Management Practices of Mitigation Measure 3.5-3 and the General Construction Permit. These measures would reduce any potentially significant affect to storm water quality or quantity to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Land Use

The applicable land use plan is the University’s 2005 Master Plan. The MND found that the Project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, would not divide an existing community, and would not conflict with an approved habitat or conservation plan. The revised Project includes an interim parking use that would not conflict with implementation of the 2005 Master Plan. Therefore, no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Noise

The MND found that the Project would have a less-than-significant noise impact, with implementation of Master Plan EIR mitigation measures to address normal construction noise issues. The revised Project would include additional demolition activity subject to these measures. The revisions would not introduce new sensitive receptors, or substantially increase the activities occurring at any given time. The revised Project would not change the number of planned interim parking spaces, and therefore would not increase mobile noise sources. Therefore, no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.
Population and Housing

The MND found that the Project would not result in a significant impact to population and housing. The units to be demolished would be acquired from willing sellers, and would not displace a substantial number of persons. In the long term, the site is planned for student housing which would help meet the University’s goals for accommodating a greater percentage of students within the campus. No new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Public Services

The MND found that the Project would not result in significant impacts to public services, including fire, law enforcement, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.11-1a requires the University to continually evaluate the need for “Blue Light” emergency telephones on campus when constructing new facilities. The Project revisions would not require additional public services. Therefore no new or increased impacts would occur.

Recreation

The MND found the Project would not impact recreational facilities. The revised Project would not affect existing recreational facilities or increase demand for recreational facilities. No new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Transportation

The MND considered the impact of converting the Project area from single family residential homes to a 250-space interim parking area. The revised Project would result in a net decrease in vehicle trips by eliminating the trips associated with eleven single family homes without increasing the number of interim parking spaces. Therefore no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

The MND found that impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. No tribal cultural resources were identified within the project vicinity. The University contacted the appropriate tribes (per Assembly Bill 52) and no concerns regarding tribal cultural resources within the Project vicinity were identified. Therefore no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.

Public Utilities

The MND found impacts to public utilities to be less than significant. The revised Project would reduce the demand for utilities (as single family residences are a greater source of utilities demand than the interim parking use). Therefore no new, or substantially greater, significant impacts would occur under the revised Project.
4 REFERENCES

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A through L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.
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### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBP</td>
<td>City of Chico Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>California Historical Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>California Historical Resources Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHR</td>
<td>California Register of Historical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>most likely descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIC</td>
<td>Northeast Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>California Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dudek was retained by California State University (CSU), Chico to complete a cultural resources study for a project that proposes demolition of 21 single-family residences near the CSU Chico campus in the City of Chico, Butte County, California (project site). The study involved completion of a California Historical Information System (CHRIS) records search, outreach with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribes/groups, a pedestrian survey of the project area for built-environment resources, and recordation and evaluation of 21 properties for historical significance. The significance evaluations included conducting archival and building development research for each property; outreach with local libraries, historical societies, and advocacy groups; and completion of a historic context.

This study was conducted in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and the project site was evaluated in consideration of California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and City of Chico Historic Resources Inventory eligibility and integrity requirements. Furthermore, as required under California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 5024 and 5024.5, CSU Chico is required to provide notification and submit documentation to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for any project having the potential to affect state-owned historical resources on or eligible for inclusion in the Master List. In accordance with PRC Section 5024(a), all properties were also evaluated in consideration of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Historical Landmark (CHL) criteria and integrity requirements.

The CHRIS records search results indicated that no archaeological or built-environment resources have been previously recorded within the proposed project area. The NAHC search of the Sacred Lands File failed to indicate the presence of Native American resources. Subsequent outreach with NAHC-listed tribal representatives was completed through mailed letters. In consideration of the severity of past disturbance to native soils, the topographic setting, and the negative inventory results, the likelihood of encountering unanticipated significant subsurface archaeological deposits or features is considered low. The project as currently designed would not impact any potentially significant archaeological resources, and would not result in a significant effect to archaeological resources. Standard protection measures for unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources and human remains have been provided (see Section 6.2, below).

All 21 properties evaluated for historical significance appear to be not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, CHL, or local register (6Z) due to a lack of significant historical associations and compromised integrity. These properties are not considered historic resources for the purposes of PRC Section 5024.5. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect state-owned historic resources on the Master List (SHPO concurrence pending). Further, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.
1 INTRODUCTION

Dudek was retained by California State University (CSU), Chico to complete a cultural resources study for a project that proposes demolition of 21 single-family residences near the CSU Chico campus in the City of Chico, Butte County, California (project site) (see Figure 1, Project Location). The study involved completion of a California Historical Information System (CHRIS) records search, outreach with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local tribes/groups, a pedestrian survey of the project area, and evaluation of 21 properties for historical significance. The significance evaluations included conducting archival and building development research for each property; outreach with local libraries, historical societies, and advocacy groups; and completion of a historic context.

This study was conducted in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, and the project site was evaluated in consideration of California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and City of Chico Historic Resources Inventory eligibility and integrity requirements. Furthermore, as required under California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 5024 and 5024.5, CSU Chico is required to provide notification and submit documentation to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for any project having the potential to affect state-owned historical resources on or eligible for inclusion in the Master List. In accordance with PRC Section 5024(a), all properties were also evaluated in consideration of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Historical Landmark (CHL) criteria and integrity requirements.

1.1 Project Description

CSU Chico proposes to acquire 21 parcels of land near campus. Each parcel contains a detached single-family residence. All residential units and accessories would be removed from the parcels. Building demolition would take place in a staged sequence, as follows: removal of all recyclable materials such as copper pipes and copper wiring; abatement of materials containing regulatory levels of lead, asbestos, and universal wastes (e.g., fluorescent light tubes); breaking up of the buildings and foundations; and removal of the crumbled buildings. Asbestos abatement and demolition notification would be consistent with the Asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants. Dust control would be maintained consistent with the Butte County Air Quality Management District Rule 205.

All existing on-site utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gas, electricity, and communication services, would be removed. Utility removal would include removal of existing underground and/or aboveground pipe, conduit, wire, structures, vaults, poles, footings, boxes, transformers, and other related components. Capping and removal of proprietary utility lines would be coordinated with the utility owner.

Existing landscaping would be removed and green waste diverted to an appropriate facility.
For interim parking uses, the project site would be graded and a layer of gravel installed as the vehicle parking surface. Parking spaces would be created on the 21 parcels. Reconstruction of some sidewalk may be required for driveway access.

1.2 Project Location

The project site consists of 21 non-contiguous parcels located in the College Park neighborhood north of the CSU Chico campus. The project site is bordered by the CSU Chico campus on the west (Esken and Konkow Halls) and south (University Stadium), West Sacramento Avenue on the north, and Chico High School on the east. The parcels are located on Stadium Way, West Street, La Vista Way, and Brice Avenue (see Figure 2, Project Area). The project site is located within Township 22 North, Range 1 East of the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute Chico Quadrangle.

1.3 Regulatory Setting

State

Public Resources Code Sections 5024 and 5024.5

PRC Sections 5024 and 5024.5 provide the following guidance:

- 5024 (a–h): Describes the process of inventorying and evaluating state-owned historical resources in consultation with the SHPO.
- 5024.5 (a–g): Describes the process of identifying adverse effects and development of alternatives and mitigation for state-owned historical resources in consultation with, and as determined by, the SHPO.

Review of Projects Affecting State-Owned Historical Resources

Under PRC Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5, state agencies must provide notification and submit documentation to the SHPO early in the planning process for any project having the potential to affect state-owned historical resources on or eligible for inclusion in the Master List (buildings, structures, landscapes, archaeological sites, and other nonstructural resources). Under PRC Section 5024(f), state agencies request the SHPO’s comments on the project.

Under PRC Section 5024.5, it is the SHPO’s responsibility to comment on the project and to determine if it may cause an adverse effect (PRC Section 5024.5), defined as a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In this case, historical resources are defined as resources eligible for or listed in the NRHP and/or resources registered for or eligible for registering as a CHL.
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National Register of Historic Places

Although there is no federal nexus for this project, the subject properties were evaluated in consideration of the NRHP designation criteria and integrity requirements to comply with PRC Sections 5024 and 5024.5. The NRHP is the United States’ official list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects worthy of preservation. Overseen by the National Park Service (NPS) under the U.S. Department of the Interior, the NRHP was authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Its listings encompass all National Historic Landmarks, as well as historic areas administered by NPS.

NRHP guidelines for evaluation of historic significance were developed to be flexible and to recognize the accomplishments of all who have made significant contributions to the nation’s history and heritage. Its criteria are designed to guide state and local governments, federal agencies, and others in evaluating potential entries in the NRHP. For a property to be listed in or determined eligible for listing, it must be demonstrated to possess integrity and to meet at least one of the following criteria listed below:

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

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

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

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

Integrity is defined in NRHP guidance, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, as “the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity” (NPS 1990). NRHP guidance further states that properties must have been completed at least 50 years ago to be considered for eligibility. Properties completed fewer than 50 years before evaluation must be proven to be “exceptionally important” (criteria consideration G) to be considered for listing.

A historic property is defined as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and that meet the NRHP criteria” (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 800.16(i)(1)).
Effects on historic properties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are defined in the assessment of adverse effects in 36 CFR Sections 800.5(a)(1) as follows:

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative.

Adverse effects on historic properties are defined as follows (36 CFR 800.5 (2)):

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

To comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the criteria of adverse effects are applied to historic properties, if any exist in the project area of potential effects, pursuant to 36 CFR Sections 800.5(a)(1). If no historic properties are identified in the area of potential effects, a finding of “no historic properties affected” would be made for the proposed project. If there are historic properties in the area of potential effects, application of the criteria of adverse effect (as described above) would result in project-related findings of either “no adverse effect” or of “adverse effect.” A finding of no adverse effect may be appropriate when the undertaking’s effects do not meet the thresholds in criteria of adverse effect (36 CFR Sections 800.5(a)(1)), in certain cases when the undertaking is modified to avoid or lessen effects, or if
conditions are imposed to ensure review of rehabilitation plans for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (codified in 36 CFR Part 68).

If adverse effects were expected to result from a project, mitigation would be required, as feasible, and resolution of those adverse effects by consultation may occur to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.6(a).

**California Historical Landmarks**

CHLs are buildings, structures, sites, or places that have been determined to have statewide historical significance by meeting at least one of the criteria listed below (OHP 2017):

- The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
- Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
- A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The resource also must have written consent of the property owner, be recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission, and be officially designated by the Director of California State Parks. CHLs #770 and above are automatically listed in the CRHR (OHP 2017).

**California Register of Historical Resources**

In California, the term “historical resource” includes “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California” (PRC Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

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

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

To understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource fewer than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

As described further below, the following CEQA statutes and guidelines are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource”; it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of an historical resource.
- PRC Section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC Sections 21083.2(b)-(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures; preservation-in-place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

Under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause “a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)). If a site is either listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or if it is included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of
PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is a “historical resource” and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for the purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)).

A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means “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); PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b)(2)):

(1) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or

(2) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(q) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(3) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any historical resources, then evaluates whether that project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource’s historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project would 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)).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

(1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

(2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC Section 21083.2(a); CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a non-unique archaeological resource qualifies as tribal cultural resource (PRC Sections 21074(c) and 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described below, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.

**California Health and Safety Code**

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains can occur until the County Coroner has examined the remains (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5b). PRC Section 5097.98 outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5c). The NAHC would notify the most likely descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the MLD by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

**Local**

**City of Chico Historic Preservation Ordinance**

As part of the City of Chico Municipal Code, its Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 19.37, Historic Preservation) gives the following criteria (Subsection 19.37.040, Historic Resource Designation Criteria):

A. Landmark and Landmark Overlay Zoning District Significance Criteria. Upon the recommendation of the board and approval of the City Council, an historic resource may be designated a landmark, or a definable geographic area may be designated a landmark overlay zoning district, if the resource or area meets any of the following criteria and retains a high level of historic integrity.

1. The resource or area is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns in the history of Chico, the State of California, or the nation;

2. The resource or area is associated with individuals who were significant in the history of Chico, the State of California, or the nation;
3. The resource or area embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction, represents the work of a master designer, or possesses high artistic values.

B. Additional Factors to be Considered in Landmark Designation. In determining whether to designate a resource a landmark, the following additional factors may be considered, if applicable:

1. A resource moved from its original location may be designated a landmark if it is significant primarily for its architectural value, or if it is one of the most important surviving structures associated with an important person or historic event.

2. A birthplace or grave may be designated a landmark if it is that of an historical figure of outstanding importance in the history of Chico, the state, or the nation.

3. A cemetery may be designated a landmark if it represents a group of persons or an era that collectively is significant in the broad patterns in the history of Chico, the State of California, or the nation.

4. A reconstructed building may be designated a landmark if the reconstruction is historically accurate based on sound historical documentation, is executed in a suitable environment, and if no other original structure that has the same historical association exists.

5. A resource achieving significance within the past fifty years may be designated a landmark if the resource is of exceptional importance within the history of Chico, the state or the nation.

C. Additional Factors to be Considered in Designating a Landmark Overlay Zoning District. In deciding whether to apply the landmark overlay zoning district to a geographic area, the following additional factors may be considered, if applicable:

1. To be designated a landmark overlay zoning district, the contributing properties must retain historic integrity and the collective value of the district contributors may be greater than the individual resources within the landmark district.

2. A landmark overlay zoning district should exhibit a recognizable style or era of design, an association of design integrity, setting, materials, and workmanship.

1.4 Project Personnel

All cultural resources technical work in support of this report was completed by Dudek staff. Quality assurance/quality control of this technical report was conducted by Dudek’s Architectural History Principal Investigator Samantha Murray, MA. Fieldwork, archival research, and preparation of Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms were conducted by Architectural Historians Sarah Corder, MFA and Nicole Frank, MSHP. Sarah Brewer, BA, contributed to archaeological components of this report, including review and summary of CHRIS records search results. Adam Giacinto, MA, RPA, acted as Archaeological Principal Investigator and prepared archaeological recommendations. All project staff meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61) in architectural history and archaeology, respectively. Preparer’s qualifications are located in Appendix A.
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
2 HISTORIC CONTEXT

2.1 Historical Overview of the City of Chico

In 1843, Edward A. Farwell and William Dickey visited the present-day Chico area on a hunting expedition. Farwell and Dickey came from Sacramento (at the time known as Sutter’s Fort) and were interested in obtaining land grants. Dickey chose the land on the north side of the Sacramento River creek and Farwell chose the land to the south. Dickey named his land Arroyo Chico (small creek) (Wells 1882).

Around the same time, General John Bidwell visited the area for the first time and purchased land from Dickey and Farwell (Wells 1882). General Bidwell pioneered one of the first emigrant parties of Americans to the state of California (Hoover et al. 1966). John Bidwell was born in New York in 1819 and had spent most of his childhood working on his father’s farm. At the age of 19, Bidwell moved west and settled in Ohio where he spent 2 years as a schoolmaster. After Ohio, he continued west to Missouri in search of adventure and land, and settled on a plot on the west side of the Missouri River. While on a trip to St. Louis, a claim jumper built a cabin on his land in Missouri, forcing Bidwell out. Unable to claim his land back, Bidwell set out to California and met with John Sutter in Sacramento (Moon 2003). Bidwell was employed by Sutter until he acquired the lands previously owned by Dickey and Farwell (original grantees of Rancho Arroyo Chico) in the Sacramento Valley (Hoover et al. 1966).

Although the land grants of General Bidwell were situated on Rancho Chico by 1845, the town was not laid out until 1860. General Bidwell built the first house in the Chico area in 1849, which was destroyed by fire in 1852 and later replaced by an adobe building (no longer extant). The first United States mail service arrived in Chico in 1851, and the town’s first postmaster was A.H. Barber (Wells 1882).

In 1852, Hall and Crandall began running stages from Marysville to Shasta. The stages would pass through Hamilton and Neal’s ranch and Chico. Bidwell opened a hotel on his land during this period, since it had become a station on the stage route for travelers needing refreshments and rest. Bidwell ran the hotel for a number of years. Later, he returned to farming and stock raising, planting fruit trees, wheat, and other grains.

Until 1860, all of the improvements south of Chico Creek were confined to Bidwell’s premises. In 1860, the town-plot of Chico was laid out by county surveyor J.S. Henning, who had been commissioned by Bidwell and his wife Annie. Shortly after, several individuals, including Richard Breese and E.B. Pond, moved to town and began development. Breese built a house and several others soon followed. Pond constructed the town’s first brick-and-mortar store, on the corner of First and Main Streets, which he ran beginning in 1861 (Wells 1882).

Bidwell donated land to schools and congregations. In 1862, Woodman’s Academy, Chico’s most prominent and long-lasting 19th century private school, opened on Block 81 (CHA 1983). Jane H. Voorhees was the first teacher (Wells 1882). The Salem Street School, Chico’s first public schoolhouse, was built in 1866 and served
the area for nearly 10 decades. The Oakdale School building was built on the south bank of Little Chico Creek (not on Bidwell’s land) in 1874 and operated until the late 1940s (CHA 1983).

The town of Chico was showing great promise in the farming and grain industries. Wheat became the staple product, and the acreage rapidly increased over the years. Chico became the principal market for the grain and furnished supplies to the rest of the country, establishing a trade that boosted the local economy. Many individuals left the foothills and the mountains and moved to Chico in hopes of prosperity. In 1864, Chico had a population of 500 and a variety of businesses, including a brewery, a law office, and a tin and stove store.

It was not until construction of the Oregon and California Railroad in 1870 that the town of Chico and the eastern part of Butte County further developed. Prior to the railroad, the Sacramento River (located 6 miles away) and horse-pulled wagons were the only outlets for trade and business operations with other cities (Wells 1882). With completion of the railroad, Butte County became a leader in pine production and soon boasted five lumber yards; two mills; a foundry; two blacksmith shops; five harness makers; three livery stables; two wagon makers; one brewery; one sash, door, and blind factory; and 13 saloons (Reid 2008).

In 1872, the City of Chico (City) was incorporated. A lot on Main Street that would house the City Hall building, at the time referred to as the station house, was donated by General Bidwell. Later that year, a two-story station house was erected. The main floor contained six large rooms to be occupied by various City officers, and three cells to hold public offenders. The second floor contained a large room for public meetings (Wells 1882). In 1874, in hopes of growing his town and securing the county seat for Chico, General Bidwell donated a park to the City. Although Chico failed in its efforts to win the county seat, the tree-lined park, which was intended as the site of a county courthouse, became the center of present-day downtown (CHA 1983).

During the 1870s, lumber had become the main industry of the area. Starting in 1871, two sawmills were established on Big Chico Creek by the Chico Flume and Lumber Company. Prior to the Chico Flume and Lumber Company becoming the Sierra Flume and Lumber Company in 1875, a flume for rough-cut lumber was built from Butte Meadows to Chico. The success of Sierra Flume and Lumber Company was short-lived, and by the turn of the 20th century, financial issues pushed the owners to sell the land they acquired in the 1870s (Schwimmer 2011).

The timing of the financial downfall of the Sierra Flume and Lumber Company coincided with the rise of the Diamond Match Company in the United States. In 1901, the Chico Investment Company facilitated the transition of the Sierra Flume and Lumber land to the Diamond Match Company. The facilitation and establishment of the Chico Investment Company was the work of several key executives of the Diamond Match Company, most notably John Heard Comstock and Fred M. Clough. Once under the ownership of the Diamond Match Company, Clough was appointed the first Pacific Coast manager for the Diamond Match Company. The Chico location opened in 1903, and in 1904 and 1905, buildings were constructed to support operations at this facility. The site had multiple buildings, yards, and a machine shop. Figure 3 shows the Diamond Match Company in 1927 when it employed hundreds of residents of Chico. The Diamond Match
Company would be an industrial fixture for Chico until the sale of the plant in 1984 and its closure in 1989 (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Schwimmer 2011).

The rise of the lumber industry in Chico and the surrounding area also had a significant impact on the architectural development of the area. Until the mid-1880s, the booming lumber industry made millwork available for local construction endeavors, thus making it an important and accessible building material for the growth and development of the City of Chico. However, a series of fires in 1870s caused a great deal of destruction to the wooden buildings throughout the City. Due to the significant destruction caused by the fires, the City took two important steps toward fire safety: switch from wooden structures to brick structures, and establish the first volunteer fire company in Chico (CHA 1983; DC 2017).

Industrialization and the railroads influenced development in Chico, but agriculture still played a significant role in the economic system for the City throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. According to the History Timeline prepared by the Chico Heritage Association and Butte County Historical Society, in the 1870s, farmers in Chico were producing a variety of crops, including wheat, barley, almonds, figs, and a variety of fruits. Advancements in transportation made it easier for the farmers to export their crops. In the 1880s, barley became an important crop to the local economy when it is used for the Chico Brewery. By 1904, the City was chosen to be a U.S. Agricultural Experiment Station, which greatly increased the variety of plants and products produced not only in Chico, but also throughout California. The success and diversification of crops in cities like Chico would prove to be key to efforts in World War I, as Chico became a huge contributor of food for the war effort. An example of this is seen with the explosion of the rice industry from its
introduction in Chico in 1910 to the end of World War I in 1918, when Butte County grew 30,000 acres of rice (DC 2017; Moon 2003).

In addition to agricultural production, agricultural support services such as canning, drying, and packing became a significant contributor to the growth and development of the area in the 20th century. Success was seen throughout the early years of the 20th century, but the industry was taken to a new level with the establishment of CalPak/Del Monte Plant #64 in Chico in 1919. CalPak/Del Monte was the canning and fruit processing giant in California throughout most of the 20th century. The Chico plant was one of many plants throughout California, and its major function was the packaging of prunes and apricots starting in 1919. The establishment of CalPak/Del Monte starting in 1916 had a significant effect on cities like Chico, and created jobs for people in the processing sector of agriculture instead of the traditional farming sector (Holmes 2013; Moon 2003).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).
Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

> A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

### 2.2 Historical Overview of California State University, Chico

In 1887, Bidwell donated an 8-acre cherry orchard to the northern branch of the State Normal School for Chico. The campus opened in 1889 with five faculty members and 90 students (Wells 1882).

In 1921, the Chico State Normal School became Chico State Teachers College and added a junior college curriculum, awarding a certificate after 2 years. Later in 1924, the college added bachelor’s degrees to its program. The original Normal School building was destroyed in a 1927 fire; a new building was completed on its site in 1929 and was named Kendall Hall. In 1935, the school underwent another change when the California Legislature converted California teachers colleges to state colleges, resulting in Chico State Teachers College being renamed as Chico State College. During that period, chimes were installed in the school’s Trinity
Tower, the first biology laboratory was established at Eagle Lake, and the school granted its first bachelor’s of science and master’s degrees.

Like other educational institutions during the war years, Chico State College experienced difficulties, including the lack of housing on campus from 1940 through 1947. However, following World War II, Chico State College experienced growth and development that warranted housing options. In 1947, temporary housing was established for veterans with the creation of 57 one- and two-bedroom apartments for married college veterans. By 1949, two temporary dormitories were constructed to house an additional 160 single men.

Other post-war growth and development on campus included construction of Ayers Hall for Science, Music and Speech in 1951; construction of two temporary dormitories for 60 women and 70 men in 1952; construction of the Physical Education Building, the University Center, and Yuba Hall in 1956; and construction of the Applied Arts and Sciences building and a temporary cafeteria building in 1957. Although many of these buildings were temporary constructions, by 1959, buildings that were more permanent were constructed, including Glenn Hall, Lassen Hall, Shasta Hall, and a library building. By 1960, the college became one of 15 colleges in the State College System for California.

Building and development continued on campus throughout the 1960s, and in 1972, the college became known as California State University, Chico. Reflecting this change, the university underwent more program changes, including switching academic departments previously congregated by schools into colleges. Currently, the campus contains 240 acres of rangeland, 800 acres of farmland, and 2,330 acres of ecological reserves (CSUC 2015a, 2015b; Lindsay 1979).

**W.H. “Old Hutch” Hutchinson**

William Henry (“Old Hutch”) Hutchinson (see Figure 4) was a noted western historian and CSU Chico professor, born on August 13, 1911, in Denver, Colorado. “He worked at various times as a horse wrangler, a cowboy, a boiler fireman, and a mucker in mines” (California State Library 1998).

From 1933 to 1946, Hutchinson served in the Merchant Marines and worked as chief purser on passenger vessels, including the Matson–Oceanic liner Monterey (California State Library 1998; Oakland Tribune 1936). During World War II, he served as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Maritime Service where he saw duty in the South Pacific, North Atlantic, and Mediterranean (California State Library 1998).

Hutchinson met his wife Esther Ethel Ormsby (1908–1990), nicknamed “Red,” while being evacuated from China on a troop ship during World War II. She had been working as a Deputy Marshall for the U.S. Treasury Department. The couple married in Fairfield Connecticut in 1942 and moved to San Francisco in 1946. The couple had two sons together: Warren and James Hutchinson (NMSU Library 2017).

Census records provide a timeline for other places Hutchinson lived throughout his life: Denver, Colorado (beginning with his birth in 1911); a short stint in Eastland, Texas, in the 1920s; a return to Denver in the
1930s; working as a chief purser on passenger vessels during the Great Depression; serving as a Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Maritime Service during World War II (California State Library 1998); and a residence in San Francisco, California in the 1940s (although he was at sea for several years). After living at 630 Stadium Way in Chico from 1960 to 1976, he moved to another residence in Chico in 1980, located at 1611 Spruce Avenue, north of CSU Chico.

After World War II, the Hutchinsons moved to Butte County and Old Hutch became a freelance writer. By 1956, he had published more than 120 fact and fiction pieces about the American West for a variety of well-known publications (Feather River Bulletin 1956). He also wrote, narrated, and produced several historical pageants on California, and maintained regular appearances on radio and television shows (California State Library 1998). The nickname “Old Hutch” is the name of a character he played on a weekly radio program put on by a Chico station. Each week, Old Hutch would tell his audience historic tales of the old west (Portola Reporter 1955). Hutchinson also worked as a columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle and frequently contributed to the Chico Enterprise-Record (California State Library 1998).

Hutchinson eventually became a widely published author and historian, best known for his 1966 two-volume biography of Senator Thomas R. Bard: Oil, Land, and Politics: The California Career of Thomas R. Bard. The book was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize and won the Commonwealth Club’s Silver Medal. Other books authored by Hutchinson include his 1946 edits to a collection of previously unpublished works by Eugene Manlove Rhodes, The Little Waddies. Hutchinson edited other writings of Rhodes’, including The Rhodes Reader (1957) and The Line of Least Resistance (1958). Hutchinson received much praise for breathing new life into Rhodes’ work and demonstrating that stories of the old west are an important American contribution to literature (Independent Star-News 1957). Hutchinson completed his first biography on Rhodes in 1956, titled A Bar Cross Man, followed by an annotated bibliography, A Bar Cross Liar. He also authored works on the history of New Mexico, including Another Verdict for Oliver Lee and Whiskey Jim and a Kid Named Billie (NMSU Library 2017).

Hutchinson also played a role in the history of a local agricultural fair in Butte County. Put on by the Third District Agricultural Association, it became known as the Silver Dollar Fair because of the actions of Hutchinson. In 1950, Hutchinson was working as publicist for the Butte District Fair. The fair had run into financial problems after local merchants were no longer interested in supporting it. Old Hutch developed a visual marketing strategy to clarify the importance of the fair to local businesses. He ordered 50,000 silver dollars from the U.S. Mint and declared that much of the fair’s business transactions would be made with these coins. The shiny, heavy coins filled cash registers to the brim and sent a clear message to merchants about the value of the fair. The coins also inspired the fair’s present name. Event though the fair eventually reverted to more conventional currency, the name endured (Silver Dollar Fair 2017).

Hutchinson taught part-time at Chico State College, Sonoma State College, and San Francisco State between 1953 and 1964. He earned his master’s degree from Chico State College in 1961, and served as a full-time faculty member at Chico State from fall 1964 until his retirement in 1978.
Newspapers, reviewers, friends, and faculty have expressed much respect for Hutchinson’s contribution to the history of the west, and he is considered “an acknowledged authority on western history” (Redlands Daily Facts 1965). Other accolades include being voted “Best Californian” in 1965 by the Common Wealth Club. Hutchinson received the Chico State Distinguished Teacher Award in 1968, and was labeled an Outstanding Professor in the CSU System in 1977. As previously mentioned, he was also nominated for a Pulitzer Prize in 1966 (Watkins et al. 1990).

It appears that Old Hutch left behind an enduring legacy on the CSU Chico campus. In 2011, President Paul J. Zingg partially credited Hutchinson with influencing the way in which the university approaches campus infrastructure projects, specifically referencing his book A Precious Sense of Place (1991), which appears to have been published by the Friends of the Meriam Library shortly after Hutchinson’s death. Zingg also noted how Hutchinson’s “sense of place” influenced the 2004 Master Plan (Zingg 2011):

> The first of these is William H. “Old Hutch” Hutchinson’s lovely history of the early decades of our campus in his aptly titled book, A Precious Sense of Place. Drawing upon his own fascination with “the many local geographies that have been and remain an essential part” of his life, Old Hutch’s account reveals that the University has been deeply informed from the beginning by a respect for the natural environment and a proud, but not arrogant, sense of exceptionalism regarding its mission as the second oldest campus in the California State University system. Our “sense of place” encompasses both our role in the North State and California higher education and also our location in a college town, bordered by historic neighborhoods and a vibrant downtown, and committed to a traditional, residential identity…. It is remarkable how Old Hutch’s affirmation of a sense of place and our master plan’s dedication to it grace the design of our campus.

The courtyard between Trinity Hall and Kendall Hall was dedicated on June 11, 1979, in his honor. Hutchinson enjoyed the campus atmosphere, and could often be found sitting on a bench in the courtyard that now bears his name (CSUC 2016).

Hutchinson died of a heart attack in Chico on March 11, 1990. Red would follow closely behind him, passing away less than 1 month after his death.
2.3 Residential Architecture in the Project Area

Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to
Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):
• One story in height
• Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
• Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
• Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
• Focus on informality
• Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
• Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
• Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
• Large chimneys
• Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
• Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
• Front and rear yards
• Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes
3  BACKGROUND RESEARCH

3.1  CHRIS Records Search

Dudek requested a CHRIS records search from the Northeast Information Center (NEIC), which houses cultural resources records for Butte County. Dudek received the results on July 26, 2017. The search included any previously recorded cultural resources and investigations within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. The CHRIS search also included a review of the NRHP; CRHR; California Points of Historical Interest list; California Inventory of Historic Resources; CHL list; the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data Files for Butte County; the Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California; and Historic Spots in California. A letter from the NEIC summarizing the results of the records search and a bibliography of prior cultural resources studies is provided in Confidential Appendix B of this report.

Previous Technical Studies

Thirty-eight previously conducted studies were identified within the 0.5-mile records search radius. Of these studies, three overlap the current project area: 000839, 006685, and 009465 (see Table 1). A brief summary of the three studies is provided in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies Within 0.5 Miles of Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>In Project Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000601</td>
<td>Archaeological/Historical Report on the Proposed Student Housing Project Area Located on the Campus of California State University at Chico</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Desautels, Roger</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000827</td>
<td>Technical Report: Cultural Resources Survey for the US Sprint Fiber Optic Cable Project – Oroville, California to Eugene, Oregon</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Minor, Rick, Jackson Underwood, Rebecca Apple, Stephen Dow Beckham, and Clyde Woods</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000827</td>
<td>US Sprint Fiber Optic Cable Project – Oroville, California to Eugene, Oregon: Addendum #1 to the Technical Report</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Shackley, M. Steven, Rick Minor, Rebecca Apple, Stephen Dow Beckham, Trudy Vaughan, Clyde M. Woods, and Jan E. Wooley</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000827</td>
<td>US Sprint Fiber Optic Cable Project – Oroville, California to Eugene, Oregon: Addendum #4 to the Technical Report, Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Regeneration Stations and Point of Presence Sites from Oroville to Eugene</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Vaughan, Trudy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies Within 0.5 Miles of Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>In Project Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1468, SHA-1684, SIS-332, Addendum #2 to the Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000827</td>
<td>US Sprint Fiber Optic Cable Project – Oroville, California to Eugene, Oregon: Addendum #5 to the Technical Report, Cultural Resources Construction Monitoring Program in California</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Gonzalez, Tirzo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000839</td>
<td>The Archaeology and Prehistory of Plumas and Butte Counties, California: In Introduction and Interpretive Model</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Kowta, Makoto</td>
<td>Yes (regional overview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000874</td>
<td>In Search of John Bidwell’s Carriage House: Archaeological Investigations at Bidwell Mansion State Historic Park, Chico, California</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Johnson, Keith</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003211</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey, Ostrander 1.7-acre Development Project</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Jensen, Sean M.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004905</td>
<td>Bidwell Mansion State Historic Park: Results of 2002 Mansion Grounds Historical and Archaeological Research</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>White, Gregory G., Kathleen Hillman, Elin Pynchon, Michael Magliari, and William A. Silva</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005721</td>
<td>CSU, Chico, TII Project: Cultural Resources Found in Trench Located in the Quad Between Glenn Hall, Trinity Hall, and the Merriam Library Building</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>White, Gregory G.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006685</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment of the California State University, Chico Master Plan 2004 Area, Butte County, California</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006752</td>
<td>An Archaeological Evaluation of the Bidwell Reach Project Chico, Butte County, California</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Harrington, Lori</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006810</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey and Test Augering of the Proposed Natural History Museum Parcel at California State University, Chico, Butte County</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Leach-Palm, Laura, and Kimberly Carpenter</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007362</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Final Report of Monitoring and Findings for the Qwest Network Construction Project, State of California</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arrington, Cindy, and Bryon Bass</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007939</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Survey for the Wildcat Activity Center</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reid, Jeff, and Josh Peabody</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007941</td>
<td>Section 106 Review, Site No. 82596 – North Chico, 1298 Nord Avenue, Chico, California</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Losee, Carolyn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007944</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Survey for the University Housing and Food Services Phase I Project</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reid, Jeff, and Heath Browning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies Within 0.5 Miles of Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>In Project Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico-1 Former Manufactured Gas Plant Soil Removal Project, Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008087</td>
<td>Historic Resources Evaluation Report for the Pacific Gas and Electric Chico-1</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Carole Denardo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Manufactured Gas Plant Generator Building, Chico, California, APN 04-038-004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008087</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring, Testing, and Evaluation at the Chico-1 Former</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Texier, Bruno, and Carole Denardo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured Gas Plant Site City Block 62, Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008087</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring and Phase II Evaluations,</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rodman, Tobin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico-1 Former Manufactured Gas Plant Site City Block 63, Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008108</td>
<td>Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Proposed Storm Drain Pipe Route within the</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Manning, James P.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento Avenue Assessment District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009465</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey for the CSU, Chico Track Restroom Improvement Project,</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Reid, Jeff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butte County, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009749</td>
<td>A Cultural Resource Study of the Proposed Big Chico Creek/Bidwell Avenue</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tuttle, Tiffany</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration Project, City of Chico, Butte County, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009749</td>
<td>An Addendum to: The Big Chico Creek/Bidwell Avenue Restoration Project Cultural</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Harrington, Lori</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009800</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey for the CSU, Chico Alumni Glenn Rehabilitation Project,</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Reid, Jeff</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009827</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Study of the Bidwell Project, AT&amp;T Mobility Site N. CA-C014,</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Bilat, Lorna</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>212 Cherry Street, Chico, Butte County, California 95928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009917</td>
<td>Architectural Evaluation of the University Center Building, CSU, Chico</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Brooksheer, Cheryl</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010865</td>
<td>An Archaeological Evaluation of the Children’s Playground and Labyrinth Project,</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Harrington, Lori</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010893</td>
<td>An Archaeological Evaluation of 1st and 2nd Street Couplet Project Butte County,</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Harrington, Lori</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chico, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012670</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Wills, Carrie D., and Kathleen A.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate SC06536A (Downtown Chico), 212 Cherry Street, Chico, Butte County,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012675</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Willis, Carrie, and Kathleen</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate SC06536A (Downtown Chico), 212 Cherry Street, Chico, Butte County,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies Within 0.5 Miles of Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIC Report No.</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>In Project Area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>012858</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Investigation for AT&amp;T Mobility CVL00240 “Bidwell” 212 Cherry Street, Chico, Butte County, California</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lossee, Carolyn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012970</td>
<td>CSU Chico – Bridge Replacement/Restoration Project, Cultural Resources Survey Report</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Baxter, R. Scott, and Katherine Anderson</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013254</td>
<td>Loveliest of Places: A Study of the Pre-Mansion Historical Resources of Bidwell Mansion State Historic Park</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>White, Gregory</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report No. 000839

The Archaeology and Prehistory of Plumas and Butte Counties, California: In Introduction and Interpretive Model is a broad-scope description of prehistoric archaeology in two counties. It does not specifically address the project area, but it does provide a substantial body of information relating to the broader prehistoric cultural context of the area.

Report No. 006685

Cultural Resource Assessment of the California State University, Chico Master Plan 2004 Area, Butte County, California (Peak & Associates 2004), provides the results of a cultural resources investigation of development projects for the California State University, Chico Master Plan 2004. The cultural investigation encompassed the entire current proposed project area. Prior to the pedestrian survey of the project area, Peak & Associates conducted a records search at the NEIC. The records search did not identify cultural resources within the current project area. Peak & Associates archaeological staff also conducted a reconnaissance field survey. The survey did not identify any NRHP/CRHR–eligible resources within the current project area, but the study identified the project area as having the potential to encounter historic and prehistoric subsurface deposits, and recommended tribal consultation and archaeological monitoring for any ground-disturbing activities. The study also recommended that, prior to the demolition or alteration of any built-environment resources greater than 45 years of age within the CSU Chico campus area, a qualified architectural historian should be retained to evaluate the potential significance of these resources (Peak & Associates 2004).

Report No. 009465

Cultural Resources Survey for the CSU, Chico Track Restroom Improvement Project, Butte County, California (Reid 2008), is a look at potential cultural resources for a project that proposes improving restroom facilities. This study encompasses the westernmost two structures of the project area. Neither the pedestrian survey nor the records search encountered any cultural resources in the direct project area, but the records search identified a number
of prehistoric and historic resources within the 0.5-mile-radius buffer, so monitoring was recommended for the ground-disturbing aspects of the project.

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

No previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the project area as a result of the NEIC records search. Sixty-five previously recorded resources were identified within a 0.5-mile-radius of the project area (see Table 2).

The closest resource to the project area is P-04-004052, the Chico Rancheria Indian Cemetery, located approximately 0.2 miles away from the project area. This is a historic-era cemetery for members of the Northwest Maidu Mechoopda tribe, and includes stone and wooden grave markers. According to the site record (Boston 1983), the cemetery was established in 1869, after the Mechoopda village moved to land donated by John Bidwell, the founder of Chico. Bidwell had employed Mechoopda tribe members on his ranch and arranged to have them stay on the ranch, rather than be forced into reservations (Boston 1983). Because the Mechoopda were able to maintain their customs, early ethnographers such as A.L. Kroeber were able to record valuable information about lifestyles and language from the Mechoopda of this rancheria (Boston 1983).

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5 Miles of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Resource Name/Description</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Date (Author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-000295</td>
<td>CA-BUT-000295/H</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Historic</td>
<td>Site includes midden, housepits, shell and glass beads, metal, and ceramics</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>1968 (Dorothy Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-000574</td>
<td>CA-BUT-000574</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Mechoopda Ind. Rancheria; Chico Rancheria</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>1967 (J. Chartkoff and K. Johnson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-002886</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic period refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>2004 (N. Neuenschwander, Peak &amp; Associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-002936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic period refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>2006 (H. Browning and E. Nilsson, URS Corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003000</td>
<td>CA-BUT-003000/H</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Chico Soda Works: warehouses with eight structural foundation features, refuse deposit, cistern, and oil pipeline</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>2006 (Bruno Texier, Garcia and Associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003001</td>
<td>CA-BUT-003001/H</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Chico-1 MGP Gas and Water Works and Historic MGP Generator: contains brick footings, a wooden underground storage tank, water pipe and cast iron conveyance, and redwood piping</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>2006 (Bruno Texier and Carole Denardo, Garcia and Associates); 2007 (Tobin Rodman, Garcia and Associates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Resource Name/Description</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Date (Author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003136</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>University Center building</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>2008 (Cheryl Brookshear &amp; Jarma Jones, JRP Historical Consulting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003137</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>California Water Service Company water tower and tank</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2008 (Dana E. Supernowicz, Historic Resource Associates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003820</td>
<td>CA-BUT-003820/H</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Protohistoric, Historic</td>
<td>Bidwell Mansion State Historic Park; includes lithic scatter, groundstone, glass trade beads, foundations, landscaping/orchard, wells/cisterns, water conveyance systems, standing structures, Bidwell development at Rancho Chico headquarters, bridges, Bidwell monuments</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>2015 (Greg White, Leslie Steidl, Sub Terra Consulting, Department of Parks and Recreation); 2015 (Greg White, Leslie Steidl, Sub Terra Consulting, Department of Parks and Recreation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003899</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Saint John’s Episcopal Church; OHP Property Number 49372 OHP PRN - NPS-82002171-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>(Unknown, Unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003928</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Annie E. K. Children’s Playground; OHP Property Number 049400; OHP PRN 5926-0042-0000</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>1983 (Will Shapiro, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003929</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Masonic Temple; OHP Property Number 049401; OHP PRN 5926-0043-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Will Shapiro, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003930</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Collier Hardware; OHP Property Number 049402; OHP PRN 5926-0044-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1981 (William Shapiro, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Bidwell Memorial Presbyterian Church; OHP Property Number 049403; OHP PRN 5926-0045-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Nanette Coulter, Yochio Kusaba, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003932</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1st Street Warehouse (California Packing Corp. Plant No. 64); OHP Property Number 049404; OHP PRN 5926-0046-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (William Hood, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003933</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Central Valley Pipe Company (Diamond Match Co. Warehouse); OHP Property Number 049405; OHP PRN - 5926-0047-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (William Hood, Emily Newton, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Resource Name/Description</th>
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<th>Date (Author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003935</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>El Rey Theater (Majestic Theater); OHP Property Number 049407; OHP PRN 596-0049-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1981 (Judy Smith, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003936</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Bear Garden (Luck Building, Native Daughters of Golden West, 1933-76); OHP Property Number 049408; OHP PRN 5926-0050-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Emily Newton, Yoshio Kusaba, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003939</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Hall (W.B. Dean House); OHP Property Number 049410; OHP PRN 5926-0239-0011; OHP PRN 5926-0053-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Maribeth Ross, Yoshio Kusaba, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003940</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP Property Number 049420; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0034; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0032; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0020; OHP PRN 5926-0056-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Judy Pepper, Mancy McDougal, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003941</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda Pi Fraternity (The White house); OHP Property Number 049421; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0022; OHP PRN 5926-0057-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Karen Zinniel, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003942</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker Home; OHP Property Number 049422; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0023; OHP PRN 5926-0058-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1981 (Sarah Heigho, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003961</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Off Broadway” (Bidwell's Store); OHP Property Number 049448; OHP PRN 5926-0081-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Lisa Agler, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003968</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reynolds House; OHP Property Number 049467; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0128; OHP PRN 5926-0098-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Karen D. Johnson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003969</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earl House; OHP Property Number 049468; OHP PRN NPS-891000636-0131; OHP PRN 5926-0099-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Karen Zinniel, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003973</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP Property Number 049475; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0146; OHP PRN 5926-0103-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Jayne May, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003974</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>“The Bakery” (George Crosette House); OHP Property Number 049476; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0148; OHP PRN 5926-0104-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003979</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Ringel Park; OHP Property Number 049482; OHP PRN 5926-0110-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Will Shapiro, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003982</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>South of Campus Neighborhood; OHP Property Number 073320; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-9999; OHP PRN 04-0004</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>1988 (John Gallardo, Giovanna R. Jackson, Elizabeth Stewart, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003987</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>French House (William H. Zwisler House); OHP PRN - 537.9-04-0014; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0018; OHP PRN 5926-0055-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003988</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>International Studies (Charles Ball House); OHP Property Number 049416; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0020; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0017; OHP PRN 5926-0054-0005</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003989</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>J.V. Richardson House; OHP Property Number 049415; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0019; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0016; OHP PRN 5926-0054-0004</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003990</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>C.C. Richardson House; OHP Property Number 049414; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0015; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0015; OHP PRN 5926-0054-0003</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003991</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>German House (Rouke-Haile House); OHP Property Number 049413; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0018; OHP PRN NPS-91000636-0014; OHP PRN 5926-0054-0002</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Norma Craig, Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003992</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Spanish House (H.W. Crew House); OHP Property Number 049412; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0017; OHP PRN - NPS-91000636-0013; OHP PRN 5926-0054-0001</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Norma Craig, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-003993</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>OHP Property Number 049419; OHP PRN 5926-0055-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Anne Slade, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary No.</td>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Resource Name/Description</td>
<td>Resource Type</td>
<td>Date (Author)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004011</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Mavis Todd Brown House (Bernard House); OHP Property Number 049488; OHP PRN - NPS-91000636-0105; OHP PRN 5926-0116-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (Jeanne Boston, Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004020</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Van Liew House; OHP Property Number 049498; OHP PRN 5926-0126-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (S.S. Newton, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004021</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>E.I. Miller House; OHP Property Number 049499; OHP PRN 5926-0127-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (John Michael, Giovanna Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004022</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>OHP Property Number 049500; OHP PRN 5926-0128-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Lynn Hoffman, Giovanna Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004023</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Chico Museum (Chico Free Public Library); OHP Property Number 049501; OHP PRN 5926-0129-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1981 (Beth Tausczik-Olsen, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004030</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Citrus School; OHP Property Number 049509; OHP PRN 5926-0137-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Maribeth Ross, Yoshio Kusaba, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004031</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Barceloux House (Hiebert House); OHP Property Number 049511; OHP PRN 5926-0139-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Jeanne Lane, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004032</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Waters House; OHP Property Number 049512; OHP PRN 5926-0140-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Grant Branson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004033</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Veteran’s Memorial Hospital; OHP Property Number 049513; OHP PRN 5926-0141-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1982 (James Roy Nash, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004036</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Bidwell Millstones (Bidwell’s Mill Site); OTIS Resource Number 049510; OHP PRN 5926-0138-0000; OHP PRN SPHI-BUT-004</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004037</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>William Nason House; OHP Property Number 049514; OHP PRN 5926-0142-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Marilyn Steinheimer, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004038</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>F.J. Boucher House; OHP Property Number 049515; OHP PRN 5926-0143-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Dave M. Brown, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004040</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stamper House; OHP Property Number 049517; OHP PRN 5926-0145-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Giovanna R. Jackson, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004041</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>OHP Property Number 049518; OHP PRN 5926-0146-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (John Gallardo, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004049</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Residence (Dr. Moulton’s House); OHP Property Number 049526; OHP PRN 5926-0154-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Karl Wahl, California State University, Chico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004052</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chico Rancheria Indian Cemetery (Mechoopa Indian Cemetery); OHP Property Number 049529; OHP PRN 5926-0157-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Jeanne Boston, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004064</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Robert Laxson Auditorium (Auditorium and Assembly Building); OHP Property Number 049592; OHP PRN 5926-0176-0004</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Karl Wahl, California State University, Chico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004065</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity Hall (Old Library, Campus Activities Center -CAC); OHP Property Number 049454; OHP PRN 5926-0176-0003</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Karl Wahl, California State University, Chico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004066</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Kendall Hall (Administration Building and New Main Building); OHP Property Number 049590; OHP PRN 5926-0176-0002</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1983 (Karl Wahl, California State University, Chico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004071</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.E. Shepard Home; OHP Property Number 049598; OHP PRN 5926-0181-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (E. Stewart, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004072</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roseanna O’Hair House; OHP Property Number 049599; OHP PRN 5926-0182-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Robin Williams, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004078</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>C.A. Wright House; OHP Property Number 049605; OHP PRN 5926-0188-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (E. Stewart, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004081</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank A. Clough House; OHP Property Number 049608; OHP PRN 537.9-04-0005; OHP PRN 5926-0191-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Robert Mortensen, E. Stewart, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004082</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Priel House; OHP Property Number 049609; OHP PRN 5926-0192-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Carol Michel, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5 Miles of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Resource Name/Description</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Date (Author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004083</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Strain House; OHP Property Number 049610; OHP PRN 5926-0193-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Carol Michel, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004084</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Barry House; OHP Property Number 049611; OHP PRN 5926-0194-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Carol Michel, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004085</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Donohue House; OHP Property Number 049612; OHP PRN 5926-0195-0000</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1984 (Sherry Snowden, Chico Heritage Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004157</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Chico State Physical Sciences Bridge</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2013 (Katherine Anderson, ESA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-04-004158</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Chico State Gus Manolis Bridge; Chico State Selvester’s Café Bridge</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2013 (Katherine Anderson, ESA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 NAHC and Native American Correspondence

Dudek contacted the NAHC on August 3, 2017, to request a search of its Sacred Lands File for the proposed project site and surrounding area. The NAHC responded on August 5, 2017, indicating that the search did not identify any Native American resources in the vicinity of the project site or surrounding search area. On July 13, 2017, CSU Chico Planning, Design, and Construction, as the lead agency, sent letters to all NAHC-listed tribes that have previously requested notifications of project pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 requirements. These letters contained a description and maps of the project and site, summarized the Assembly Bill 52 process and timing, and provided the lead agency representative contact information (see Appendix C). No responses have been received to date (see Table 3). Per PRC Section 21080.31(d), the 30-day period for a tribe to request consultation has closed.

Table 3. Record of Native American Heritage Commission Correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Tribe/Organization</th>
<th>Date of Assembly Bill 52 Tribal Outreach (Letter)</th>
<th>Response Received?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson</td>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>July 13, 2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis E. Ramirez, Chairperson</td>
<td>Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria</td>
<td>July 13, 2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Building Development Research

Extensive archival research was conducted in support of this Historical Resources Technical Report. Short descriptions of the research efforts are provided below.

**CSU Chico Special Collections and University Archives**

On July 5 and 6, 2017 and on August 29, 2018, Dudek staff reviewed a variety of collection materials in person pertaining to the history of the City of Chico and the CSU Chico campus. The collection included City directories, multiple newspaper articles, campus maps, photographs, letters, and campus reports, which were all used in the preparation of the historic context (see Section 2, above).

**Butte County Historical Society Archives**

Dudek visited the Butte County Historical Society in person on July 7, 2017, and met with Nancy Brower. Ms. Brower looked through the Butte County Historical Society archives and stated that she did not have any information regarding any of the properties within the project site. Ms. Brower was able to provide resources on the history of Chico that were used in the preparation of the historic context (see Section 2).

**Chico Heritage Association**

Dudek contacted the Chico Heritage Association’s Elizabeth Stewart via email and inquired about the subject properties. Ms. Stewart responded that she did not locate any information related to the subject properties, but stated that some of her colleagues may be able to assist with the background research on the City and adjacent areas. Dudek visited the Chico Heritage Association on July 6, 2017, and spoke with two staff members who confirmed that there was no specific information about the subject properties or the previous occupants of the homes, but did provide information that aided in preparation of the historic context (see Section 2). The Chico Heritage Association explained that the Chico Museum recently completed a large-scale research effort on important people in the history of Chico, and suggested that Dudek contact the museum for possible information about the people who lived in the subject properties throughout the years.

**Chico Museum**

At the direction of the Chico Heritage Association, the Chico Museum was contacted via email multiple times for additional information pertaining to the residents of the subject properties over the years. No response has been received to date.

**City of Chico Building Division**

Dudek visited the City of Chico Building Division in person on July 6, 2017 and August 28, 2018. Dudek was informed that all building permit files begin in 1952, and there were no building permits before that year on file. All available building permit files for each property were reviewed to understand construction histories.
City of Chico Planning Division

Dudek contacted Shannon Costa, assistant planner for the City of Chico, via email on July 6, 2017. Dudek was provided with information on neighborhood development related to the subject properties. Ms. Costa then directed Dudek to the Butte County Assessor’s office for any additional information.

Butte County Assessor’s Office

Dudek used the Butte County Assessor’s online parcel information system to obtain information on the subject properties. Dudek also contacted the assessor’s office via email to see if any additional information is available in the assessor’s files. The assessor’s office was unable to provide any additional information related to any of the properties within the project area.

Aerial Photograph and Historic Map Review

Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps for the City of Chico were prepared in the following years: 1884, 1886, 1890, 1902, 1909, 1921, and 1949. None of the Sanborn maps reviewed included the project area, which is likely due to later development in this area. Historic aerial photographs for the project area were available for the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012 (NETR 2017). The 1941 aerial photograph shows very little development in the project area. It shows that the property does not appear to be subdivided for housing, but is a large undeveloped parcel of land with development on all sides. The 1947 aerial photograph shows increased residential development and division of the large parcel into smaller residential lots. One major difference between the 1941 and the 1947 aerial photographs is that Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are now visible. By 1969, the neighborhood is almost fully developed with residential properties. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017).
4 FIELD SURVEY

Dudek Architectural Historian Sarah Corder conducted a pedestrian survey of the project site on July 6, 2017 and on August 27, 2018. The project site includes 21 residential properties that are adjacent to a fully developed college campus and located in a fully developed residential neighborhood (see Figure 5). All buildings were photographed, researched, and evaluated in consideration of NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria and integrity requirements, and in consideration of potential impacts to historical resources under CEQA. The survey entailed walking all sides of the buildings and the surrounding campus.

Dudek documented the subject property using field notes, digital photography, and close-scale field maps. Photographs of the project area were taken with a Canon Power Shot SX160 IS digital camera with 16 megapixels and 16x optical zoom. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the current study are on file at Dudek’s Pasadena, California, office.
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5 FINDINGS

5.1 Significance Evaluation Findings

Dudek surveyed 21 residential properties, all built at least 50 years ago. Each property was photographed, researched, and recorded on the appropriate set of DPR forms (Appendix D). Each property was also evaluated for historical significance in consideration of NRHP, CRHR, CHL, and City of Chico designation criteria and integrity requirements. Table 4 provides a summary of all properties evaluated and the associated findings. The full significance evaluation for each property can be found in the DPR forms provided in Appendix D. As a result of the significance evaluations, none of the 21 properties appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, CHL, or local register (status code 6Z) due to a lack of significant historical associations and compromised integrity.

Table 4. Summary of Property Significance Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.*</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel Number</th>
<th>Year Built (per County Assessor)</th>
<th>Evaluation Findings**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>602 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-006-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>615 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-010-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>616 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-005-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>628 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-003-000</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>608 La Vista Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-013-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>615 La Vista Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-016-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>629 La Vista Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-015-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>630 Stadium Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>725 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-011-000</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>899 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-011-000</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>621 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>622 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-004-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>627 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-008-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>633 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-130-007-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>855 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-012-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>847 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-017-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>612 Stadium Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-008-000</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>623 Stadium Way</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-010-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>909 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-007-000</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>917 Warner Street</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-006-000</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>631 West Sacramento Avenue</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>003-120-002-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Corresponds to Figure 5  
** Status Code 6Z = not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR
5.2 Finding of No Adverse Effect

Built Environment Resources

All 21 properties evaluated for historical significance appear not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, CHL, or local register (6Z) due to a lack of significant historical associations and compromised integrity. These properties are not considered historic resources for the purposes of PRC Section 5024.5. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect state-owned historic resources on the Master List (SHPO concurrence pending). Further, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Archaeological Resources

Based on the negative results of the NEIC records search, NAHC correspondence, and tribal outreach, no additional archaeological mitigation is recommended. The proposed project area has been substantially disturbed. In consideration of the severity of past disturbance to native soils, the topographic setting, and the negative inventory results, the likelihood of encountering unanticipated significant subsurface archaeological deposits or features is considered low. The project as currently designed would not impact known archaeological resources, and would not result in a significant effect to archaeological resources. Standard protection measures for unanticipated discoveries of archaeological resources and human remains are provided below.

Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources

In the event that unanticipated archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) or paleontological resources are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find would immediately stop and the lead agency would be notified. A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, would be retained and provided the opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Should it be required, temporary flagging may be installed around this resource in order to avoid any disturbances from construction equipment. Depending upon the significance of the find under CEQA (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), the archaeologist may record the find to appropriate standards (thereby addressing any data potential) and allow work to continue. If the archaeologist observes the discovery to be potentially significant under CEQA or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, additional efforts may be warranted.

Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if potential human remains are found, the lead agency staff and the County Coroner must be immediately notified of the discovery. The coroner would provide a determination within 48 hours of notification. No further excavation or disturbance of the identified material, or any area reasonably suspected to overlie additional remains, can occur until a
determination has been made. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, the coroner would notify the NAHC within 24 hours. In accordance with PRC Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the MLD from the deceased Native American. Within 48 hours of this notification, the MLD would recommend to the lead agency her/his preferred treatment of the remains and associated grave goods.
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APPENDIX A

Preparer’s Qualifications
Samantha Murray, MA
Senior Architectural Historian and Built Environment Lead

Samantha Murray is a senior architectural historian with 12 years’ professional experience in all elements of cultural resources management, including project management, intensive-level field investigations, architectural history studies, and historical significance evaluations in consideration of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and local-level evaluation criteria. Ms. Murray has conducted hundreds of historical resource evaluations and developed detailed historic context statements for a multitude of property types and architectural styles, including private residential, commercial, industrial, educational, medical, ranching, mining, airport, and cemetery properties, as well as a variety of engineering structures and objects. She has also provided expertise on numerous projects requiring conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Ms. Murray meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for both Architectural History and Archaeology. She is experienced managing multidisciplinary projects in the lines of transportation, transmission and generation, federal land management, land development, state and local government, and the private sector. She has experience preparing environmental compliance documentation in support of projects that fall under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). She also prepared numerous Historic Resources Evaluation Reports (HRERs) and Historic Property Survey Reports (HPSRs) for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

**Dudek Project Experience (2014-2017)**

**Development**

**Yosemite Avenue-Gardner Avenue to Hatch Road Annexation Project, City of Merced, Merced County, California.** Ms. Murray managed and reviewed the historic resource significance evaluation of a single-family residence/agricultural property within the proposed project site. The evaluation found the property not eligible under all NRHP and CRHR designation criteria. The project proposes to annex 70 acres from Merced County to the City of Merced and to construct and operate the University Village Merced Student Housing and Commercial component on an approximately 30-acre portion of the project site. No development is proposed on the remaining 40 acres.

**Schouten House Property Evaluation, California State University, Chico Research Foundation, Butte County, California.** Ms. Murray prepared a historic resource evaluation report and DPR form for a former single-family residence located at 2979 Hegan Lane in Butte County, California, in consideration of CRHR and local level eligibility criteria and integrity requirements. The University Research Foundation was proposing demolition of the property.

**Avenidas Expansion Project, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California.** Ms. Murray peer reviewed a historical resource evaluation report for the property at 450 Bryant Street. The peer review
assessed the report’s adequacy as an evaluation in consideration of state and local eligibility criteria and assessed the project’s conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Robertson Lane Hotel Commercial Redevelopment Project, City of West Hollywood, California. Ms. Murray is currently serving as architectural historian and peer reviewer of the historical evaluation report. The project involved conducting a records search, archival research, consultation with local historical groups, preparation of a detailed historic context statement, evaluation of three buildings proposed for demolition in consideration of local, CRHR, and NRHP designation criteria, and assistance with the EIR alternatives analysis.

Rocketship Senter Road Public Elementary School Project, City of San Jose, Santa Clara County, California. Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and prepared a historic resource evaluation report in compliance with the City of San Jose’s historic preservation ordinance. Ms. Murray evaluated a 1960s church building in consideration of NRHP, CRHR, and local designation criteria and integrity requirements.

Jack in the Box Drive Through Restaurant Project, City of Downey, Los Angeles County, California. Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and lead author of the cultural resources study which included evaluation of two historic resources in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included a records search, survey, and Native American Coordination.

San Carlos Library Historical Resource Technical Report, City of San Diego, California. Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and author of the Historical Resource Technical Report for the San Carlos Library. Preparation of the report involved conducting extensive building development and archival research on the library building, development of a historic context, and a historical significance evaluation in consideration of local, state, and national designation criteria and integrity requirements. The project proposes to build a new, larger library building.

Historical Evaluation of 3877 El Camino Real, City of Palo Alto, California. Ms. Murray served as architectural historian, originally providing a peer review of another consultant’s evaluation. The City then asked Dudek to re-do the original evaluation report. As part of this work Ms. Murray conducted additional archival research on the property and evaluated the building for historical significance in consideration of local, state, and national designation criteria and integrity requirements. The project proposes to demolish the existing building and develop new housing.

429 University Avenue Historic Resources Evaluation Report Peer Review, City of Palo Alto, California. Ms. Murray conducted a peer review of a study prepared by another consultant, and provided a memorandum summarizing the review, comments, and recommendations, and is currently working on additional building studies for the City of Palo Alto.

1050 Page Mill Road Historic Resources Evaluation Report Peer Review, City of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California. Ms. Murray conducted a peer review of a study prepared by another consultant, and provided a memorandum summarizing the review, comments, and recommendations.

Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve (BCCER) Henning Property Historical Evaluation, California State University, Chico, California. Ms. Murray authored the historical significance evaluation report for a property located at 3521 14 Mile House Road as requested by the California State University Chico Research Foundation. The property is historically known as the Henning Property and has served as the BCCER conference center in recent years. The Foundation is considering demolition of the existing
property due to numerous safety concerns and the high cost associated with bringing the building up to current code requirements.

**635 S. Citrus Avenue Proposed Car Dealership MND, City of Covina, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and archaeologist, and author of the cultural resources MND section. The project proposes to convert an existing Enterprise Rent-a-Car facility into a car dealership. As part of the MND section, Ms. Murray conducted a records search, Native American coordination, background research, building permit research, and a historical significance evaluation of the property. The study resulted in a finding of less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources.

**8228 Sunset Boulevard Tall Wall Project, City of West Hollywood, California.** Ms. Murray prepared DPR forms and conducted building development and archival research to evaluate a historic-age office building. The project proposes to install a wall sign on the east side of the building.

**Historic Resource Evaluation of 8572 Cherokee Drive, City of Downey, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and project manager. She prepared a historical resource evaluation report and a set of DPR forms to evaluate a partially demolished residence that was previously determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP (known as the Al Ball House). The current owner is proposing to subdivide the lot and develop four new homes.

**Montclair Plaza Expansion Project, City of Montclair, California.** Resources MND section, which included an evaluation of several department store buildings proposed for demolition. The project proposes to expand the existing Montclair Plaza Shopping Center.

**Foothill 533 IS/MND, City Ventures, City of Glendora, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian, archaeologist, and author of the cultural resources IS/MND section. As part of the cultural study, Ms. Murray recorded and evaluated five historic-age commercial/industrial properties proposed for demolition as part of the project. The project proposes to develop a series of new townhomes.

**Normal Street Project, City of San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and co-author of the Historical Resources Technical Report for properties located at 3921-3923; 3925-3927; 3935 Normal Street for the City of San Diego’s Development Services Department. Ms. Murray assisted with the final round of comments from the City and wrote the historical significance evaluations for all properties included in the project.

**Education**

**Kings Beach Elementary School Modernization Project, Tahoe Truckee Unified School District, Tahoe City, Placer County, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and co-author of the cultural resources study. The study involved evaluation of the existing school for NRHP, CRHR and local eligibility, conducting archival and building development research, a records search, and Native American coordination.

**Cypress College Facilities Master Plan Program EIR, City of Cypress, Orange County, California.** The North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make upgrades and repairs to existing buildings, as well as to construct new facilities to improve the safety and education experience of those attending Cypress College. The College proposed to implement the Facilities Master Plan to more effectively meet the space needs of the projected on-campus enrollment through the next decade and beyond, while constructing and renovating facilities to meet the
District’s instructional needs. Ms. Murray authored the cultural resources study for the project, which included a significance evaluation of all 1960s and 1970s buildings on campus proposed for demolition or renovation. As a result of the significance evaluation, including consideration of CRHR evaluation criteria and integrity requirements, the original 1960s–1970s campus appears to be eligible as a historic district under CRHR Criterion 3 for conveying a concentration of planned buildings, structures, and associated elements united aesthetically by their embodiment of the Brutalist style. The study also entailed conducting extensive archival and building development research, a records search, Native American coordination, detailed impacts assessment, and development of mitigation measures for project conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

**Tahoe Lake Elementary School Facilities Master Plan Project, Tahoe Truckee Unified School District, Tahoe City, Placer County, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and lead author of the cultural resources study. She recorded and evaluated the Tahoe Lake Elementary School Building for NRHP, CRHR, and local level criteria and integrity considerations. The study also entailed conducting archival and building development research, a records search, and Native American coordination.

**San Diego State University (SDSU) Open Air Theater Renovation Project, SDSU and Gatzke Dillon & Balance, LLP, San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and prepared a technical memorandum that analyzed the project’s potential to impact the OAT theater (a contributing property to the San Diego State College NRHP Historic District). This included conducting a site visit, reviewing proposed site and design plans, and preparing a memorandum analyzing the project’s conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

**Mt. San Jacinto College (MSJC) Master Plan Project, City of San Jacinto, Riverside County, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian, archaeologist, and lead author of the cultural resources study. As part of the study she evaluated 11 buildings for NRHP, CRHR, and local level criteria and integrity requirements. The buildings were constructed prior to 1970 and proposed for demolition as part of the project. The study also entailed conducting extensive archival and building development research at District offices, a records search, and Native American coordination.

**San Diego State University (SDSU) Engineering and Sciences Facilities Project, SDSU and Gatzke Dillon & Balance, LLP, San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served architectural historian, archaeologist, and lead author of the Cultural Resources Technical Report for the SDSU Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building Project. The project required evaluation of 5 historic-age buildings in consideration of NRHP, CRHR, and local designation criteria and integrity requirements, an intensive level survey, Native American coordination, and a records search. The project proposes to demolish four buildings and alter a fifth as part of the university’s plan to update its engineering and science facilities.

**Fullerton College Facilities Master Plan Program EIR, North Orange County Community College District, City of Fullerton, Orange County, California. 2017.** The North Orange County Community College District (NOCCCD) is undertaking a comprehensive improvement and building program to make upgrades and repairs to existing buildings, as well as to construct new facilities to improve the safety and education experience of those attending Fullerton College. The College proposed to implement the Facilities Master Plan to more effectively meet the space needs of the projected on-campus enrollment through the next decade and beyond, while constructing and renovating facilities to meet the District’s instructional needs. Ms. Murray co-authored and oversaw the cultural resources study. All buildings and structures on campus over 45 years old and/or proposed for demolition/substantial alteration as part of the proposed project were
photographed, researched, and evaluated in consideration of NRHP, CRHR, and local designation criteria and integrity requirements, and in consideration of potential impacts to historical resources under CEQA. As a result of the significance evaluation, three historic districts and one individually eligible building were identified within the project area. The study also entailed conducting extensive archival and building development research, a records search, Native American coordination, detailed impacts assessment, and development of mitigation measures for project conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

**The Cove: 5th Avenue Chula Vista Project, E2 ManageTech Inc., San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and co-author of the CEQA report. The project involved recordation and evaluation of several properties functioning as part of the Sweetwater Union High School District administration facility, proposed for redevelopment, as well as an archaeological survey of the project area.

**Energy**

*J-135I Electrical Distribution and Substation Improvements and J-600 San Dieguito Pump Station Replacement Project, Santa Fe Irrigation, San Diego County, California.* Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and prepared the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and associated memo concerning replacement of the original 1964 San Dieguito Pump Station. Ms. Murray recorded and evaluated the pump house for state and local significance and integrity considerations. As part of this effort she conducted background research, prepared a brief historic context, and a significance evaluation.

**Expert Witness**

*Robert Salamone vs. The City of Whittier.* Ms. Murray was retained by the City of Whittier to serve as an expert witness for the defense. She peer reviewed a historic resource evaluation prepared by another consultant and provided expert testimony regarding the contents and findings of that report as well as historic resource requirements on a local and state level in consideration of the City of Whittier’s Municipal Code Section 18.84 and CEQA. Judgement was awarded in favor of the City on all counts.

**Healthcare**

*Hamilton Hospital Residential Care Facility Project, City of Novato, Marin County, California.* Ms. Murray served as architectural historian, prepared a cultural resources study, and assessed the proposed project’s design plans for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The project proposed to construct an addition and make alterations to an NRHP-listed district contributing property. With review from Ms. Murray, the project was able to demonstrate conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation.

**Culver Place Assisted Living Project, DJB Architects, Culver City, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian, archaeologist, and author of the Letter Report for a Cultural and Paleontological Resources Study. Ms. Murray conducted the intensive-level cultural resources survey of the project area, conducted background research, and coordinated with local Native American groups. The project proposes to construct an assisted living facility on a large private property in Culver City.

**Transportation**

*SR-86 and Neckel Road Intersection Improvements and New Traffic Signal Light Project, Caltrans, City of Imperial, California.* Ms. Murray served as Principal Architectural Historian, and author of the HPSR and Finding of No Adverse Effect document. The project involved an intensive field survey, Native American and historic group coordination, a records search, and recordation and NRHP and CRHR evaluation of two historic drainage canals proposed for improvement as part of Caltrans intersection
improvement project. All documents were signed and approved by Caltrans District 11 and the Caltrans Cultural Studies Office.

**California Boulevard Roundabout Project, OmniMeans, City of Napa, California.** The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the City of Napa worked together to deliver a cooperative project encompassing three intersections: First Street/California Boulevard, Second Street/California Boulevard, and State Route 29 (SR-29) northbound off-ramp/First Street. The City of Napa (City) proposed improvements at the First Street/California Boulevard and Second Street/California Boulevard intersections within the County of Napa. It was proposed to reconfigure these two intersections to improve traffic operations and accommodate the reversal in travel direction on First and Second Streets between California Boulevard and Jefferson Street. The project also proposes to modify the SR-29 northbound off-ramp and First Street intersection with a modern roundabout. Ms. Murray served as Principal Architectural Historian and archaeologist, preparing of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) map and subsequent preparation of Caltrans documentation, including an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR), Historical Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), Finding of No Adverse Effect Report (FNAE), and Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR). This included an evaluation of seven previously unevaluated properties for the NRHP and CRHR, and consideration of impacts to the West Napa Historic District.

**Water/Wastewater**

**Morena Reservoir Outlet Tower Replacement Project, City of San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray evaluated the 1912 Morena Dam and Outlet Tower for NRHP, CRHR, and local level eligibility and integrity requirements. The project entailed conducting extensive archival research and development research at City archives, libraries, and historical societies, and preparation of a detailed historic context statement on the history of water development in San Diego County.

**69th and Mohawk Pump Station Project, City of San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and lead author of the Historical Resource Technical Report for the pump station building on 69th and Mohawk Street. Preparation of the report involves conducting extensive building development and archival research on the pump station building, development of a historic context, and a historical significance evaluation in consideration of local, state, and national designation criteria and integrity requirements.

**Pump Station No. 2 Power Reliability and Surge Protection Project, City of San Diego, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and prepared an addendum to the existing cultural resources report in order to evaluate the Pump Station No. 2 property for NRHP, CRHR, and local level eligibility and integrity requirements. This entailed conducting additional background research, building development research, a supplemental survey, and preparation of a historic context statement.

**Orange County Central Utility Facility Upgrade, County of Orange Public Works, City of Santa Ana, Orange County, California.** To further the County’s long-term goals of operational safety, improved efficiency, cost effectiveness, and supporting future campus development plans, the proposed Central Utility Facility Upgrade project consisted of improvements and equipment replacements recommended by the Strategic Development Plan for the CUF’s original utility systems. Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and archaeologist, and prepared the cultural resources MND section. As part of this effort Ms. Murray conducted a detailed review of historic resource issues within and around the proposed project area to assess potential impacts to historic buildings and structures. The proposed project involved improvements to 16 buildings located within the Civic Center Campus. As a result of the cultural resources
analysis, it was determined that the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to any of the historic-age buildings or the associated Civic Center Plaza walkways/landscaping.

**Bear River Restoration at Rollins Reservoir Project, Nevada Irrigation District, Nevada and Placer Counties, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian and co-author of the Cultural Resources Inventory Report. Ms. Murray conducted background research on the 1963 Chicago Park Powerhouse Bridge and prepared a historic context for the Little York Township and Secret Town Mine.

**Otay River Estuary Restoration Project (ORERP), Poseidon Resources, South San Diego Bay, California.** Ms. Murray served as architectural historian for the documentation of Pond 15 and its associated levees. The project proposes to create new estuarine, salt marsh, and upland transition habitat from the existing salt ponds currently being used by the South Bay Salt Works salt mining facility. Because the facility was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, the potential impacts caused by breaching the levees, a contributing feature of the property, had to be assessed.

**Other Project Experience (2008-2014)**

**LADPW BOE Gaffey Pool and Bathhouse Project, Los Angeles County, California (2014).** Ms. Murray served as project manager, field director for the intensive-level cultural resources survey, and primary author of the cultural resources technical report. Ms. Murray reviewed proposed design plans for new construction within an NRHP-listed historic district for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The LADPW BOE proposed to conduct various improvements to the Gaffey Street Pool and surrounding area, located in Upper Reservation of Fort McArthur in San Pedro, California.

**Metro Green Line to LAX Project (2013-2014).** Ms. Murray served as project manager for a multi-disciplinary project that includes cultural resources, biology, and paleontology. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) have initiated an Alternatives Analysis (AA)/Draft EIS/Draft EIR for the Metro Green Line to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) project. The AA/DEIS/DEIR is being prepared to comply with NEPA and CEQA. This study will examine potential connections between the planned Metro Crenshaw / LAX Transit Corridor Project’s Aviation/Century Station and the LAX Central Terminal Area (CTA) located approximately one mile to the west. Client: Terry Hayes Associates.

**LADPW BOE Downtown Cesar Chavez Median Project, Los Angeles County, California (2013).** Ms. Murray served as field director for the intensive-level cultural resources survey, and co-author of the Caltrans ASR and HRER. The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LAPDW), Bureau of Engineering (BOE), proposes to provide for transportation enhancements along West Cesar Chavez Boulevard in the downtown area of Los Angeles. Client: LADPW BOE, Lead Agency: Caltrans, District 7.

**Edwards Air Force Base Historic Context and Survey, Multiple Counties, California (2013).** Ms. Murray served as lead architectural historian and project manager for survey and evaluation of 17 buildings and structures located throughout the base, and preparation of a Cold War historic context statement, an analysis of property types, and registration requirements for all built environment resources on base. Client: JT3/CH2M Hill.

**San Gabriel Trench Grade Separation Project (Phases I, II, and III); Cities of San Gabriel, Alhambra, and Rosemead, Los Angeles County, California (2008–2010, 2011-2014).** Ms. Murray served as
Archaeologist, Architectural Historian, and Osteologist throughout various stages of the project. The project consisted of conducting a cultural resources assessment for a proposed grade separation located within the cities of San Gabriel, Alhambra, and Rosemead. The proposed project would lower a 2.2 mile section of Union Pacific Railroad tracks in the immediate vicinity of the historic Mission San Gabriel Arcángel. Ms. Murray was involved in both the archaeological and architectural history components of this project. This includes the archaeological and architectural history field surveys, archaeological testing of the site and completion of over 100 DPR forms for the evaluation of built environment resources. She also served as the on-site human osteologist. Client: Terry A. Hayes Associates, LLC. Agency: Caltrans.

Azusa Intermodal Parking Facility Project, Azusa, Los Angeles County, California (2012). Ms. Murray served as field director, assistant project manager, and primary report author for the intensive-level cultural resources survey and cultural resources technical report, which included evaluation of several built environment resources adjacent to an existing NRHP district. The City of Azusa proposed to construct an approximately 39-foot high, four-story parking structure, bus bays for passenger loading/unloading for layovers, and electric charging stations for patrons of the future Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa Station. Client: Terry Hayes Associates.

Terminal Island Historic Building Evaluations, Los Angeles County, California (2011). Ms. Murray served as project manager, field director for the architectural history survey, and primary author of the technical report. She formally evaluated 16 Port of Los Angeles-owned properties on Terminal Island for NRHP and CRHR eligibility, as well as local level eligibility. Client: CDM; Port of Los Angeles.

LOSSAN San Luis Rey River and Second Track Project, Oceanside, San Diego County, California (2011). Ms. Murray served as primary author for the technical report and conducted the intensive-level cultural resources field survey. The project proposes to construct a new 0.6-mile section of double-track to connect two existing passing tracks, and replace the existing San Luis Rey River Bridge. She prepared the cultural resources technical report and evaluated the bridge for NRHP, CRHR, and local level criteria and integrity requirements. Client: HNTB Corporation.

LADPW BOE San Pedro Plaza Park Project, Los Angeles County, California (2011). Ms. Murray served as project manager, field director for the intensive-level cultural resources survey, and primary author of the cultural resources technical report. She evaluated the entire park for local, CRHR, and NRHP eligibility and integrity requirements. The LADPW BOE proposed to conduct various outdoor improvements to the San Pedro Plaza Park. Client: LADPW BOE.

Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project, Los Angeles County, California (2011). Ms. Murray supervised architectural history survey and participated in the evaluation of over 100 built environment resources that may be affected by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (Metro’s) proposed Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor Project. The project is approximately 8.5 miles in length and is located within the cities of Los Angeles and Inglewood, Los Angeles County, California. The project was subsequently approved by SHPO with no comments. Client: Terry Hayes Associates, LLC; Agency: Metro.

LOSSAN Control Point San Onofre to Control Point Pulgas Double Track Project, San Diego County, California (2011). Ms. Murray served as field director for the archaeological and architectural history survey and co-authored the technical report. She conducted a survey and evaluation of cultural resources in support of the Los Angeles to San Diego, California (LOSSAN) Control Point (CP) San Onofre to CP Pulgas Double Track Upgrade Project. The project is located within the boundaries of the Marine
Corps Base (MCB) Camp Pendleton in Northern San Diego County, on federal land that is part of a long-term lease to the rail operator. Client: HNTB Corporation.

**Half Moon Bay Airport Taxiway and Access Road Improvement Project, San Mateo County, California (2010).** Ms. Murray served as field director for the archaeological and architectural history survey and co-authored the technical report. She conducted a cultural resources survey of 21.65 acres situated on three areas within the 313-acre airport property, and evaluated airport properties for the CRHR and NRHP. Half Moon Bay Airport is located approximately 5 miles north of the City of Half Moon Bay in unincorporated San Mateo County, California. Client: Coffman Associates.

**Sunset Avenue Grade Separation Project, Riverside County, California (2010).** Ms. Murray served as field director for the archaeological and architectural history survey and co-authored the ASR, HRER, and HPSR reports. The project involved a proposed grade separation of Sunset Avenue, which crosses the UPRR in the City of Banning, Riverside County. She conducted a 43.6-acre survey for cultural resources, and prepared environmental compliance documentation in accordance with Caltrans. Client: Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.; Agency: Caltrans District 8.

**Hollister Avenue Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project, Santa Barbara County, California (2010).** Ms. Murray supervised the architectural history survey of surrounding properties. The project proposed the seismic retrofit of Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Bridge 51C-0018 on Hollister Avenue in an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, located between UPRR mile posts 362.08 and 362.41. Client: Santa Barbara County Public Works Department; Agency: Caltrans District 5.

**Nogales Grade Separation/Gale Avenue Widening/Evaluation of 938 Nogales Street; City of Industry, Los Angeles County, California (2009).** Ms. Murray participated in the architectural history field survey of several properties and co-authored the report. The project consisted of conducting a cultural resources assessment for a proposed grade separation project that would lower Nogales Street beneath the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and widen a 0.83 mile section of Walnut Drive/Gale Avenue located in the City of Industry. Client: Terry A. Hayes Associates, LLC. Agency: Caltrans.


**Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Kings County, California (2009-2012).** Served as project manager and primary author of the Final ICRMP document. The project consists of preparing a management plan for the protection and management of cultural resources located within Naval Air Station, Lemoore. The management plan inventories known cultural resources, summarizes relevant laws and regulations, and establishes management priorities for the installation. Client: NAVFAC SW (U.S. Navy).

**Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Corona, Riverside County, California (2009-2011).** Served as project manager and primary author of the Advance Draft document. The project consists of preparing a management plan for the protection and management of cultural resources located within Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Corona.
The management plan inventories known cultural resources, summarizes relevant laws and regulations, and establishes management priorities for the installation. Client: NAVFAC SW (U.S. Navy).

**Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Orange County, California (2009-2011).** Served as project manager and primary author of the Advance Draft document. The project consists of preparing a management plan for the protection and management of cultural resources located within Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach. The management plan inventories known cultural resources, summarizes relevant laws and regulations, and establishes management priorities for the installation. Client: NAVFAC SW (U.S. Navy).

**Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake; Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino Counties, California (2009-2011).** Served as co-author of the final document. The project consists of preparing a management plan for the protection and management of cultural resources located within Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake. The management plan inventories known cultural resources, summarizes relevant laws and regulations, and establishes management priorities for the installation. Client: NAVFAC SW (U.S. Navy).

**Select Technical Reports (as lead author)**

Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Historic Report for the property located at 3167 Senter Road, San Jose, California 95111, Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 494-01-022.* Prepared for Launchpad Development and the City of San Jose.


Murray, Samantha. 2015. *SDSU Open Air Theatre Renovation Historical Resources Technical Memorandum.* Prepared for SDSU.

Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Cultural Resources Study for the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, San Jacinto Campus Master Plan Project, City of San Jacinto, Riverside County, California.* Prepared for the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District.

Murray, Samantha and Salli Hosseini. 2015. *Cultural Resources Study for the Jack in the Box Drive-Through Restaurant Project, City of Downey, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for the City of Downey.

Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Cultural Resources Study for the Hamilton Hospital Residential Care Facility Project City of Novato, Marin County, California.* Prepared for the City of Novato.

Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Historic Property Survey Report for the SR-86 Neckel Road Intersection Improvements and New Traffic Signal Light Project in the City and County of Imperial, California.* Prepared for the City of Imperial and Caltrans District 11.


Murray, Samantha and Adam Giacinto. 2015. *Cultural Resources Technical Report for the SDSU Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building.* Prepared for SDSU.


Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Cultural Resources Study for the Robertson Lane Hotel and Commercial Redevelopment Project, City of West Hollywood, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for the City of West Hollywood.


Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Addendum to Phase I Cultural Inventory for Pump Station No. 2 Power Reliability and Surge Protection Project, San Diego County, California (WBS# S-00312.02.02).* Prepared for the City of San Diego.

Murray, Samantha. 2015. *Significance Evaluation of the Property at 8572 Cherokee Drive, City of Downey, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for the City of Downey.


Murray, Samantha. 2014. *Significance Evaluation of the Property at 3521 14 Mile House Road, Forest Ranch, Butte County, California.* Prepared for California State University, Chico.

Murray, Samantha, Adam Giacinto, and Justin Castells. 2014. *Cultural and Paleontological Resources Inventory for the Cove Development project, City of Chula Vista, California.* Prepared for E2 ManageTech Inc.

Murray, Samantha, Steven Treffers, and John Dietler. 2014. *Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Gaffey Pool and Bathhouse Project in San Pedro, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California.* Prepared for the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering.


Murray, Samantha, Steven Treffers, Mary Ringhoff, and Jan Ostashay. 2011. *Built Environment Evaluation Report for Properties on Terminal Island, Port of Los Angeles, City and County of Los Angeles, California.* Prepared for CDM and the Port of Los Angeles.

Murray, Samantha, Cheryle Hunt, and John Dietler. 2011. *Cultural Resources Survey Report for the South San Fernando Valley Park and Ride Project, City and County of Los Angeles, California.* Prepared for the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering.


Murray, Samantha, Robert Ramirez, and John Dietler. 2011. *Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan for Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, Detachment Corona, Riverside County, California.* Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Navy NAVFAC SW.


**Publications**

Presentations

**Historical Resources under CEQA.** Prepared for the Orange County Historic Preservation Planner Working Group. Presented by Samantha Murray, Dudek. December 1, 2016. Ms. Murray delivered a one-hour PowerPoint presentation to the Orange County Historic Preservation Planner Working Group, which included planners from different municipalities in Orange County, regarding the treatment of historical resources under CEQA. Topics of discussion included identification of historical resources, assessing impacts, avoiding or mitigating impacts, overcoming the challenges associated with impacts to historical resources, and developing effective preservation alternatives.

**Knowing What You’re Asking For: Evaluation of Historic Resources.** Prepared for Lorman Education Services. Presented by Samantha Murray and Stephanie Standerfer, Dudek. September 19, 2014. Ms. Murray and Ms. Standerfer delivered a one-hour PowerPoint presentation to paying workshop attendees from various cities and counties in Southern California. The workshop focused on outlining the basics of historical resources under CEQA, and delved into issues/challenges frequently encountered on preservation projects.

**Relevant Training**

- CEQA and Historic Preservation: A 360 Degree View, CPF, 2015
- Historic Designation and Documentation Workshop, CPF, 2012
- Historic Context Writing Workshop, CPF, 2011
- Section 106 Compliance Training, SWCA, 2010
- CEQA Basics Workshop, SWCA, 2009
- NEPA Basics Workshop, SWCA, 2008
- CEQA, NEPA, and Other Legislative Mandates Workshop, UCLA, 2008
Sarah Brewer
Archaeologist

Sarah Brewer is an archaeologist with more than 16 years’ professional experience in cultural resource management in California. She has managed both survey crews and lab processing, and carries extensive experience in field excavation, survey, lab processing, data management, and reporting.

Project Experience

**Education**

**Modular Student Housing Project, University of California (UC), Santa Cruz.** Completed cultural resources inventory (records search, survey and reporting) for the UC Santa Cruz Modular Student Housing Project.

**Energy**

**Pit 3, 4, and 5 Hydroelectric Project APE Expansion (FERC No. 233), Stillwater Sciences, Shasta County, California.** Conducted an archaeological survey to identify and record cultural resources for a hydroelectric project property expansion along the Pit River in Shasta County, California.

**Sanborn Solar, Terra-Gen LLC, Kern County, California.** Led a team on an archaeological survey to identify and record cultural resources for a solar farm project in Mojave, California.

**Dodge Flats, NextEra Energy Resources, Washoe County, Nevada.** Led a team on a reconnaissance-level survey to identify and record cultural resources for a solar farm project near Reno, Nevada.

**Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project, Southern California Edison, Kern and Los Angeles Counties, California.** Conducted an archaeological survey to identify and record cultural resources for a transmission line upgrade related to a wind farm. Survey was from Pasadena to Tehachapi, Los Angeles and Kern Counties, California.

**Big Creek Hydroelectric Project FERC relicensing, Southern California Edison, Fresno and Madera Counties, California.** Conducted an archaeological survey to identify and record cultural resources for a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing project covering several reservoirs in Fresno and Madera Counties, California.

**Municipal**

**On-Call Projects, City of Monterey, California.** Prepared the following reports for the City of Monterey:

- Cultural Resource Constraints Review for Mar Vista Storm Drain Improvements Project
- Cultural Resource Constraints Review for Via Paraiso Handrail Improvements Project
- Cultural Resource Section 106 Review for the Presidio Sewer Manhole Project (Manholes PC03-035 and -045 on Sewer Lines TV-103 and TV-104)
El Cerrito Avenue Sewer Improvements Archaeological Test Excavations, Hillsborough, California. Excavated archaeological rapid recovery units in prehistoric sites along El Cerrito Avenue in Hillsborough, California, for a sewer line replacement project.

**Water/Wastewater**

Interlake Tunnel and Spillway Modification, Horizon Water and Environment LLC, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, California. Led an archaeological survey team to identify and record cultural resources around the Lake San Antonio shoreline. Recorded 11 new sites, updated 3 previously-recorded sites and documented 24 isolates. The survey covered more than 1,200 acres. This project will join Lake Nacimiento with Lake San Antonio by tunnel so the lake levels can be controlled and managed.

**As-Needed Monitoring Projects, Stillwater Ecosystem, Watershed and Riverine Sciences, Shasta County, California.** Prepared the following reports:

- 2016 Archaeological Site Monitoring Program Pit 1 Hydroelectric Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) No. 2687)
- 2016 Archaeological Site Monitoring Program Pit 3, 4, and 5 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 233)
- 2016 Archaeological Site Monitoring Program Hat Creek Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2661)
- Cultural Resources Monitoring Report for Pit 3, 4, and 5 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 233) Hazard Tree Removal, Northshore Campground
- Cultural Resource Monitoring Report for the Lake Britton Shoreline Stabilization Project
- Cultural Resources Monitoring Report for the Pit 3, 4, and 5 Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 233) Hazard Trees Removal, Delucci Ridge and Dusty Campground

**Relevant Previous Experience**

Surveying and Excavation Projects, Various Locations, California. Performed field and lab work on a variety of survey and excavation projects in Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, Madera, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Counties and the city of Santa Clara. Survey tasks ranged from reconnaissance-level to intensive inventory efforts, complete with on-site site recording, digitization of site records and graphic illustration. Excavation efforts ranged from Phase I testing to data recovery efforts. Labwork included post-field processing of artifacts, creating artifact catalogs and performing basic analysis, as well as preparing collections for curation. Report production tasks included writing, formatting, and editing reports that detailed the archaeological findings.

**Specialized Training**

MOCHE-UNC Archaeological Field School, 1999. Huanchaco, Peru.

**Publications**


Sarah Corder
Architectural Historian

Sarah Corder is an architectural historian with more than 10 years’ professional experience throughout the United States in the fields of architectural history and historic preservation. Prior to coming to Dudek, she owned and operated a historic preservation consulting business in Virginia. Throughout her career, Ms. Corder managed and worked on a variety of projects including National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nominations, tax credit rehabilitation projects, Save America’s Treasures projects, and numerous transportation projects. She served as a historic preservation project manager or architectural historian on all projects.

Relevant Project Experience

**As-needed CEQA Planning Services, SFO, San Francisco, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a historical resources assessment report that included 28 properties in consideration of national, state and local criteria and integrity requirements. The project also included a survey, archival research, records search and preparation of DPR forms for each property.

**Castellija School Project Focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Palo Alto, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a cultural resource study that included 11 historic resources in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included a survey, archival research, and a records search.

**CSU, Chico, Siskiyou Hall, Chico, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a historical resources technical report for Siskiyou Hall located on the CSU, Chico campus. The project also included a survey, archival research, and a records search.

**Environmental Services Retainer, Southern California.** Ms. Corder assisted with the preparation of a historical resources technical report for a DMV building in San Diego, California. Her contributions included archival research and preparation of historic context sections.

**Fullerton College Master Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Fullerton, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a cultural resource study that included 25 historic resources in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included a survey, archival research, and a records search.

**Olivewood Village Historic Resources Assessment, Pasadena, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a historical resources technical report for an institutional building in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included a survey, archival research, and a records search.

**Owlwood, Los Angeles, California.** Ms. Corder prepared a cultural resources study for a residential building in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included archival research, and a records search.

---

**EDUCATION**

Savannah College of Art and Design
MFA, Historic Preservation, 2004
Bridgewater College
BA, History, 2002

**CERTIFICATIONS**

Certified Historic Preservation Consultant, Commonwealth of Virginia
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards in Architectural History and History, exceeds requirements

**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

National Trust for Historic Preservation
Los Angeles Conservancy
Society for Architectural Historians
Pacific Freeway Center, Fontana, California. Ms. Corder prepared a cultural resources survey report for a large industrial complex in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included preparation of DPR form, archival research, survey, and a records search.

University Villages, Merced Student Housing Project, Merced, California. Ms. Corder prepared a cultural resources letter report for a residential agricultural complex in consideration of national, state, and local criteria and integrity requirements. The study also included preparation of a DPR form, archival research, survey, and a records search.

Relevant Previous Experience

Development

East Los Angeles College Environmental Impact Report (EIR), South Gate, California. Served as architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic period buildings, and developed mitigation measures.

Wetlands Pocket Park, Los Angeles, California. Served as architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic period buildings.

Transportation

Crenshaw/Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) Transit Corridor, Cities of Los Angeles and Inglewood, California. Served as architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic period buildings.

Alameda Corridor—East Construction Authority (ACE) San Gabriel Trench Grade Separation, Los Angeles County, California. Served as architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic period buildings.

NRHP Evaluations and Nominations

Old Town Historic District, Harrisonburg, Virginia. Served as project manager and architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded 450 historic buildings and structures, prepared presentations for public meetings, performed extensive primary and secondary source research, and managed survey teams.

Whitesel Brothers, Harrisonburg, Virginia. Served as project manager and architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic building and prepared an NRHP nomination.

Ramsay, Greenwood, Virginia. Served as project manager and architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded 17 historic buildings and structures and prepared an NRHP nomination.

George Chrisman House, Linville, Virginia. Served as project manager and architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded historic buildings and structures and prepared an NRHP nomination.

David and Catherine Driver Farm, Timberville, Virginia. Served as project manager and architectural historian for the project. Evaluated and recorded 823 acres of farming complex including seven historic buildings and five structures and prepared an NRHP nomination.
Professional Experience

**SWCA Environmental Consultants, Pasadena, California.** Served as an architectural historian and a project coordinator for multiple programs. Responsibilities included historic resource surveys, primary and secondary research, and quality assurance (QA)/quality control (QC) and senior level oversight for hundreds of California Department of Parks and Recreation forms. (2009–2014)

**Sabe Preservation Consulting, Harrisonburg, Virginia.** Owned a historic preservation consulting services firm. Responsibilities included NRHP nomination preparation and inventory; rehabilitation project management; Section 106 review; Main Street planning and development; building condition assessment and Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation; management of all financial documents; client interaction; leading public meetings and workshops; and management of employees, interns and subcontractors. (2004–2009)

**Owens-Thomas House Museum, Savannah, Georgia.** Served as preservation project manager for a nineteenth century plaster conservation project. Responsibilities included plaster conservation, management and training of staff and student interns, photographic documentation, presentation of project information to the public and museum staff, preparation of weekly reports, and safety compliance. (2005–2006)
Adam Giacinto, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Adam Giacinto is an archaeologist with more than 11 years’ experience preparing cultural resource reports, and managing archaeological survey, evaluation, and data recovery-level investigations. His research interests include prehistoric hunter-gatherer cultures and contemporary conceptions of heritage. His current research focuses on the social, historical, archaeological, and political mechanisms surrounding heritage values. He has gained practical experience in archaeological and ethnographic field methods while conducting research in the throughout California, Mexico, and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Giacinto brings additional specialized experience in cultural resources information processing gained while working at the South Coastal Information Center. He has worked as part of a nonprofit collaboration in designing and managing a large-scale, preservation-oriented, standardized database and conducting site and impact predictive Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis of the cultural resources landscape surrounding ancient Lake Cahuilla. He provides experience in ethnographic and applied anthropological methods gained in urban and rural settings, both in the United States and internationally.

Selected Projects

McCoy Solar Energy Project, Blythe, California. As Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto supervised, implemented, and reported upon compliance efforts under Section 106 of the NHPA, BLM Guidelines, CEQA, and County of Riverside Guidelines. General responsibilities included day-to-day scheduling oversight of Native American monitors and archaeologists, tribal interface, management of cultural monitoring implementation, and agency reporting. Worked with the Dudek Compliance team to provide cultural summaries for 14 variance requests. Reporting included preparation and submittal of daily cultural resource summaries to interested tribal parties and the BLM, monthly summaries of cultural compliance status and treatment of unanticipated finds, bi-weekly BLM-McCoy Solar, meetings and a monitoring summary report. Mr. Giacinto was the lead in two formal trainings with monitors and counsel members from the Colorado River Indian Tribes regarding federal and state regulations relating to human remains, County and BLM guiding documents, identification of cultural material, and the multiple understandings of “cultural resources”.

Blythe Solar Power Project, Blythe, California. As Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto supervised, implemented, and reported upon cultural compliance and construction monitoring efforts under Section 106 of the NHPA, BLM Guidelines, California Energy Commission Guidelines, CEQA, and County of Riverside Guidelines. General responsibilities included day-to-day scheduling oversight of Native American monitors and archaeologists, tribal interface, management of cultural monitoring implementation, and agency reporting to both the BLM and Energy Commission. Reporting included preparation and submittal of daily cultural resource summaries to interested tribal parties, Energy Commission, and the BLM, monthly summaries of cultural compliance status and treatment of unanticipated finds, bi-weekly BLM-McCoy Solar, meetings and a monitoring summary report. Mr. Giacinto was the lead in multiple trainings.
Wind Energy Project, Confidential Client, Riverside, California. As principal cultural investigator, Mr. Giacinto prepared the cultural scope and schedule, coordinated the records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report for the County of Riverside that provided management and compliance recommendations relating to identified cultural resources. Additional responsibilities included coordination of paleontological and Native American monitor subconsultants.

Ocotillo Wind Energy Facility Third Party Compliance Monitoring, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Imperial County, California. As third party observer, Mr. Giacinto collaborated with the BLM in maintaining cultural compliance with federal environmental policies. In addition, processed archaeological and Native American comments for BLM attention.

Shu’luuk Wind Project Cultural Resource Study Survey, Campo Environmental Protection Agency and Invenergy LLC, Campo Indian Reservation, California. As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed two teams of archaeologists, consisting of seven total practitioners, in conducting a survey of the 2,400-acre study area in a general inventory of potentially impacted cultural resources. Worked with Campo Environmental Protection Agency, of the Campo Kumeyaay Nation, in forming management objectives and integrating six Native American Monitors into daily survey activities.

Napa Roundabouts Project, City of Napa, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto completed Native American coordination, preparation of an ASR and HRER, review of historical and geoaarcheological documentation, and successfully developed, implemented, and reported upon an XPI Investigation, including preparation of a XPI Proposal and technical report. Mr. Giacinto managed fieldwork, which included survey, the use of mechanical geoprobebs and hand excavation with the intent of identifying the potential for both prehistoric and historical-era resouces within the NRHP-eligible West Napa Historic District. A successful mitigation strategy was developed for the City of Napa and Caltrans, within federal, state and local regulatory contexts.

Caltrain Electrification Project, Cities of San Francisco, San Mateo, Palo Alto and San Jose, California. As Co-Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto supervises, implements, and reports upon cultural inventory and compliance efforts under Section 106 of the NHPA, Joint Power Board, Project MOA, CEQA, and local Guidelines for the San Francisco to San Jose section. General responsibilities include oversight of Native American monitors, built environment specialists and archaeologists, management of cultural monitoring implementation and site treatment, client reporting, meetings and report preparation. Implementation of mitigation included exploratory archaeological investigations at multiple NAHC-eligible resources.

San Pablo Broadband Project, City of San Pablo, California. As principal cultural investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) sacred lands file search, tribal outreach, and preparation of a constraints study, ARMR-style technical report and monitoring plan, and IS/MND under CEQA and Section 106 for the entire City of San Pablo area. Work included preparation of a regional sensitivity study for known and buried cultural resources by applying a weighted geologic, soils, geotechnical, slope, landscape, and previous technical study information. A mitigation strategy was prepared to meet City needs within this area containing numerous sensitive NRHP/CRHR-listed archaeological (Nelson Mound sites) and built environment resources.
California High Speed Rail, Fresno, California. As Co-Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto supervised, implemented, and reported upon cultural inventory and compliance efforts under Section 106 of the NHPA, Federal Rail Authority, CEQA, and local Guidelines for Fresno to Bakersfield section. General responsibilities included day-to-day scheduling oversight of Native American monitors, built environment specialists and archaeologists, management of cultural monitoring implementation and site treatment, client reporting, meetings and report preparation. Mr. Giacinto was the lead in multiple trainings.

SFO RCC/ Air Train Project, San Francisco International Airport, California. As principal cultural investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a NWIC records search, NAHC sacred lands file search, tribal outreach, and preparation of a constraints study, ARMR-style technical report for compliance with CEQA and Section 106. Work included an assessment of known resources and potential for unanticipated buried cultural resources by consulting geologic, soils, historical map, geotechnical, slope, landscape, and previous technical study information. Preparation of a report and maps that met SHPO, FAA and Airport staff needs. The report addressed anticipated subsurface disturbance that would result from proposed project components and analyzed the potential for impacts to unanticipated archaeological deposits. The report resulted in the recommendation of No Historic Properties Effected based on the review of archival data, previous investigations, and clear geomorphic evidence demonstrating that the proposed RCC/AirTrain footprint was planned in an area underlain by modern fill and Bayshore Mud considered not suitable to support the presence of developed cultural deposits.

Confidential Power Project, Wadsworth, Nevada. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a the Nevada Cultural Resource Information System (NVCRIS) records search, prepared a study of prehistoric and historical-era constraints, oversaw drone photography, predictive analyses (slope, aspect, drainage, elevation, geomorphic), archaeological survey sampling, and prepared a full report with appropriate mitigation.

Confidential Solar Project, Calneva, Nevada. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto conducted a NVCRIS records search and prepared a critical issues analysis for cultural resources.

Confidential Wind Project, Eastern San Diego County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed a SCIC records search, NAHC SLF search, and coordinated surveys of 500 acres of private land. Survey of an additional 1200 acres of BIA-managed land is currently in pending. Project involves county, US federal, and tribal federal agency review and compliance with a variety of regulatory conditions.

Yokohl Ranch Development Project, The Yokohl Ranch Company, LLC, Tulare County, California. As co-principal investigator and field director, Mr. Giacinto managed 15 archaeologists in conducting significance evaluation of 118 historical and prehistoric cultural resources throughout the 12,000 acre Yokohl Valley area. Operated as tribal interface, and facilitated the respectful handling and reburial of sensitive cultural material with the tribes, applicant, and NAHC.

Yokohl Ranch Cultural Resources, The Yokohl Ranch Company, LLC, Tulare, California. As Principal investigator and field director, Mr. Giacinto managed 15 archaeologists in conducting 1,900 acres of survey throughout the Yokohl Valley.

Water and CEQA Plus
Water Tank Project, City of Rohnert Park, Sonoma County, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and
preparation of a technical report. Project involved extended phase I exploratory probing of identified resources and high-probability areas for unidentified resources, site recordation, a geomorphic analysis, and preparation for a monitoring plan meeting both CEQA considerations and Section 106 compliance for USACE review. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed and provided to the City of Ronert Park.

**New Hogan Reservoir Project, Calaveras County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Central California Information Center (CCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), archaeological survey, and preparation of a constraints study with management recommendations for Calaveras County Water District to meet CEQA compliance.

**Auburn Recycled Wastewater Treatment Plant Secondary Process Upgrade Improvement Project, City of Auburn, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Recycled Water Pipeline Project, City of Woodland, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Las Gallinas Treatment Plant Secondary Upgrade Improvement Project, Las Gallinas, Marin County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory and evaluation review completed for the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Pure Water Plan Constraints Study and PEIR, City of San Diego, California.** As Principal investigator and field director, Mr. Giacinto managed preparation of a constraints study for the Pure Water Project. Work involved a records search of over 100 mile linear miles of San Diego. Site record information from more than 1,236 cultural resources was processed, coded, and integrated within a geospatial sensitivity model to identify archaeological and built environment constraints throughout the proposed alignment. This information was integrated within a PEIR and is currently being used to assist with management planning through the project alignment. Maps were then generated using generalized grid units (1000 x 1000 meters in size) to provide a visual model of relative archaeological resource sensitivity while maintaining the appropriate level of confidentiality for public dissemination to assist in planning.

**El Dorado Irrigation 2017 Flume Replacement Project, Riverton, El Dorado County, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report for EID under CEQA regulatory context. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory, including updates to the El Dorado Canal, Olgiby Grade, and additional historic-era sites.

**El Dorado Irrigation District Emergency Tree Harvest, El Dorado, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report for CalFire and EID under CEQA regulatory
context. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory, including updates to the El Dorado Canal.

**Santa Margarita Hidden Ridge Project, Orange County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, SCCIC archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. The proposed intersected two NRHP-listed resources and a NRHP-listed archaeological district. Mr. Giacinto developed and managed testing efforts to appropriately define significant deposits and prepared a monitoring plan. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA, and project was successfully permitted.

**South Orange County Water Authority Brine line Project, Orange County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed an updated survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory requiring Army Corps review for Section 106 compliance. Mr. Giacinto successfully re-delineated NRHP-listed archaeological resource boundaries based on review of survey and archival data. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**El Toro Recycled Water Project, Orange County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Reach 5 Project, Riverside County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed provided recommendations to SAWP for a monitoring approach that would satisfy both State Water Board and Pechanga tribe interests. Project included archaeological monitoring of areas along Tescal Canyon Road and met compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Carlsbad Desalination Third Addendum to EIR Biological Survey and Monitoring, Poseidon Water LLC, Carlsbad, California.** As archaeological consultant, Mr. Giacinto conducted archaeological monitoring and consultation on an as-needed basis.

**Lake Morena Dam Project, Lake Morena, City of San Diego, California.** As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, agency correspondence, and preparation of a archaeological and built environment technical report work related to dam improvements.

**Hanson El Monte Pond Restoration, Lakeside’s River Park Conservancy, San Diego, California.** As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the field efforts, reporting, and agency interface for a cultural inventory. Resources were evaluated for significance under county guidelines, CEQA, and Section 106 of the NHPA. Worked with the Army Corps for submittal of documents to SHPO.

**Hamilton Hospital Project, City of Novato, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed tribal and archaeological fieldwork and methodological reporting relating to the extended Phase I inventory geoprobe drilling and shovel test pit excavation. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and local regulations.

**Laurel Ridge Project, City of Novato, Marin County, California.** As third party cultural consultant, Mr. Giacinto reviewed technical report findings and recommendations for compliance with CEQA and Section...
106 compliance. Recommendations were made to ensure that all mitigation strategies were well grounded and defensible.

**Private Pier Project, City of Tiburon, Marin County, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed and provided to the County of Marin for this negative cultural inventory.

**Oakmont Senior Living Facility, City of Novato, Marin County, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation

**UC Merced Student Housing Project, Merced County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Central California Information Center (CCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological and historic architectural survey, and preparation of a technical report. Mr. Giacinto prepared and reviewed management recommendations for CEQA considerations and Section 106 compliance.

**New Hogan Reservoir Project, Calaveras County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Central California Information Center (CCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), archaeological survey, and preparation of a constraints study with management recommendations for Calaveras County Water District to meet CEQA compliance.

**Royal Gorge Trails Project, Donner Summit, Donner Land Trust, Placer County, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated and completed a North Central Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy meeting federal, state, and local standards was developed and provided to the client for this negative cultural inventory.

**Emergency Helipad Project, Tahoe-Truckee Airport District, South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, California.** As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy meeting federal, state, and local standards was developed and provided to the client for this negative cultural inventory.

**MCWRA Interlake Spillway Project, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, California.** As Co-Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto provided oversight and management of Inventory and Evaluation. Project involved survey of Lake San Antonio and outflow at Lake Nacimiento, as well as evaluation of the Lake San Antonio historic-era dam.

**South Lake Solar Project, Fresno County, California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SJVIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), review of existing information, and preparation of a Critical Issues Analysis.
Donner Trail Elementary School Project, Truckee, Placer and Nevada County, California. As archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy meeting state and local standards was developed and provided to the client for this negative cultural inventory.

Tahoe Lake Elementary School Project, South Lake Tahoe, California. As archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto assisted with report preparation and project coordination, as well as prepared geoarchaeological assessment for ACOE or project area.

Roberts’ Ranch Project, Vacaville, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report under CEQA regulatory context. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory.

Collins Drive Project, City of Auburn, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical memo. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting CEQA and local requirements for this cultural inventory.

Dorsey Marketplace Project, City of Grass Valley, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting CEQA and local requirements for this cultural inventory, including recommendations relating to historic mining features.

Penn Valley Project, SimonCre, County of Nevada, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical memo. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting Army Corps of Engineers, CEQA and local requirements for this cultural inventory update.

Byron Airport Development Program, Contra Costa, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory.

Combie Road Corridor Improvement Project, Auburn, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological and historic architectural survey, DPR 523 building forms, and preparation of a technical report under CEQA regulatory context. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory.

Lassen Substation Project, Mt Shasta, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated and conducted a review of the archaeological and built-environment technical study and related sections of the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment on behalf of the CPUC.
Meadowrock Vinyard Project, Napa, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological and historic architectural survey, and preparation of a technical report under CEQA regulatory context. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for this cultural inventory.

Highway 101 Overcrossing Project Offsite Staging Area Project, City of Palo Alto, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto reviewed existing Historic Property Survey Reports and Archaeological Survey Reports; then prepared an addendum study to meet CEQA and Caltrans regulations and styles. He coordinated a records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of the technical report.

Park Boulevard Environmental Impact Report (EIR), City of Palo Alto, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report and EIR section. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed and provided to the City of Palo Alto for this negative cultural inventory.

Vacaville Center Campus Project, Solano Community College District, City of Vacaville, California. As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, NAHC and Native American communication, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. Recommendations were framed in compliance with CEQA regulations and submitted to the lead agency.

Makani Power Wind Turbine Pilot Program, Alameda, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a NWIC records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a negative technical memo for this potential wind farm. The mitigation strategy did not require additional archaeological monitoring or other work based on the lack of archaeological sites, and the low potential for encountering unrecorded subsurface cultural resources. Recommendations were submitted as a categorical exemption to the reviewing agency.

Maidu Bike Path and Park Projects, City of Auburn, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Auburn Recreation District Creek Vegetation Management Project, City of Auburn, California. As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. Two new archaeological sites were recorded. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting CEQA, US Army Corps Section 106, and local requirements for this cultural inventory.

Steephollow Creek and Bear River Restoration, Nevada County, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto assisted with management of field efforts and preparation of a technical report for a cultural inventory. Resources were evaluated for significance under CEQA, and Section 106 of the NHPA.
Development

Auburn Recreation District Operations and Development Project, City of Auburn, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a North Central Information Center (NCIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting Bureau of Reclamation, CEQA, and local requirements for this cultural inventory.

Bellevue Ranch 7 Project, City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American correspondence, archaeological and historic architectural survey, and preparation of a technical report. Mr Giacinto prepared and reviewed management recommendations. Project involved evaluation of an 1920s era residential building, review of building records, and assessment for unidentified historic-era resources. All work and recommendations met both CEQA considerations and Section 106 compliance.

Kitchell Santa Rosa Project, Granite Construction, City of Santa Rosa, California. As Principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwestern Information Center (NWIC) records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American information outreach, and preparation of a technical memo. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed meeting CEQA and local requirements for this cultural inventory.

Clearwater Project, City of Rohnert Park, Sonoma County, California. As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Northwest Information Center (NWIC) records search update and reviewed existing mitigation for the City of Rohnert Park.

1836 Columbia Street Project, Parikh Properties, City of San Diego, California. As Co-Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a SCIC records search, NAHC, archaeological survey, and preparation of a negative technical report for this small residential development. The mitigation strategy did not require additional archaeological monitoring or other work based on the lack of archaeological sites, and the low potential for encountering unrecorded subsurface cultural resources. Recommendations were submitted to the City of San Diego.

Canergy - Rutherford Road Development Project, Ericsson-Grant, Inc., El Centro, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated records searches, Native American contact, map preparation and fieldwork.

Oro Verde Development Project, Wohlford Land Co., LLC, Valley Center, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a negative technical letter report for this small residential development. The mitigation strategy did not require additional archaeological monitoring or other work based on the lack of archaeological sites, and the low potential for encountering unrecorded subsurface cultural resources. Recommendations were submitted to the County of San Diego.

Fifth Avenue Development Cultural Inventory, E2 ManageTech, Inc., Chula Vista, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated the preparation of a paleontological, archaeological, and historic resource inventory for a proposed residential project. Responsibilities included a SCIC records search, San Diego Natural History Museum (SDNHM) records search, archival research, agency and client
communication, GIS, and compiling the technical report and appendices. Results were submitted as a technical report to the City of Chula Vista.

**Normal Street Evaluations, Darco Engineering, Inc., San Diego, California.** As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the preparation of a historic resource evaluation for a number of buildings located in the community of University Heights. Responsibilities included an SCIC records search, agency and client communication, archival research, GIS, and compiling the technical report and appendices. Results were submitted as a technical report and associated appendices to the City of San Diego.

**Mapleton Park Centre Site Analysis, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., Murrieta, California.** As Principal archaeological consultant, Mr. Giacinto prepared a project constraints study for Kaiser Permanente, within the County of Riverside.

**New Kaiser Permanente Medical Center EIR, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., San Diego, California.** As field director, Mr. Giacinto conducted a survey of the proposed medical center and reported negative findings to the City of San Diego.

**St. John Garabed Church Environmental Services, St. John Garabed Armenian Apostolic Church Trust, San Diego, California.** As field director and co-principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto conducted a survey of the proposed church facilities and reported findings to the City of San Diego. Additional responsibilities included preparation of the cultural and paleontological sections for the project EIR.

**PMC Quarry Creek Project Phase II Cultural Evaluation, McMillin Land Development, Carlsbad, California.** As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed and conducted archaeological testing, data analysis, report writing and mapping of existing cultural resources within the 60-acre Quarry Creek Project study area.

**University Office and Medical Park Project Cultural Resource Study Survey, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Marcos, California.** As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed a team of archaeologists in conducting survey of the 49.5-acre study area in a general inventory of potentially impacted cultural resources and prepared maps and a report for the presentation of this information.

**Education**

**Mission Beach Elementary School EIR, McKellar McGowan, San Diego, California.** As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a Southern California Information Center (SCIC) records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. The mitigation strategy did not require archaeological monitoring or other work based on the lack of archaeological sites, and the low potential for encountering unrecorded subsurface cultural resources. Recommendations were submitted to the City of San Diego.

**San Diego State University (SDSU) West Campus Housing EIR/Tech Studies, Gatzke, Dillon and Balance, San Diego, California.** As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report and EIR section. An appropriate mitigation strategy was developed and provided to SDSU for this negative cultural inventory.

**Orange Coast College Initial Study (IS), Coast Community College District, Orange, California.** As principal archaeological investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated records search, NAHC and Native American
consultation, archaeological survey, preparation of a technical report, and provided management and compliance recommendations relating to cultural resources on three Orange County College campuses.

**Energy**

**BayWa Granger Solar Site Survey, RBF Consulting, Valley Center, California.** As Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the inventory and prepared management recommendations for a proposed solar farm in Valley Center, California. A relationship of open dialogue between Mr. Giacinto and the client allowed for the project design to avoid significant direct and indirect impacts to cultural resources the proper the development of compliant mitigation and informed project design. Results were submitted to the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Landuse.

**Valley Center Solar Site Survey, RBF Consulting, Valley Center, California.** As Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the inventory and prepared management recommendations for a proposed solar farm in Valley Center, California. A relationship of open dialogue between Mr. Giacinto and the client allowed for the project design to avoid significant direct and indirect impacts to cultural resources the proper the development of compliant mitigation and informed project design. Results were submitted to the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Landuse.

**Data Collection for the Tierra Del Sol Solar Farm Project, Tierra Del Sol Solar Farm LLC, Tierra Del Sol, California.** As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed a crew of 8 archaeologists in conducting the survey, surface mapping, surface collection, and excavation of 13 prehistoric and historical period sites throughout the McCain Valley. Mr Giacinto prepared an inventory and evaluation report for this project, completed to County of San Diego Standards.

**Rugged Solar Farm Project, Rugged Solar LLC, Boulevard, California.** As principal investigator and field director, Mr. Giacinto managed a crew of 12 archaeologists in conducting the survey, surface mapping, surface collection and excavation of 42 prehistoric and historical period sites throughout the McCain Valley. Mr Giacinto prepared an inventory and evaluation report and EIR section for this project, completed to County of San Diego Standards.

**Gas Line for Poway Pump Station, City of Poway, San Diego County California.** As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto conducted an inventory, coordinated survey, and provided amangement recommendations in technical report.

**Sol Orchard Solar Farm, RBF Consulting, Ramona, California.** As Principal Investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated archaeological and Native American monitoring and prepared management recommendations for a proposed solar farm in Ramona, California. All impacts to significant cultural resources in the vicinity were avoided. Results were submitted to the County of San Diego.

**Solar Farm Cultural Resources Services, Confidential Client, San Diego, California.** As project director, Mr. Giacinto managed a crew of 8 archaeologists in conducting the survey, surface mapping, surface collection, and excavation of 13 prehistoric and historical period sites throughout the McCain Valley.

**As-Needed Environmental Analysis for Solar Project Road Access, Confidential Client, San Diego, California.** As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed a crew of 12 archaeologists in conducting the survey, surface mapping, surface collection and excavation of 42 prehistoric and historical period sites throughout the McCain Valley.
East County Substation EIR/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), San Diego County, California. As field archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto worked as part of a team to survey the possible impacts to exiting and newly recorded cultural resources.

Class III Cultural Resources Inventory for Meteorological Masts 1 and 4 and Access Roads, Iberdrola Renewables, Kern County, California. As field director, Mr. Giacinto managed a team of archaeologists in conducting surveys of the study area in a general inventory of potentially impacted cultural resources.

Wood to Steel Pole Conversion Survey, San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E), San Diego County, California. As crew chief, Mr. Giacinto managed a team of archaeologists in conducting a survey of Circuit 75 in a general inventory of potentially impacted cultural resources.

Sunrise Powerlink Project Monitoring, SDG&E, Imperial and San Diego Counties, California. As a field director, Mr. Giacinto assisted in managing an archaeological field crew, aided in data collection, and conducted monitoring by facilitating planned mitigation strategies of construction and pre-construction activities associated with a 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line, access roads, and work areas.

Cal Valley Solar Ranch-Switchyard Site No. 3 Archaeological Testing, Ecology & Environment Inc., San Luis Obispo County, California. As part of a team of archaeologists, conducted excavations and general testing of a middle prehistoric site.

Wood to Steel Pole Conversion, SDG&E, Cleveland National Forest (CNF), San Diego County, California. As crew chief, Mr. Giacinto managed a team of archaeologists in conducting a survey of Circuit 440 in a general inventory of potentially impacted cultural resources.

Devers to Palo Verde 2 (DPV2) Colorado River Substation Project Monitoring, Southern California Edison (SCE), Blythe, California. As project archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto monitored the geotechnical testing of soils along access road leading into Colorado River Substation from the west.

Sunrise Powerlink Pole Fielding and Environmental Monitoring, SDG&E, Imperial and San Diego Counties, California. As the archaeological representative, Mr. Giacinto worked with SDG&E-contracted engineers, surveyors, and biologists to assess proposed work areas, access roads, and structure locations for possible impacts upon existing cultural resources.

Wood to Steel Pole Conversion Pole Fielding, SDG&E and CNF, San Diego County, California. As the archaeological representative, Mr. Giacinto worked with SDG&E-contracted engineers, surveyors, and biologists to assess proposed pole transmission pole locations for possible impacts upon existing cultural resources.

Wood to Steel Pole Conversion, SDG&E and CNF, San Diego County, California. As field archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto worked as part of a team to survey segments of Circuit 449, Circuit 78, TL 625, and TL 629 for possible impacts to existing cultural resources.

Guy Pole and Stub Pole Removal Monitoring, SDG&E, Carlsbad, California. As archaeological representative, Mr. Giacinto monitored activities associated with the removal of existing unused energy transmission infrastructure in an area near recorded cultural resources of noted significance.
DPV2 500 kV Transmission Line Survey, SCE, Riverside County, California. As field archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto worked as part of a team to survey more than 45 miles of linear proposed project area. Conducted an intensive inventory of prehistoric and historical period cultural resources from Desert Center to Thousand Palms.

DPV2 Colorado Switchyard Survey, SCE, Riverside County, California. As project archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto prepared the site records gathered through a pre-field records search and created project area maps in GIS illustrating the location and type of preexisting cultural resources prior field survey for a fiber-optic ground wire project for DPV2 Colorado switchyard in Blythe.

Pole Replacement Projects Surveying, SCE, Orange and Riverside Counties, California. As project archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto prepared the site records gathered through a pre-field records search and created project area maps in GIS illustrating the location and type of preexisting cultural resources prior to fieldwork for the deteriorated pole project within the CNF, and deteriorated pole and pole replacement on private property.

Sunrise Powerlink Environmentally Superior Southern Alternative Survey, SDG&E, San Diego and Imperial Counties, California. As project archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto assisted in preparing the site records gathered through a pre-field records search and digitized the boundaries if archaeological sites in GIS illustrating the location and type of preexisting cultural resources, and a records search of existing site data for alternative route.

Military

Cultural Resources Inventory, March Joint Powers Authority, Riverside County, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the field efforts, reporting, and facilitated tribal consultation for cultural inventory. The report included preparation of a cultural context for WW-I and WW-II era history of the air fields and camp in the vicinity. Resource considerations were compliant with CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Utility Corridor Survey at Edwards Air Force Base, U.S. Air Force, California. As Archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto guided the design and preparation of digital field forms to assist in the recordation of archaeological resources at archaeological sites throughout the EAFB, including the Pancho Barnes site.

Infill Survey Project at Edwards Air Force Base, U.S. Air Force, California. As Field Director, Mr. Giacinto managed a team of five archaeologists in conducting a general pedestrian inventory of cultural resources within a 7,650-acre study area.

Desert Warfare Training Facility Cultural Resources Inventory Project, U.S. Navy Southwest, Imperial County, California. As field archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto worked as part of a team to conduct an intensive inventory of prehistoric and historical period cultural resources in selected areas within the Chocolate Mountains Gunnery Range in Niland.

Morgan/Bircham 55 to 12 kV Project Survey, U.S. Navy-Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS)-China Lake, Inyo County, California. As project archaeologist, Mr. Giacinto prepared the site records gathered through a pre-field records search and created project area maps in GIS illustrating the location and type of preexisting cultural resources prior to field survey at NAWS China Lake.
Resource Management

Pure Water Project Constraints Study and PEIR, City of San Diego, California. As Principal investigator and field director, Mr. Giacinto managed preparation of a constraints study for the Pure Water Project. Work involved a records search of over 100 mile linear miles of San Diego. Site record information from more than 1,236 cultural resources was processed, coded, and integrated within a geospatial sensitivity model to identify archaeological and built environment constraints throughout the proposed alignment. This information was integrated within a PEIR and is currently being used to assist with management planning through the project alignment. Maps were then generated using generalized grid units (1000 x 1000 meters in size) to provide a visual model of relative archaeological resource sensitivity while maintaining the appropriate level of confidentiality for public dissemination to assist in planning.

Lake Morena Dam Project, Lake Morena, City of San Diego, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American correspondence, archaeological survey, agency correspondence, and preparation of a archaeological and built environment technical report work related to dam improvements.

Hanson El Monte Pond Restoration, Lakeside’s River Park Conservancy, San Diego, California. As Principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the field efforts, reporting, and agency interface for a cultural inventory. Resources were evaluated for significance under county guidelines, CEQA, and Section 106 of the NHPA. Worked with the Army Corps for submittal of documents to SHPO.

Peter’s Canyon Regional Park CEQA Study, Orange County Fire Authority, Orange, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto conducted a cultural resources inventory of all cultural resources within Peters Canyon planned fuel reduction areas. Mr. Giacinto coordinated a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a technical report. Recommendations were provided to agency personnel to assist in mitigating any possible adverse effects to cultural resources in the project vicinity.

Lake Cahuilla Cultural Resources Management Plan, ASM PARC, Riverside County, California. As project archaeologist and lead analyst, Mr. Giacinto developed a standardized database associated with ancient Lake Cahuilla and the surrounding archaeological and ecological landscape. Performed GIS data integration and predictive analysis, data entry of site record information, and completed multi-day, multi-person record search covering 17 USGS quadrangle in Riverside County. The project was finalized with the preparation of a management document submitted to the the Friends of the San Jacinto Mountains with the intent of identifying known and potential areas for preservation.

Third Party Review and Monitoring

Rio Mesa Solar Electric Generating Facility CEQA Studies, BrightSource Energy, Inc., Riverside, California. As third party reviewer, Mr. Giacinto collaborated with the BLM, the California Energy Commission, and Brightsource to review URS Corporation’s cultural report content, quality, and environmental compliance.

Tribal

South Palm Canyon West Fork Flood Emergency Work, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Palm Springs, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto worked with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office to conduct archaeological monitoring on tribal lands of emergency repairs within Andreas Canyon National Register of Historic Places listed district. A monitoring
report with a summary of findings and implemented mitigation activities, daily monitoring logs and photos, and confidential figures was provided to the tribe.

South Palm Canyon Improvements, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Palm Springs, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto worked with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office to conduct archaeological monitoring on tribal lands of facility improvements within Andreas Canyon National Register of Historic Places listed district. A monitoring report with a summary of findings and implemented mitigation activities, daily monitoring logs and photos, and confidential figures was provided to the tribe.

Water/Wastewater
El Toro Recycled Water Project, Orange County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Reach 5 Project, Riverside County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed provided recommendations to SAWP for a monitoring approach that would satisfy both State Water Board and Pechanga tribe interests. Project included archaeological monitoring of areas along Tescal Canyon Road and met compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Santa Margarita Hidden Ridge Project, Orange County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, SCIC archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. The proposed intersected two NRHP-listed resources and a NRHP-listed archaeological district. Mr. Giacinto developed and managed testing efforts to appropriately define significant deposits and prepared a monitoring plan. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA, and project was successfully permitted.

South Orange County Water Authority Brine line Project, Orange County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed an updated survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory requiring Army Corps review for Section 106 compliance. Mr. Giacinto successfully re-delineated NRHP-listed archaeological resource boundaries based on review of survey and archival data. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Phase I Archaeological Inventory Report for the San Juan Creek Outfall Project, Orange County, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto managed the survey, archival searches, tribal correspondence, and reported management recommendations for a cultural resources inventory. Considerations included compliance under CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Carlsbad Desalination Third Addendum to EIR Biological Survey and Monitoring, Poseidon Water LLC, Carlsbad, California. As archaeological consultant, Mr. Giacinto conducted archaeological monitoring and consultation on an as-needed basis.

Old Mission Dam, City of San Diego, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto conducted an inventory, coordinated survey, and prepared recommendations for the maintenance of the National Register of Historic Places listed resource, Old Mission Dam.
Otay River Wetland Mitigation, Poseidon Water LLC, San Diego, California. As field director, Mr. Giacinto conducted a cultural resources survey of a mitigation property, managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), to be used for estuary restoration.

Vallecitos Water District Rock Springs Sewer, Infrastructure Engineering Corporation, San Diego, California. As principal investigator, Mr. Giacinto coordinated a SCIC records search, NAHC and Native American consultation, archaeological survey, and preparation of a negative technical letter report for this small residential development. The mitigation strategy did require additional archaeological monitoring based on the potential to encounter subsurface cultural resources. Recommendations were submitted to the Vallecitos Water District.

Relevant Previous Experience

Attended AB 52 Training Hosted by UAIC, Roseville, California. Attended CEQA AB 52 training hosted by United Auburn Indian Community. Was provided training on tribal perspectives provided by UAIC, Pechanga, and NAHC as well as representing council. Also talks by Tom Gates of the Energy Commission.

Guest Lecturer in Cultural Resources for Upper Division CEQA Course, University of San Diego, California. As Cultural Resources Lecturer, Mr. Giacinto was invited to present on Cultural Resources history and management under CEQA for an upper division USD course in April, 2015. A presentation was created with the intention of providing a contextual and technical understanding of how cultural resources are interpreted and evaluated under CEQA. The implications relating to the Friends of Mammoth (1972) decision and other cases were outlined in detail. AB-52 considerations and timing were summarized, and implications of Tribal Cultural Resources as a class of resource discussed.

Investigation of Emergent Trends of San Diego Cultural Resource Management, San Diego County, California. As ethnographic researcher, conducted verbal, semi-structured interviews with 17 archaeologists, policy makers, and Native American monitors and curators regarding the history and current practice of Cultural Resource Management. Information was contextualized through extensive background research using legal, academic, specialized, and archival sources. Analysis employed a synthesis of cultural anthropological and archaeological theory and practice. Results were published as M.A. thesis in Anthropology at San Diego State University (2012).

Needs Assessment/Diagnostic for the Community of La Sierra de San Francisco, Baja California Sur, Mexico. As ethnographic researcher, worked for San Diego State University through a grant provided by the International Community Foundation to conduct a general needs assessment in a UNESCO protected community within a UNESCO defined region of World Heritage, La Sierra de San Francisco. Resolved to help with improving the infrastructure of potable water, assisting in the construction of a system of telecommunications for education, and conducting workshops aimed at the preservation of local prehistoric and historical cultural and archaeological resources (2009-2011).

Ethnographic Field School, Zimatlan, Oaxaca, Mexico. As ethnographic student/researcher for San Diego State University, lived with local family and conducted interviews with local population regarding microcredit, sustainable/traditional agriculture and husbandry. Additionally, compiled audio/visual digital stories with local youth and conducted training in research and appropriate documentation. Emphasis was placed on dietary and generational cultural changes (2008).
**Research Assistant, San Diego State University Collections Management.** As graduate student at SDSU, worked in Collections Management under the instruction of Dr. Lynn Gamble (2007). Responsibilities included laboratory analyses, data entry, record processing, and collections curation management.

**Research Assistant, South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.** As graduate student at SDSU, worked at SCIC under the instruction of Dr. Seth Mallios (2008). Responsibilities included site record and report processing and resource mapping.

**Archaeological Field School, San Diego State University.** As graduate student at SDSU, attended an archaeological fieldschool at Cuyamaca Complex Type Site under the instruction of Dr. Lynn Gamble (2007).

**Archaeological Researcher, Institute of Archaeomythology.** As as researcher and photographer, attended lectures and assisted with symposiums in Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania (2004, 2008)

**Archaeological Field School, Sonoma State University.** As undergraduate student at SSU, attended an archaeological fieldschool under the instruction of Dr. Adrian Praetzellis (2005).

**Publications**


*Lake Cahuilla Cultural Resources Management Plan.* ASM PARC. April, 2011.


Conway, F., R. Espinoza, and A. Giacinto. 2010 Results of Needs Assessment Conducted with Communities of La Sierra de San Francisco, 2009-2010. Submitted to the International Community Foundation.

**Selected Technical Reports**


Giacinto, A. 2015. *Negative Cultural Resources Inventory for the Vacaville Center Campus Project, City of Vacaville, California.* Prepared for and submitted to the Solano Community College District


Giacinto, A. 2015. *Phase I Archaeological Inventory Report for the San Juan Creek Outfall Project, Dana Point, California.* Prepared for and submitted to the South Orange County Water Authority.


Giacinto, A. 2014. *Negative Cultural Resources Inventory for the Coast Hwy 101 Pump Station Project, City of Encinitas, California.* Prepared for and submitted to the City of Encinitas.


Hale, M. and A. Giacinto 2014. *Negative Cultural Resources Phase I Inventory for the Canergy Project, Brawley, Imperial County, California.* Prepared for Ericsson-Grant Inc. Submitted to Imperial County Planning and Development.
Castells, J. and A. Giacinto 2014. Historic Resources Inventory for the Normal Street Project, City of San Diego, California. Submitted to City of San Diego.


Hale, M., and A. Giacinto 2013. *Yokohl Ranch Project EIR, Chapter 4.6, Yokohl Valley, Tulare County, California*


A. Giacinto and M. Hale, 2012. *Cultural Resources Inventory for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Otay River Estuary Restoration Project, Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California*
Giacinto, A. 2012. Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center, San Diego County, California

Hale, M., and A. Giacinto 2012. Cultural Resources Inventory for the Orange County Fire Authority Project, Peters Canyon, Orange County, California

Hale, M., and A. Giacinto 2012. North Embarcadero Port Master Plan Amendment (NE-PMPA) EIR, Chapter 4.9, Port of San Diego, San Diego, California.

Hale, M., and A. Giacinto 2012. Rio Mesa Solar EIS, Chapter 4.6, Brightsource, Riverside County, California.


Hale, M., A. Giacinto, and J. Schaefer 2012. Class III Cultural Resources Inventory for the Campo Invenergy Project, Campo Indian Reservation, San Diego California.


Presentations


Invited Guest Lecture on Cultural Resources in CEQA. University of San Diego, CA. 2015.


A GIS Analysis of Ancient Lake Cahuilla Archaeological Sites, Riverside County, CA, United States. For Balancias y Perspectivas, National Institute of Archaeology and History (NIAH), Mexicali, MX, 2011.
APPENDIX B

CONFIDENTIAL Records Search Results
June 30, 2017

Native American Heritage Commission  
1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Subject: NAHC Sacred Lands Records Search Request for the CSU Chico College Park Project, Butte County, California

Dear NAHC Staff,

Improvements are planned to existing CSU Chico facilities in Chico, California (Figure 1). The area is comprised of a disturbed parcel of undeveloped land. The proposed project would fall on a number of parcels with existing buildings, all located southwest of the intersection of Warner St and West Sacramento Ave. This search area falls in Township 22N; Range 1E; in an unsectioned area west of Section 26; and the Chico, CA USGS map.

Dudek is contacting the NAHC as part of the Inventory effort to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for any Native American cultural resources that may fall within a one-mile buffer of the proposed project location. Please provide contact information for all Native American tribal representatives that should be contacted regarding these project activities. This information can be emailed to me at agiacinto@dudek.com.

If you have any questions about this investigation, please contact me directly by email or phone.

Regards,

Adam Giacinto, M.A., RPA
Archaeologist

DUDEK
853 Lincoln Way
Auburn, CA 95603
Office: 760.479.4252
Email: agiacinto@dudek.com

Attachments:
Figure 1. Records Search Map
June 5, 2017

Adam Giacinto
Dudek

Email to: agiacinto@dudek.com

RE: CSU Chico College Park Project, Butte County

Dear Mr. Giacinto,

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not preclude the presence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources for cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and/or recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans tribes who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these 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 me at frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contacts
7/5/2017

Mechoopda Indian Tribe
Dennis E. Ramirez, Chairperson
125 Mission Ranch Blvd
Chico, CA 95926
dramirez@mechoopda-nsn.gov
(530) 899-8922
(530) 899-8517 - Fax

Mechoopda Maidu
Concow

Estom Yumea Maidu Tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria
Glenda Nelson, Chairperson
2133 Monte Vista Avenue
Oroville, CA 95966
info@enterpriserancheria.com
(530) 532-9214
(530) 532-1768 Fax

Greenville Rancheria
Kyle Self, Chairperson
P.O. Box 279
Greenville, CA 95947
kself@greenvillerancheria.com
(530) 284-7990
(530) 284-6612 Fax

Tsi Akim Maidu
Grayson Coney, Cultural Director
P.O. Box 510
Browns Valley, CA 95918
tsi-akim-maidu@att.net
530-274-7497

Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians
Gary Archuleta, Chairperson
#1 Alverda Drive
Oroville, CA 95966
frontdesk@mooretown.org
(530) 533-3625
(530) 533-3680 Fax

Tsi Akim Maidu
Don Ryberg, Chairperson
P.O. Box 510
Browns Valley, CA 95918
tsi-akim-maidu@att.net
Office 530-274-7479
cell 530-559-8595

KonKow Valley Band of Maidu
Wallace Clark-Wilson, Chairperson
PO Box 5850
Oroville, CA 95966
KonKow / Concow
(530) 533-1504

Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians
James Edwards, Chairperson
5 Tyme Way
Oroville, CA 95966
jedwards@berrycreekrancheria.com
(530) 534-3859
(530) 534-1151 Fax

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 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessments for the updated contact list for the CSU Chico College Park Project, Butte County
July 13, 2017

Gene Whitehouse, Chairman
United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
10720 Indian Hill Road
Auburn, CA 95603

Subject: Tribal Consultation – CSU Chico College Park Demolition Project

Dear Mr. Whitehouse:

California State University Chico has received a request for formal notice of proposed projects within the geographic area of the University campus from the United Auburn Indian Community per Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(b). In accordance with Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(d), the University is hereby providing formal notification to the United Auburn Indian Community of the College Park Demolition project.

The proposed project would include the demolition of ten residential structures in the College Park neighborhood, which are in the process of being purchased by the University from the Research Foundation, a campus auxiliary organization. The 2005 Master Plan identifies this area for acquisition and for future housing development and parking. The demolition project would include the demolition of ten existing houses, likely built between 1939 and 1951, and stabilization of the parcels for future use. The stabilization of the site would involve grading to level each parcel after the demolition, and the installation of gravel or other groundcover. Some of the parcels may be used as temporary surface parking. If and when the site is proposed for development an appropriate CEQA review would be conducted to evaluate the environmental effects of such a future project. For your reference, the University has attached three figures that identify the project location on a regional, local, and site level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Built Date (per County Assessor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-005-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-010-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-005-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-003-000</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-013-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-016-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-015-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Stadium Way</td>
<td>003-120-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-130-011-000</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-011-000</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Whitehouse
Subject: Tribal Consultation – CSU Chico College Park Demolition Project

Neither the CSU Chico campus nor this adjacent project site are within the UAIC’s geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation (per the map provided to the University by UAIC). The University, however, acknowledges the United Auburn Indian Community’s desire to protect its cultural heritage.

If the United Auburn Indian Community possesses information regarding the project site or would like to consult with the University on the College Park Demolition project, please contact us at the following address:

Sandra Beck AIA, LEED AP
Director – Planning, Design & Construction & Campus Architect
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929-0018

Per Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(d), a request for consultation must be submitted within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Should a consultation be requested, the University requests that written delegation of authority be provided. If you have any questions, please contact me at (530) 898-3285 or sebeck@csuchico.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sandra Beck AIA, LEED AP
Director – Planning Design & Construction & Campus Architect

Attachments:
1: Regional Map
2: Vicinity Map
3: Site Map

cc: Jason Camp, Tribal Historical Preservation Officer, UAIC
     Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager, UAIC
July 13, 2017

Dennis Ramirez, Chairman
Mechoopda Indian Tribe of the Chico Rancheria, California
125 Mission Ranch Blvd.
Chico, CA 95926

Subject: Tribal Consultation – CSU Chico College Park Demolition Project

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

California State University Chico has received a request for formal notice of proposed projects within the geographic area of the University campus from the Mechoopda Indian Tribe per Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(b). In accordance with Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(d), the University is hereby providing formal notification to the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of the College Park Demolition project. The University recognizes the importance of the Tribe’s historical, cultural, and sacred sites and values your participation in the planning process for this project.

The proposed project would include the demolition of ten residential structures in the College Park neighborhood, which are in the process of being purchased by the University from the Research Foundation, a campus auxiliary organization. The 2005 Master Plan identifies this area for acquisition and for future housing development and parking. The demolition project would include the demolition of ten existing houses, likely built between 1939 and 1951, and stabilization of the parcels for future use. The stabilization of the site would involve grading to level each parcel after the demolition, and the installation of gravel or other groundcover. Some of the parcels may be used as temporary surface parking. If and when the site is proposed for development an appropriate CEQA review would be conducted to evaluate the environmental effects of such a future project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Built Date (per County Assessor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-006-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-010-000</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-005-000</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 Brice Avenue</td>
<td>003-130-003-000</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-013-000</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-016-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 La Vista Way</td>
<td>003-120-015-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Stadium Way</td>
<td>003-120-009-000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Ramirez  
Subject: Tribal Consultation – CSU Chico College Park Demolition Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>725 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-130-011-000</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899 Warner Street</td>
<td>003-120-011-000</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University acknowledges the Mechoopda Indian Tribe’s desire to protect its cultural heritage and may possess information regarding the project site. For your reference, the University has attached three figures that identify the project location on a regional, local, and site level.

If the Mechoopda Indian Tribe would like to consult on the College Park Demolition project, please submit a request for consultation to the University at the following address:

Sandra Beck AIA, LEED AP  
Director – Planning, Design & Construction & Campus Architect  
California State University, Chico  
400 West First Street  
Chico, CA 95929-0018

Per Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(d), a request for consultation must be submitted within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Should a consultation be requested, the University requests that written delegation of authority be provided. If you have any questions, please contact me at (530) 898-3285 or sebeck@csuchico.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sandra Beck AIA, LEED AP  
Director – Planning Design & Construction & Campus Architect

Attachments:  
1: Regional Map  
2: Vicinity Map  
3: Site Map

cc: William Cornelius, Mechoopda Indian Tribe
Regional Map

SOURCE: ESRI Basemaps

CSU Chico College Park Project

FIGURE 1
APPENDIX D
DPR Forms
P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location: □ Not for Publication  ■ Unrestricted
   and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
   a. County: Butte
   b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Chico
      Date: 1978  T 22N; R E; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 27; Mount Diablo B.M.
   c. Address: 602 Brice Avenue
   d. UTM: Zone:10S ; 598452.56 m E/ 4398647.23 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth
   e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:
      APN. 003-130-006-000. The subject property is located at the corner of Warner Street and Brice Avenue.

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
   The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1946 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is roughly L-shape in plan with a cross-hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior walls are clad in brick and stucco. The main entrance to the house is located on the southeast elevation and is sheltered beneath a low-pitched, front-gabled roof filled with horizontal wood siding. The southeast (main) elevation presents as two sections. The left (southern) recessed central section is distinguished by an integral porch, brick cladding, and a large brick chimney. A central bay projects approximately 6 feet from the rest of the elevation and is stucco clad with a side entry point under an open wooden trellis supported by two wooden posts. The integral porch has a painted concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by a single step. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular and contains a tripartite wood frame window featuring a fixed central pane flanked by multiple side-lights, an entry door that is obscured by a security door, two additional tripartite windows in the main projection, and a two-over-two wood frame window to the east of the side entry door. The northeast elevation of the building also features an irregular fenestration and contains a tripartite window, side entry door that is obscured by a storm door, two two-over-two windows, a multi-light entry door, five two-over-two windows, and a large carport that shelters a modern single-width garage door.

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

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

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Main Elevation (view to northwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3435

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: ■Historic  □Prehistoric  □Both 1946 (Butte County Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address:
   CSU Chico
   400 West First Street
   Chico, CA 95929

P8. Recorded by:  (Name, affiliation, and address)
   Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
   38 North Marengo Avenue
   Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded:  7/5/2017

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
   Intensive

P11. Report Citation:  (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018)

*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):  *Required information
*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

*Resource Name or #: 602 Brice Avenue

602 Brice Ave
Chico, CA

*Required information
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*NRHP Status Code 6Z

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) 602 Brice Avenue

B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence

*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch

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

Constructed in 1946 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBP's) were found for the property: construction of a carport with composition shingles set on brick and wood in front of the existing garage in 1950 (CCBP #10025); a roof built over a new 8 X 25 ft. patio in 1952 (CCBP #685); addition of a louvered sunshade over the front porch, including change of a window to a door in 1953 (CCBP #1426); installation of a television antenna in 1954 (CCBP #262); an electrical permit for an addition in 1964 (CCBP #3871); replacement of ceramic tiles in a bathroom in 1965 (CCBP #5222); partial reroof with composition shingles in 1996 (CCBP #B96-00430); and replacement of a water heater in 2001 (CCBP #P01-00679). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the addition of security doors, addition of metal louvers over windows on the main elevation, reconfiguration of entry points on the northeast elevation, addition of an open trellis on the northeast elevation, and replacement of the garage door.

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

*B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Unknown

*B10. Significance: Theme: Area: Property Type: Applicable Criteria: N/A

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

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was predominately owned and occupied by Harry Nichols Jr. and his wife Sally. Mr. Nichols is listed in directories as a farmer. The only other name that was associated with the house was Mr. Alan Sagouspe, who was listed as an owner of the property on a building permit from 2001 (CCBP # P01-00527).

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including an L-shaped residence on the corner of Warner Avenue and Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1946 date of construction for 602 Brice Avenue. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References: See continuation sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder

*Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

Source: Google Earth

This space reserved for official comments.)
By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).
Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion A/1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion B/2.
Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1946 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, use of large picture windows, variety of cladding, asymmetry in the façade), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including reconfiguration of entry points on the northeast elevation, addition of an open trellis on the northeast elevation, addition of a carport, addition of louvers over windows on the main elevation, and replacement of the original garage door. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion C/4 (Information Potential)
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1946. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

 Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity:
Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.
Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including reconfiguration of entry points on the northeast elevation, addition of a carport in front of the original garage, addition of an open trellis on the northeast elevation, the addition of louvers over windows on the main elevation, and replacement of the garage door. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of metal louvered sunshades, construction of a wooden trellis, addition of the carport, and replacement of the garage door. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the subject property significantly impact the building’s ability to correlate to a single-family residence designed in the Ranch style of architecture. Currently the building reads as two separate properties when evaluating the southeast (main) elevation and the northeast (side) elevation. Multiple entry points on the northeast elevation create a feeling of a multi-family unit and distract from the original design and feeling as a single-family residence. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


The subject property is located on the corner of Warner Street and La Vista Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan, with a gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior cladding includes horizontal and vertical wood siding and stucco. The southeast (main) elevation presents as five sections. The left is a front entry porch and is clad in vertical wood siding. The next section of the house (to the far right) is on the same plane as the central block and is distinguished by a large brick eave-wall chimney, and is clad in horizontal wood siding. The integral porch has a painted concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by a single step, with three 4 X 4 in. wooden posts supporting the roof. Fenestration on the primary elevation is irregular and contains a single-car-width sectional garage door, a one-over-one wood-frame window, an simple wooden entry door, a bay window in the projection, paired six-over-one windows, a main entry door obscured by a security screen, and two six-over-one windows flanking the brick chimney. A large air conditioning unit is mounted in the center of the roof.

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1940 facing onto La Vista Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan, with a gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior cladding includes horizontal and vertical wood siding and stucco. The southeast (main) elevation presents as five sections. The left is a front-gabled single-car-width garage clad in horizontal wood siding. A short enclosed breezeway clad in horizontal wood siding connects the garage to the house. The breezeway contains a simple wooden entry door sheltered beneath a side-entry porch. The next section of the house projects approximately 3 feet from the central block and is clad in stucco. The central block of the house is distinguished by a partial-width broad-entry porch and is clad in vertical wood siding. The last section of the house (to the far right) is on the same plane as the central block and is distinguished by a large brick eave-wall chimney, and is clad in horizontal wood siding. The integral porch has a painted concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by a single step, with three 4 X 4 in. wooden posts supporting the roof. Fenestration on the primary elevation is irregular and contains a single-car-width sectional garage door, a one-over-one wood-frame window, an simple wooden entry door, a bay window in the projection, paired six-over-one windows, a main entry door obscured by a security screen, and two six-over-one windows flanking the brick chimney. A large air conditioning unit is mounted in the center of the roof.

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

*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 #) Main Elevation (view to northwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3316

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

*P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded: 7/5/2017

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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 #: 608 La Vista Way

Map Name: Chico

Scale: 1:24,000

Date of Map: 1978

608 La Vista Way
Chico, CA

*Resource Name or #: 608 La Vista Way

*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

*Required information
B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence

*B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1940; however, no original building permit was found. The following CCBP was found for the property: installation of new roof-mounted 3-ton HVAC unit in 1997 (CCBP #97-00192). The building permit folder also contained a service request from 1974 for tree trimming (CCBP #1929) and a code violation in 2002 for illegal dumping of tree trimmings.Observed alterations to the house from unknown dates include additions to the south of the house with an enclosed breezeway, a garage, reconfiguration of entry points on the south side of the main elevation, and addition of security door on main entry door.

*B7. Moved? □ No    □ Yes    □ Unknown Date:

*B8. Related Features:
B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Unknown

*B10. Significance:

Period of Significance:  
Property Type:  
Applicable Criteria: N/A

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

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:

- 1945 – Henry E. and Mabel Wiest, vice president of North Valley Tractor and Equipment Company
- 1948–1950 – Donald J. and Kathleen Quinn, secretary of the Chico Chamber of Commerce
- 1953–1956 – Henry E. and Frances L. Wiest, driver for Chico Wood Products
- 1958 – Clinton E. and Patricia Walden, drapery installer for Chico Carpet and Draperies
- 1960 – Eugene McElroy, salesman
- 1961 – Frances Ramsdell
- 1962 – Henry Wiest
- 1997 – John Jeffries
- 2002 – Fraser and Mary Panerio Page et al.

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
B10. Significance (Continued):

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. Poor image quality resulted in limited information about the building, which should be visible in 1941 given its 1940 date of construction. The 1947 and 1969 aerial photographs indicate that there is increased development in the area, and there is an irregular-shaped building located on the parcel associated with 608 La Vista Way. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)**

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style houses often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

**NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:**

**Criterion A/1 (Events)**

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.
Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For this reason, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to the Minimal Traditional style of architecture. The subject property was constructed in 1940 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roof, minimal detailing at the roofline), the building exhibits substantial alterations, including additions to the south of the house with an enclosed breezeway, a garage, reconfiguration of entry points on the south side of the main elevation, addition of a security door at the main entry point, and the addition of rooftop air conditioning unit. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional single-family residence constructed in 1940. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States during World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last Minimal Traditional style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Minimal Traditional style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity:

**Location:** The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

**Design:** The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including construction of an addition, reconfiguration of entry points on the main elevation, addition of rooftop air conditioning unit, and addition of a security door to the main entry point. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

**Setting:** Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. However, the surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

**Materials:** Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including an addition to the south of the house, reconfiguration of entry points, addition of a rooftop air conditioning unit, and installation of a security door. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location:  □ Not for Publication  ■ Unrestricted

□ USGS 7.5' Quad:  Chico  Date:  1978  T 22N; R E; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 27; Mount Diablo B.M.

c. Address: 615 Brice Avenue  City:  Zip:  
d. UTM: Zone:10S ; 598457.14 m E/ 4398588.33 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth

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

APN. 003-130-010-000. The subject property is located on the south side of Brice Avenue between the CSU Chico campus to the west and Warner Street to the east.

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

The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1951 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a cross-hipped roof with composition shingles. The northwest (main) elevation presents as three sections. A left (northern) section projects approximately 4 feet forward from the main body of the house and is clad in stucco. This section features a single-car-width garage, a recessed central section distinguished by a partial-width broad entry porch that is clad with vertically oriented wooden siding, and a right (western) section projecting approximately 6 feet from the central section that is clad in stucco. The integral porch has a concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by a single step, with wooden posts supporting the roof. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular and contains a single-car-width sectional garage door, a wood frame tripartite window featuring a fixed central pane flanked by sidelights, an entry door with a side light, and a set of three aluminum-frame horizontal slider windows in the western projection.

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

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

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Main Elevation (view to southwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3414

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

1951 (Butte County Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded:  7/5/2017

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none.”) Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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 #: 615 Brice Avenue

*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

615 Brice Ave
Chico, CA

*Required information
B1. Historic Name:  
B2. Common Name:  
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence  
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence  

B5. Architectural Style: Ranch  

B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)  
Constructed in 1951 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: original building permit for a one-story wood and stucco house with an attached garage in 1951 (CCBP #262); plumbing and sewer permit for one toilet, one basin, one bath, one sink, and one tray in 1951 (CCBP #241); electrical permit for new dwelling 6 circuits, 16 switches, 13 outlets, meter, and #12 wire in 1951 (CCBP #4783); construction of the roof and north and west walls on the patio with wood frame and stucco with dimensions of 15 X 20 ft. in 1953 (CCBP #1341); installation of a water heater in 1957 (CCBP #710); replacement of the furnace in 1965 (CCBP #5139); electrical permit for a new meter in 1979 (CCBP #9235); replacement of the shake roof in 1984 (CCBP #5033); and reroof with composition shingles in 2002 (CCBP #B02-395). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include replacement windows, replacement front entry door, and replacement garage door.  

B7. Moved? □ No □ Yes □ Unknown Date:  
B8. Related Features:  
B9a. Architect: Unknown  
B9b. Builder: Unknown  

B10. Significance: Theme: Property Type: Area:  
Period of Significance:  
Applicable Criteria: N/A  

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:  
- 1952–1963 – James and Thelma Bachand, sergeant for the Chico Police Department  
- 1965 – Philip and Kristen Mast, student  
- 1966–1978 – George Bachand, retired  
- 1979 – Betty French  
- 1984 – Barbara Stanley, DDS, dentist  
- 2002 – Michael and Kristene Wagner  

Based on archival research, it appears that the early owners of the house also occupied the house. However, more recent City directories and building permits suggest that the house was likely a rental property for California State University Chico students and was no longer owner-occupied starting in 1990.

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References:  
See continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:  

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder  
Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

See Continuation Sheet

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible on the map. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there is increased development in the area, but there is no building on the parcel associated with 615 Brice Avenue. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The 1969 aerial photograph indicates additional development in the area, including the parcel associated with 615 Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1951 date of construction. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).
Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)**

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

**NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:**

**Criterion A/1 (Events)**

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.
Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For this reason, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch Style. The subject property was constructed in 1951 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, use of large picture windows, variety of cladding, asymmetry in the façade), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement roof, replacement windows, replacement garage door, and replacement entry door. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion C/4 (Information Potential)
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria:

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch style single-family residence constructed in 1951. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement roof, replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement garage door. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: There have been numerous alterations to the house that have compromised the property’s material integrity, including roof replacement, window replacement, door replacement, and garage door replacement. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of, setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location: [ ] Not for Publication  ■ Unrestricted

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Chico  
date: 1978  
c. Address: 615 La Vista Way  
d. UTM: Zone:10S; 598420.80 m E/4398658.78 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth  
e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation: APN. 003-120-016-000. The subject property is located on the south side of La Vista Way between the CSU Chico campus to the west and Warner Street to the east.

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

The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto La Vista Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan with horizontal wood siding and a cross-hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles and featuring a decorative scallop trim below the fascia. The northwest (main) elevation presents as two sections: a left (northeast) section set back approximately 4 feet from the central block of the house that features a single-car-width garage, and a central block of the house that contains the offset main entrance. The front entrance is located beneath a shed roof extension and sits atop a concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by two steps. The porch roof is supported by one wooden knee bracket. The other bracket appears to be missing, which is causing structural failure of the porch roof. Fenestration across the primary elevation is irregular and contains a single-car-width sectional garage door, paired one-over-one vinyl replacement windows, a replacement paneled entry door with divided fanlight detail, and two paired one-over-one replacement windows.

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

*P4. Resources Present: ■Building  □Structure  □Object  □Site  □District  □Element of District  □Other (isolates, etc.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Main Elevation (view to southeast), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3348

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

1947 (Butte County Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico  
400 West First Street  
Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA  
38 North Marengo Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded: 7/5/2017

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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):
*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

615 La Vista Way
Chico, CA
B1. Historic Name: La Vista Way
B2. Common Name: 615 La Vista Way
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence

*B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Constructed in 1947 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: construction of an addition measuring 9 X 12 ft. to the kitchen for use as a breakfast nook in 1955 (CCBP #257), erection of a television antenna in 1956 (CCBP #204), an upgrade to the electrical system in 1957 (CCBP #23), sewer repairs in 1984 (CCBP #5024), roof repairs in 1984 (CCBP #2061), removal and replacement of the composition shingle roof in 1996 (CCBP #96-00237), an upgrade to the electrical system in 1998 (CCBP #98-00030), replacement of the HVAC unit in 2000 (CCBP #00-00981), and sewer lateral repair in 2012 (CBPP #413706). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement garage door.

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

*B8. Related Features:

*B10. Significance: Theme: Property Type: Applicable Criteria:
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:

- 1948 – C.E. and Thelma Nicklett, salesman
- 1952 – Carl and Ethel Duley, principal of Hooker Oak School
- 1955 – Earl Perry
- 1956–1969 – Harry E. and Jesse Wilson, employee of Pac Telephone
- 1970–1978 – Sam S. Simmons
- 1984 – Joe and Noel Collura
- 1996–2000 – Kristen Swigart

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
*B15. Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there is increased development in the area, including a rectangular building on the parcel associated with 615 La Vista Way, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon's analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City's growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life o

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and
development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to as Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For this reason, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.
Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, hipped roof, minimal detailing at the roofline), the building exhibits substantial alterations, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement garage door, and replacement roofing. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property's history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity:
Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement garage door, and replacement roofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.
Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement garage door, and replacement roofing. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location:  □ Not for Publication   ■ Unrestricted   *a. County: Butte
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
  *b. USGS 7.5’ Quad: Chico   Date: 1978   T 22N; R E; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 27; Mount Diablo B.M.
  c. Address: 616 Brice Avenue
  d. UTM: Zone:10S ; 598431.20 m E/ 439827.41 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth
  e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:

APN. 003-130-005-000: The subject property is located on the north side of Brice Avenue between the CSU Chico campus to the west and Warner Street to the east.

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

The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1946 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is roughly rectangular in plan with a hipped roof covered with composition shingles. The building is clad in stucco with brick wainscoting on the lower half of the southeast (main) elevation. The southeast (main) elevation features an offset to the east integral porch located in a short recess, which is flanked by the other two sections of the façade that feature irregular fenestration. The integral porch has a painted concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by two steps. The fenestration across the elevation is irregular and contains a one-over-one replacement window with false grilles, a large three-light window, a paneled entry door, and a one-over-one replacement window with false grilles. There is also a brick chimney that pierces the roof. A one-story, single-car-width garage is located south of the main house and is accessed via a concrete driveway.

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

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

*P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Main Elevation (view to northwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3402

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: □Historic
□Prehistoric    □Both 1946 (Butte County Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)
Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded: 7/5/2017

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none.”) Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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 #: 616 Brice Avenue

*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

616 Brice Ave
Chico, CA

*Required information
B1. Historic Name: 
B2. Common Name: 
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence  
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence  
*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch  
*B6. Construction History:  
Built in 1946 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: a plumbing and sewer connection permit in 1951 (CCBP #217), electrical permit for clothes dryer in 1953 (CCBP #5292), 12 X 18 ft. addition to the rear of house in 1956 (CCBP #623), construction of a 17 X 24 ft. roof patio in 1956 (CCBP #623), construction of a 9 X 15 ft. addition to the side of the garage in 1956 (CCBP #623), sewer work from 1964 to 1965 (CCBP #3123 and CCBP #3306), installation of composition roofing in 1984 (CCBP #5300), and reroofing with composition roofing in 1992 (CCBP #B1146). The only observed alteration to the house is replacement vinyl windows on all visible elevations.

*B7. Moved?  ■ No  □ Yes  □ Unknown  Date:  
Original Location:  
*B8. Related Features: 
B9a. Architect: Unknown  
B9b. Builder: Unknown  
*B10. Significance:  
Theme:  
Property Type:  
Applicable Criteria: N/A  
(Period of Significance:  
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.))

Archival research found the following people associated with the property: 
• 1948–1952 – T.J. and Margaret Broedlow, manager of Zellerbach Paper Company  
• 1953–1970 – Paul G. Jones, campus barber  
• 1984 – Paragon Property Management  
• 1992 – Mike Costanza

Based on archival research, it appears that the early owners of the house also occupied the house. However, more recent City directories and building permits suggest that the house was likely a rental property for CSU Chico students and was no longer owner-occupied starting in the mid-1980s.

See Continuation Sheet

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)  
B13. Remarks:  
*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder  
*Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17  

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)  
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there was increased development in the area, but the subject property is not visible due to tree coverage and poor image quality. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:
Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.
Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For this reason, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1946 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, variety of cladding, asymmetry in the façade), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1946. The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement roofing, replacement windows, and replacement entry door. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including roof replacement, window replacement, and door replacement. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of, setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
PRIMARY RECORD

Other Listings
Review Code
Reviewer
Date

Page 1 of 8

*Required information

Resource Name or #: 628 Brice Avenue

P1. Other Identifier:
P2. Location: ⮕ Not for Publication ⮕ Unrestricted

a. County: Butte

b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Chico

d. Address: 628 Brice Avenue

c. Address: 628 Brice Avenue

d. UTM: Zone:10S ; 598392.36 m E/ 4398607.16 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth

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

APN. 003-130-003-000. The subject property is located on the north side of Brice Avenue between the CSU Chico campus to the west and Warner Street to the east.

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

The subject property is minimal Ranch-style, exhibiting characteristics of both Minimal Traditional and Ranch style, single-family residence built in 1948 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is roughly rectangular in plan, with stucco cladding and a cross-gabled roof covered with composition shingles. The front-facing gable is filled with horizontal wood siding and contains a louvered vent. The southeast (main) elevation presents as two sections: a left (southern) section distinguished by a partial-width broad entry porch, and a right (eastern) section projecting approximately 4 feet. The integral porch consists of a painted concrete slab accessed by a front walkway and three concrete steps. The porch’s overhanging eave is supported by three 4 X 4 in. painted wood posts. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular, consisting of a two-over-two wood frame window, a large tripartite picture window with a central pane surrounded by multiple lights, a simple wooden entry door located at the easternmost edge of the porch, and a two-over-two wood frame window that features wooden board and batten shutters. The front yard of the house is circumscribed by a white picket fence, and there is a concrete driveway located to the south.

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

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 #)

Main Elevation (view to northwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_397

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

1948 (Butte County Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded: 7/5/2017

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none.”)

Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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 #: 628 Brice Avenue

*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

628 Brice Ave
Chico, CA
NRHP Status Code: 6Z

Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): 628 Brice Avenue

B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence
B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Ranch-style
B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
   Constructed in 1948 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property:
   - Television antenna in 1953 (CCBP #199)
   - Multiple requests from 1963 to 1971 to the city for filling in holes caused by construction (CCBP #s 405, 3296, 7788, 6500)
   - Replacement gas service in 1981 (CCBP #103400)
   - Installation of composition roofing in 1986 (CCBP #B7988)
   - Electrical service upgrade in 1995 (CCBP #C95-01161)
   - An addition and remodel of a room and bathroom in 2001 (CBPP #C01-00733). The only observed alteration to the house is a replacement entry door on the main elevation.

B7. Moved? ■No □Yes □Unknown Date: Original Location:
B8. Related Features:
   B9a. Architect: Unknown
       b. Builder: Unknown

B10. Significance: Theme: Property Type: Applicable Criteria: N/A
   (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:
   • 1950–1958 – Helen Rahe, secretary
   • 1960–1962 – Mack McConnelly
   • 1963 – James Martin, teacher at Chico State
   • 1964–1970s – Ed McConnley, retired
   • 1975 – Julio Medina, builder
   • 1986–1990s – Alan Miller
   • 2001 – Tom Patty

Based on archival research, it appears that the early owners of the house also occupied the house. However, more recent City directories and building permits suggest that the house was likely a rental property for CSU Chico students and is no longer owner occupied.

See Continuation Sheet

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


B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
*Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(source: Google Earth)

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*B10. Significance (Continued):

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there is increased development in the area, but there is no building on the parcel associated with 628 Brice Avenue. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The 1969 aerial photograph indicates additional development in the area, including the parcel associated with 628 Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1948 date of construction. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935–1950)

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional
homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to as Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:
Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property is minimal Ranch-style, exhibiting characteristics of both Minimal Traditional and Ranch style, single-family residence built in 1948 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roof, asymmetry in the façade) and is relatively unaltered on the exterior, the building is an unremarkable and an ubiquitous example of a minimal Ranch-style residence with elements of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture seen throughout the United States, and does not warrant consideration as an individual property. Further, the subject property is not eligible as a contributor to a historic district, since the surrounding neighborhood contains modest examples of altered Ranch-style and Minimal Traditional style residences. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential): There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.
California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a minimal Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1948. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first nor last minimal Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common minimal Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the minimal Ranch style, but cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement roof and replacement entry door. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including roof replacement and door replacement. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):
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P1. Other Identifier:

*Resource Name or #:* 629 La Vista Way

P2. Location: [ ] Not for Publication  ■ Unrestricted

*County:* Butte

**b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Chico

**Date:** 1978  T 22N;  R E;  \(\frac{1}{4}\) of \(\frac{1}{4}\) of Sec 27; Mount Diablo B.M.

c. **Address:** 629 La Vista Way

d. **Section:** 10S; 598396.24 m E/ 439842.36 m N (G.P.S.) Google Earth

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

APN: 003-120-015-000. The subject property is located on the north side of La Vista Way between the CSU Chico campus to the west and Warner Street to the east.

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

The subject property is an altered Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto La Vista Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan with horizontal wood siding and a cross-hipped roof covered with composition shingles. The northwest (main) elevation presents as three sections: a left (eastern) section set back approximately 4 ft. from the main body of the house accessed by a concrete driveway, a central section with an entry porch in the cross-hip roof, and a right (western) section projecting approximately 4 ft. from the central section. The porch has a painted concrete slab foundation and is accessed from a front walkway by a single step, with a single 4 X 4 in. wooden post supporting the roof. The porch also features a simple wood railing and raked detailing on the fascia. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular and consists of a replacement entry door in the eastern recessed section, a one-over-one wood frame window, a large fixed picture window with diagonal wooden shutters, a paneled main entry door, and a two-over-two wood frame window on the right projection.

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

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

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Main Elevation (view to southeast), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3351

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: ■ Historic  □ Prehistoric  □ Both

1947 (Butte County Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico

400 West First Street

Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA

38 North Marengo Avenue

Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded: 7/5/2017

P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2017)

*Required information*
Resource Name or #: 629 La Vista Way

Map Name: Chico

Scale: 1:24,000

Date of Map: 1978

629 La Vista Way
Chico, CA

*Required information
B1. Historic Name: 
B2. Common Name: 
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence  
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence  
*B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional  
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations) 
Constructed in 1947 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBP's) were found for the property: TV antenna in 1953 (CCBP #10), reroof with composition shingles in 1995 (CCBP #1995), and electrical work in 1999 (CBPP #1999-00171). There is also an encroachment permit with no permit number from 2002 that indicates sewer work was completed. Other observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include replacement windows, replacement door, and addition of a rooftop HVAC unit.

*B7. Moved? ☐No ☑Yes ☐Unknown Date:  
*B8. Related Features:  
B9a. Architect: Unknown 
b. Builder: Unknown  
*B10. Significance: Theme:  
Period of Significance:  
Property Type:  
Applicable Criteria:  
(Describe importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:  
• 1948 – J.J. and Phyllis Neves, baker  
• 1950–1956 – Henry A. and Phyllis Clough, postal carrier  
• 1957 – Julia Wainscott, secretary at Chico State  
• 1958 – Elwun P. and Hazel Milhorn, engineer  
• 1960–1961 – Lester Anderson  
• 1962–1970 – Henry Clough, field claim representative for Farmers Insurance  
• 1975–1978 – Dennis German, welder  
• 1985 – Jeff Huber  
• 1990 – Mike Francis, student  
• 1995–1999 – Francis Stanley Allen

See Continuation Sheet

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)  
*B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

*B13. Remarks:  

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder  
*Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)  
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)

DPR 523B (1/95)  
*Required information
*B10. Significance (Continued):

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there was increased development in the area, and construction activity at 629 La Vista Way suggests that the house was in the process of being built, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

> A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

> A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)**

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

**NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:**

**Criterion A/1 (Events)**

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.
Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, hipped roof, minimal detailing at the roofline), the building exhibits substantial alterations, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement roofing, and addition of a rooftop air conditioning unit. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement roofing, and addition of a rooftop air conditioning unit. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as indicated when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, replacement roofing, and addition of a rooftop air conditioning unit. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.
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The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto Stadium Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan with horizontal wood siding and gabled roof covered in composition shingles. The single-car garage contains a low-pitched front-gabled roof with narrow eaves clad in composition shingles. The garage is connected to the main house via a short breezeway. The left (southern) section is recessed approximately 6 feet from the main body of the house that is distinguished by an entry door with concrete stoop. The center section projects approximately 4 feet forward and is distinguished by an integral covered porch. The right (northeastern) section is slightly recessed from the projection and features a set of paired windows. The front door is oriented perpendicular to the main elevation, facing south onto the porch. The floor of the porch is concrete and is accessed from a front walkway, with two 4 X 4 in. painted wood posts supporting the roof. Fenestration across the primary elevation is irregular, containing a modern entry door, a one-over-one wood window, a large tripartite picture window with a fixed center pane flanked by two sliding windows, and a set of paired single lite windows.
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Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2017)
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*Resource Name or #: 630 Stadium Way

*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978
B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence

*B5. Architectural Style: Ranch

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Constructed in 1947 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBP) were found for the property: constructed of a 9 X 14 ft. addition to rear of house in 1950 (CCBP #9969); construction of an addition to the end of the garage in 1950 (CCBP #9969); construction of a television antenna in 1954 (CCBP #00446); construction of a television antenna in 1955 (CCBP #74); kitchen remodel with movement of a window and addition of drain board in 1955 (CCBP #307); plumbing work in 1956 (CCBP #449); addition of family room, addition of a serving room, and modifications to a bathroom in 1956 (CCBP #961); construction of an addition in 1957 (CCBP #702); addition of a swimming pool in 1959 (CCBP #2266); remodel in 1966 (CCBP #2557); a reroof in 1981 (CCBP #1225); repairs due to fire damage in 1981 (CCBP #1366); electrical work in 1988 (CCBP #7949); sewer lateral repair in 1999 (CCBP #411075); and a reroof with composition shingles in 2005 (CCBP #05-00224). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include replacement windows and door.
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(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:
- 1948 – Evelyn McKenzie
- 1950–1958 – Earl and Wandalee Dohrn, service station manager and Dohrn’s Shell Service
- 1990 – Corbs Gorath, student
- 2005 – Frederick and Jessalyn Gorath
- 2007 – Robert Ciapponi

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

*B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
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Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there is increased development in the area, including an irregular shaped residence on the corner of Warner Avenue and Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction for 630 Stadium Way. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, since the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

> A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

> A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

### Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

### NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

**Criterion A/1 (Events)**

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

**Criterion B/2 (Persons)**

*DPR 523L (1/95) Required information*
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Only one name warranted further research: William Henry Hutchinson (also known as “Old Hutch”). See Section 2.2, above, for more information.

Following NRHP Guidance for Criterion B (Boland n.d.; NPS 1990), it is important to first assess the importance of Old Hutch in relation to the historic context. Archival research reveals that Hutchinson is significant within the local context of CSU Chico, with a period of significance from 1960 to 1976. This period captures the time when he lived at residence, his tenure as a full-time professor at CSU Chico, and publication of perhaps his most important book. For the subject property to be eligible under this criterion, it must be shown that Hutchinson gained importance while occupying the subject property.

Permit records and City directories confirm that Old Hutch lived at the residence on Stadium Way from at least 1960 through 1976, although it is very likely that he lived at the home until at least 1978 when he retired as a professor. This is further evidenced by the fact that the next owner did not occupy the property until 1980. Research indicates that his time at the subject property overlaps some of his most important contributions to Chico and CSU Chico. Hutchinson was a professor of California and Western History at CSU Chico from 1953 through 1978 (he became a full-time professor beginning in 1964). He earned his Master’s Degree in History from CSU Chico in 1961. In 1965, he was voted “Best Californian” by the Common Wealth Club. Hutchinson received the Chico State Distinguished Teacher Award in 1968, and was labeled an Outstanding Professor in the CSU system in 1977. His Pulitzer Prize-nominated book Oil, Land, and Politics: The California Career of Thomas R. Bard was published in 1966 (Watkins et al. 1990).

Hutchinson also authored numerous books prior to his residency at Stadium Way, including his 1946 edits to a collection of previously unpublished works by Eugene Manlove Rhodes, The Little Waddies. Hutchinson edited other writings of Rhodes, including The Rhodes Reader (1957) and The Line of Least Resistance (1958). Hutchinson completed his first biography on Rhodes in 1956, titled A Bar Cross Man.

It is also necessary to ascertain the length of time and nature of Hutchinson’s association with the subject property. Old Hutch lived at the subject property from at least 1960 through 1976 (very likely until 1978), and he continued to live in Chico until his death in 1990. The subject property was his primary residence during that time, and he shared it with his wife Esther Ethel Ormsby (1908–1990), also known to locals as “Red.” City directories from 1960 and 1976 verify that Old Hutch and Red lived at the subject property. Census records also provide a timeline of Hutchinson’s other residences throughout his life, including his home in Denver, Colorado (beginning with his birth in 1911); a short stint in Eastland, Texas, in the 1920s; a return to Denver in the 1930s; working as a chief purser on passenger vessels during the Great Depression; serving as a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Maritime Service during World War II (California State Library 1998); and a residence in San Francisco, California, in the 1940s (although he was at sea for several years). After his time at the subject property, he moved to another residence in Chico in 1980 located at 1611 Spruce Avenue, north of CSU Chico. In consideration of Hutchinson’s productive life as a writer and a professor, the subject property is the most relevant.

Hutchinson’s local significance is more closely aligned with the recent history of CSU Chico than any broader associations with the City of Chico. Although Hutchinson lived at the subject property during his time as a professor and writer, the property itself does not convey his importance to CSU Chico, nor can it be directly tied to his important publications. Although Hutchinson published arguably his most important work while living at the subject property, this significance is not conveyed by the property. It is also unknown where Hutchinson did most of his writing and research. Further, none of the local historians or faculty interviewed about the Hutchinson house drew any important connections between the man and the property. Further, after his retirement, CSU Chico dedicated the courtyard between Trinity Hall and Kendall Hall in his honor on June 11, 1979. Labeled with wooden signage as “W.H. Hutchinson/Old Hutch’s Plaza,” the plaza is a place strongly associated with Hutchinson, as students and faculty have fond memories of him sitting on a specific bench in the courtyard enjoying the environment or chatting with students (CSUC 2016). An off-campus residence such as the subject property is less closely associated with his important contributions to CSU Chico and his work as a respected local historian and author.

The subject property itself has integrity issues. Although the subject property’s exterior retains requisite integrity to the period of significance, the property’s interior has been altered since Old Hutch and Red occupied it. It appears that the Hutchisons added a swimming pool to the property when they first moved in, and remodeled the home in 1966. Building permit research indicates that repairs had to be made to the home after a fire in 1981, although the extent of interior repair/alteration is unclear.
In consideration of the information presented here, it does not appear that the subject property meets the high burden of proof required under this criterion, as Hutchinson’s important contributions as a professor and writer are much more closely aligned with the CSU Chico campus than the off-campus home he shared with his wife. Further, the subject property does not contain specific features or elements that convey Old Hutch’s significance, and its integrity has been altered since the couple vacated it. Finally, the home has not been identified as important by the local historians and faculty who knew him. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, asymmetry in the façade, gabled roofline), the building exhibits alterations, including replacement windows, replacement door, and replacement roofing. The result is an altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. As discussed in consideration of NRHP/CRHR Criterion B/2, W.H. Hutchinson’s important contributions as a CSU Chico professor and writer are much more closely aligned with the CSU Chico campus than the off-campus home he shared with his wife. Further, the subject property does not contain specific features or elements that convey his significance, and its integrity has been altered since the property was vacated by the Hutchinsons in the late 1970s. Finally, the home has not been identified as important by the local historians and faculty who knew him. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
City of Chico Criteria:

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have compromised its integrity of design, including replacement windows, replacement door, and replacement roofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. However, the surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by CSU Chico development, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including replacement windows, replacement door, and replacement roofing. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no important associations with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.
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Resource Name or #: 725 Warner Street

P1. Other Identifier:
*P2. Location:  [ ] Not for Publication  [ ] Unrestricted
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
  *[a. County]: Butte
  *[b. USGS 7.5' Quad]: Chico
  *[c. Address]: 725 Warner Street
  *[d. UTM]: Zone: 10S; 598483.95 m E / 4398599.74 m N (G.P.S.)
  *e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
     Elevation: APN. 003-130-011-000. The subject property is located on the corner of Brice Avenue and Warner Street.

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
   The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1950 facing onto Warner Street. The one-story building is irregular in plan with horizontal wood siding and a cross-hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles. The northeast (main) elevation presents as three sections: a left (eastern) section that is part of the central block of the house, a center projection that projects approximately 6 ft. from the central block of the house and is distinguished by large corner windows, and a right (north) section that is part of the central block of the house and is distinguished by a partial-width broad entry porch. The integral porch has a concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by a single step, with three 4 X 4 in. wooden posts supporting the roof. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular and contains a corner window on the east side of the elevation, two corner windows in the projection, an entry door with side light, and a tripartite picture window consisting of a single fixed pane with multiple side lights. All windows are wood framed.

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

*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 #) Main Elevation (view to southwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3571

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  [ ] Historic  [ ] Prehistoric  [ ] Both
   1950 (Butte County Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:  CSU Chico
   400 West First Street
   Chico, CA 95929

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)
   Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
   38 North Marengo Avenue
   Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded:  7/5/2017

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2017)

*Attachments:  [ ] 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):
*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

725 Warner St
Chico, CA

*Required information
B1. Historic Name: 725 Warner Street
B2. Common Name: 725 Warner Street
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence

B5. Architectural Style: Ranch

B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Constructed in 1950 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: request for inspection for building, plumbing, and electrical in 1959 (CCBP #2145); request for gutter inspection in 1962 (CCBP #401553); construction of patio cover over existing patio slab in 1982 (CCBP #4917); request for a building footing inspection in 1982 with no permit number; installation of new built-up roof with tar and gravel in 1991 (CCBP #523); reroof with composition shingles in 1995 (CCBP #94-02737); reroof of garage in 1997 (CCBP #97-01381); multiple sewer repairs in 2001 (CCBP #s 411410 and 01-01114); upgrade to electrical panel in 2001 (CCBP #01-01530); and replacement of riser in 2009 (CCBP #09-02164). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include replacement windows and entry door.

B7. Moved? □ No  □ Yes  □ Unknown  Date: Original Location:

B8. Related Features:
B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Unknown

B10. Significance: Theme: Property Type: Applicable Criteria:
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:

- 1952–1956 – Pollard and Holis Nuner, employee of East Del Mar Motel
- 1957–2000s – Fred Lucchesi, accountant

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates that there is increased development in the area, but there is no building on the parcel associated with 725 Warner Street. By 1947, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, Stadium Way, and La Vista Way are visible. The 1969 aerial photograph indicates additional development in the area, including the parcel associated with 725 Warner Street, which is consistent with the 1950 date of construction. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information because the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References: See Continuation Sheet
B13. Remarks:
B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).
The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.
Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1950 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, asymmetry in the façade, use of large picture-style windows), the building exhibits substantial alterations, including replacement windows, a replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1950. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria:
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity:
Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.
Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by CSU Chico development, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

The property has no direct links to important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References (Continued):


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location:  ■ Unrestricted

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

The subject property is a single-family residence built in 1939 facing onto Warner Street. Due to extensive alterations to the residence, the original architectural style cannot be determined. The one-story building is irregular in plan with replacement horizontal wood siding and a hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles. The northeast (main) elevation presents as two sections: the central block of the house, which features an offset entry point, and the right (northern) section, which features a large brick exterior eave wall chimney and is recessed approximately 4 feet from the central block of the house. The main point of entry features a poured concrete stoop clad with brick veneer and is accessed from a front walkway and curved two steps. The front entry is also accented by brick veneer detailing at-grade flanking the entry door and under a fixed wood frame picture window. Fenestration across the elevation is irregular and contains a one-over-one wood frame window, a simple wood entry door, the large picture window, and another window that is largely obscured by a tree on the north side of the house.

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

HP2. Single Family Property

*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 #)

Main Elevation (view to southwest), 7/5/17, Photo # IMG_3558

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:  □ Historic

□ Prehistoric

□ Both

1939 (Butte County Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico

400 West First Street

Chico, CA 95929

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

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA

38 North Marengo Avenue

Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded:  7/5/2017

P10. Survey Type:  (Describe)

Intensive

P11. Report Citation:  (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.")

Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 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):
*Map Name: Chico

*Scale: 1:24,000

*Date of Map: 1978

899 Warner St
Chico, CA
B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name:
B3. Original Use: Single-family residence
B4. Present Use: Single-family residence
*B5. Architectural Style: Altered beyond recognition
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
   Constructed in 1939 (Butte County Assessor). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: electrical work in 1957 (CCBP #943); removal and replacement of old window sash in 1960 (CCBP #2861); repairs to composition shingle roof in 1973 (CCBP #8501); removal and replacement of existing siding on the house and garage in 1986 (CCBP #7989); replacement of windows in 1986 (CCBP #7989); electrical work, including new wiring in walls and new box, in 1986 (CCBP #8399); reroof with composition shingles in 1987 (CCBP #9457); and installation of a Payne heating and cooling unit in 1987 (CCBP #9497). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include a replacement entry door, addition of brick veneer detailing, and reconfiguration of openings on the main elevation.
*B7. Moved? □ No □ Yes □ Unknown Date:
*B8. Related Features:
   B9a. Architect: Unknown
   b. Builder: Unknown
*B10. Significance: Theme: Area:
   Period of Significance: Property Type: Applicable Criteria:
   (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Archival research found the following people associated with the property:

• 1940–1980 – Van and Alice Normoyle
• 1985–1987 – Sharon Wallace

Van Normoyle had a variety of occupations according to archival research, including salesman, manager of the Park Hotel, and restaurateur.

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder
*Date of Evaluation: 7/5/17

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)
Source: Google Earth

(This space reserved for official comments.)
A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1969, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, and 2012. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. Poor image quality resulted in limited information about the subject property, which should be visible in 1941 given its 1939 date of construction. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates additional development in the area, including a building located on the parcel associated with 899 Warner Street. The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information because the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.
The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017). Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

Criterion A/1 (Events)
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2 (Persons)
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3 (Architecture)
To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1939 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although it is likely that the subject property was originally constructed as a Ranch-style house, all character-defining features of any architectural style have been lost. The result it is a heavily altered and unremarkable example of a vernacular residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):
There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
The subject property is a modest and heavily altered vernacular single-family residence that was constructed in 1939. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States during World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or the last vernacular residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
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Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common vernacular house that was popular throughout the United States in the years during World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of a particular style. It is heavily altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**City of Chico Criteria:**
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

**Integrity:**

**Location:** The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

**Design:** The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement siding, entry reconfiguration, replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

**Setting:** Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. However, the surrounding area’s integrity was compromised by CSU Chico development, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized (NETR 2017). Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus.

**Materials:** Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including replacement siding, entry reconfiguration, replacement windows, replacement entry door, and replacement roofing. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** Alterations made to the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood have impacted the building’s ability to convey its historic sense of post–World War II residential development in Chico. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

Chico City Directories Various Years.


State of California  The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

PRIMARY RECORD
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P1. Other Identifier: __________

*P2. Location:  ■ Not for Publication  □ Unrestricted
   *a. County Butte and
   *b. USGS 7.5’ Quad Chico Date 1948 (PR 1978) T 22N; R 1E; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M. DB.M.
   c. Address 621 Brice Avenue (APN 003-130-009-000) City Chico Zip 95926
   d. UTM: Zone 10S, 598433 mE/ 4398572 mN
   e. Other Locational Data: Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.25 miles then turn right on Brice Avenue. Subject property is on south side of Brice Avenue and is the third property on the block.

*P3a. Description:
The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is relatively regular in plan, with stucco cladding and a cross-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. A composition shingle front-gabled two-car-width garage is detached from the main house to its south and is accessed by a poured concrete driveway.

See Continuation Sheet

*P3b. Resource Attributes:  HP2: Single Family Property

P5a. Photograph or Drawing

*P4. Resources Present:  ■ Building
   □ Structure  □ Object  □ Site  □ District  □ Element of District  □ Other
   P5b. Description of Photo: Main Elevation of 621 Brice Avenue; View Facing Southwest; IMG 8061

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:  ■ Historic  □ Prehistoric
   □ Both
   1947 (Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:  CSU Chico
   400 West 1st Street
   Chico, CA 95929

*P8. Recorded by:  Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
   38 N. Marengo Avenue
   Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded:  8/28/2018

*P10. Survey Type:  Intensive Pedestrian Survey

*P11. Report Citation:  Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project
   California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).

*Attachments:  ■ NONE  □ Location 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): ________

DPR 523A (9/2013)  *Required information
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1947, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: pour slab for patio and cover, 20' x 15' in 1960 (CCBP #2701); request to the city from property owners from 621 and 627 Brice for the area between the driveways of the two properties be painted to indicate a legal parking area in 1973 (CCBP #1031, service request); repair sewer lateral, plumbing permit in 1983 (CCBP #3096); upgrade electric service in 1997 (CCBP #97-00896); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the alteration of windows, replacement of front door and garage door.

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:
- P.J. Merlo and Leone, Chico Wood Products Co, 1948-1952
- Claude E. Pope and Mina H. Pope, 1953-1959
- John K. Potter and Mildred S., agent California Western Life Insurance, 1960-1978
- P. Collins, student, 1979-1981
- Cathy Falconer, student 1981-1982
- Kathy Sweeney, 1982-1985

See Continuation Sheet
*P3a. Description:

The northwest (main) elevation presents as three sections: a center recessed integral porch flanked on its left (northern) and right (western) by projecting front-facing gables which extend approximately 6 feet forward from the main body of the house. The left (northern) section contains a louvered vent below the roofline and a tripartite window featuring a fixed central pane flanked by sidelights with two small horizontal louvered vents below each sidelight. The center integral porch has a painted poured concrete slab foundation accessed from a front concrete walkway by two steps, supported by two vertical 4x4 in. posts with squared wooden bases. The fenestration within the porch (I to r): vinyl tripartite window featuring a fixed central pane and two sidelights centered on the northwest elevation, and a half-glass one-leaf entry door on the eastern elevation. The right (western) section’s fenestration is irregular with a small one-over-one window to the left (north), a louvered vent below the roof line, and a tripartite window featuring a fixed central pane and two sidelights off center with two small horizontal louvered vents below. The southwestern elevation features irregular fenestration of three one-over-one windows. Both the rear (southeastern) and left (northeastern) elevations were inaccessible for proper photo documentation.

*B10. Significance:

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including a rectangular residence half-way down on Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction for 621 Brice Avenue. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in
1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935–1950)**

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further
incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico. Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to as Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a
growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

**Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

**Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.**

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roof, minimal detailing at the roofline), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors as well as replacement of the original garage door. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

**California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance**

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common
residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define
integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors and replacement of the garage door. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and replacement of the garage door. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Minimal Traditional-style residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or...
workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:
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**Resource Name or #:** 622 Brice Avenue

**P1. Other Identifier:**

*Resource Name or #:* 622 Brice Avenue

**P2. Location:** ■ Not for Publication □ Unrestricted

a. County: Butte

b. USGS 7.5’ Quad Chico Date 1948 (PR 1978) T 22N ; R 1E ; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M DBM.

c. Address: 622 Brice Avenue (APN 003-130-004-000) City Chico Zip 95926

d. UTM: Zone 10S, 598413 mE/ 4398614 mN

e. Other Locational Data: Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.25 miles then turn right on Brice Avenue. Subject property is on north side of Brice Avenue and is the third property on the block.

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

The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1951 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is relatively regular in plan, with stucco cladding and a low-pitched side-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. A one-story, two-car-width garage is located north of the main house and is accessed via a poured concrete driveway to the left (west) of the front elevation. The garage has a front-facing gable which is filled with horizontal wood siding and stucco below. The garage doors are also clad with horizontal wood siding. See Continuation Sheet

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** HP2: Single Family Property

**P4. Resources Present:** ■ Building

□ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other

**P5a. Photograph or Drawing**

**P5b. Description of Photo:** Main Elevation of 622 Brice Avenue; View Facing Northwest; IMG 8083

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:** ■ Historic □ Prehistoric □ Both

1951 (Assessor)

**P7. Owner and Address:**

CSU Chico
400 West 1st Street
Chico, CA 95929

**P8. Recorded by:**

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 N. Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

**P9. Date Recorded:**

8/28/2018

**P10. Survey Type:** Intensive Pedestrian Survey

**P11. Report Citation:** Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).

*Attachments: NONE □ Location 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):
B1. Historic Name: 622 Brice Street

B2. Common Name: 622 Brice Avenue

B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence

B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence

B5. Architectural Style: Ranch

B6. Construction History:
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1951, the original building permit stipulates the construction of a new dwelling and garage per application of a “new single family dwelling 6 room and bath and half bath as per plans. Also 20x22 garage on rear of lot”. Materials listed on the application for building permit are as follows: Exterior walls (stucco), Roof (cedar shake), Interior walls (plaster), 1 story, 25'6 CC 62 length with 1660 square feet (CCBP #145). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: electrical permit character of the work described as new switch 2-55 MB in 1951 (CCBP #4714); permit for erection of TV antenna in 1954 (CCBP #332); reroof in 1966 (CCBP #5405); a/c installation in 1979 (CCBP #A 2177); City Provisions regulating home occupation. Nancy Steadal applied for business name listed as Calif. Arts and Crafts Guild and listed the nature of the business as newsletter service in 1981 (CCBP #n/a); reroof in 1981 (CCBP #1082); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the alteration of windows, replacement of front door, and addition of bay window on southeast elevation.

B7. Moved? ☒No ☐Yes ☐Unknown Date: ____________________ Original Location: ____________

B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect:

B9b. Builder:

B10. Significance: Theme __________________________ Area __________________________

Period of Significance __________________________ Property Type __________________________ Applicable Criteria __________________________

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References:
See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA
Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*P3a. Description:

The main entrance to the house is located on the southeast elevation and is sheltered beneath a full-width porch with exposed rafters which is repeated on the rear (northwest) elevation. The main (southeastern) elevation’s porch consists of brick with no additional steps and is supported by five sets of vertical 4x4 in. paired wood posts. The fenestration across the elevation is irregular (l to r): an angled bay window with a picture window in the center flanked by two one-over-one windows, a single-leaf main entry door, and two pairs of one-over-one windows. The northeastern elevation’s fenestration is semi-regular with two pairs of one-over-one windows with three small vents below. The side-facing gable is filled with horizontal wood siding with stucco below and a louvered vent. The rear (northwestern) elevation presents as three sections. An integral porch supported by two 4x4 in. vertical wood posts on a brick foundation with a single-leaf entry door obscured by a security door and a one-over-one window. A center section extends out approximately 6 feet from the main building with a one-over-one window. An additional integral porch on the right (west) side is supported by one wood 4x4 in. vertical post and a half-height brick wall which terminates onto a brick patio. The fenestration features (l to r): a pair of one-over-one windows, a horizontal sliding window, and pair of French entry doors. On the western end of the brick patio is remnants of a brick cooking pit. The southwest elevation features a pair of one-over-one windows, a brick chimney which is two feet higher than the roof peek, and a gas meter.

*B10. Significance:

According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1951, the original building permit stipulates the construction of a new dwelling and garage per application of a “new single family dwelling 6 room and bath and half bath as per plans. Also 20x22 garage on rear of lot”. Materials listed on the application for building permit are as follows: Exterior walls (stucco), Roof (cedar shake), Interior walls (plaster), 1 story, 25’6 CC 62 length with 1660 square feet (CCBP #145). The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: electrical permit character of the work described as new switch 2-55 MB in 1951 (CCBP #4714); permit for erection of TV antenna in 1954 (CCBP #332); reroof in 1966 (CCBP #5405); a/c installation in 1979 (CCBP #A 2177); City Provisions regulating home occupation. Nancy Steadal applied for business name listed as Calif. Arts and Crafts Guild and listed the nature of the business as newsletter service in 1981 (CCBP #n/a); reroof in 1981 (CCBP #1082); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the alteration of windows, replacement of front door, and addition of bay window on southeast elevation. Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

• Francis J. and Nordis J. Schuster, chiropractor at 341 Broadway, 1952-1959
• Paul W. Henry and Barbara, district sales manager TelCo, 1950-1960
• Mrs. Mary J. Norgren, office manager York Chico Co, 1961-1972
• Rev. Paul Forman and Marti, pastor Community Congregational Church, 1973-1975
• Heather Heaslip, student, 1976
• Cindy M. Adams, student, 1977-1979
• Kim Bernatchy, student, 1980
• Tracey Butler, student, 1981
• H. Skadal, no occupation listed, 1982
• Claire Pittman, student, 1983
• Robert Andoe and Claire P., construction worker, 1984-1985
A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, although the rectangular sapped residence at 622 Brice Avenue does not appear until the 1952 aerial photograph which is consistent with the construction date of 1951. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their store fronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or
trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time,
the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1951 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, use of large picture windows, integral full-length porch), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of original windows and doors, reroofing, the addition of a bay window on the southeast (main) elevation and the alteration of the northwest elevation. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

**California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance**

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

**The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).**

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1951. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors, alterations to primary elevations, reroofing and change of original materials. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of
setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and reroofing with a modern material. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Ranch-style residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present. In addition, the alteration to the buildings main elevation (southeastern) with a bay window disrupts the traditional appearance of a Ranch-style house. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier: ____________

P2. Location: 
- Not for Publication
- Unrestricted
a. County: Butte and Chico
b. USGS 7.5’ Quad: Chico
   Date: 1948 (PR 1978)
   T 22N; R 1E; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M.D.M.
c. Address: 627 Brice Avenue (APN 003-130-008-000)
   City: Chico
   Zip: 95926

d. UTM: Zone 10S, 598412 mE/ 4398564 mN

e. Other Locational Data: Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.25 miles then turn right on Brice Avenue. Subject property is on south side of Brice Avenue and is the fourth property on the block.

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a side-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles and a small brick chimney. Exterior walls are clad in stucco. The northwestern (main) elevation presents as three sections. The left (northern) section projects approximately 6 feet forward from the main body of the house and features a single-car-width garage accessed by a poured concrete and gravel driveway. See Continuation Sheet

P3b. Resource Attributes: HP2: Single Family Property

P5a. Photograph or Drawing

P4. Resources Present: 
- Building
- Structure
- Object
- Site
- District
- Other
Element of District: Other

P5b. Description of Photo: Main Elevation of 627 Brice Avenue; View Facing Northwest; IMG 8045

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: Historic
- 1947 (Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address:
CSU Chico
400 West 1st Street
Chico, CA 95929

P8. Recorded by:
Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 N. Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded: 8/28/2018

P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian Survey

P11. Report Citation: Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project
   California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).

Attachment: NONE

Required information
**Resource Name or #**  627 Brice Street  
**NRHP Status Code**  6Z

| B1. Historic Name: |  
| B2. Common Name: | 627 Brice Avenue |  
| B3. Original Use: | Single Family Residence |  
| B4. Present Use: | Single Family Residence |  
| B5. Architectural Style: | Minimal Traditional |  
| B6. Construction History: | 
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1947, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: construction 6' fence from left rear corner of dwelling to rear existing fence and from right front corner to existing fence, wood fence in 1952 (CCBP #657); permit for television antenna in 1953 (CCBP #135); request to the city from property owners from 621 and 627 Brice for the area between the driveways of the two properties be painted to indicate a legal parking area in 1973 (CCBP #1031, service request); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the alteration of garage door, reroof, and addition of security door.  
| B7. Moved? | No |  
| B8. Related Features: |  

| B9a. Architect: |  
| b. Builder: |  
| B10. Significance: | Theme |  
| Area |  
| Period of Significance |  
| Property Type |  
| Applicable Criteria |  

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was predominately owned and occupied by Farnum S. Howard listed in the directories as vice-principal and dean of Chico High School. The only other names that were associated with the house was J.W. Morse, listed as John W. and his wife Christine C. Morse whose occupation was noted as salesman for the Parker Hardware Store and owned the property from 1948 till 1949. The property was owned by Mr. Howard from 1950 until 1985.  

**See Continuation Sheet**  

| B11. Additional Resource Attributes: |  
| B12. References: |  
| See Continuation Sheet |  

| B13. Remarks: |  
| B14. Evaluator: | Sarah Corder, MFA |  
| *Date of Evaluation:* | 8/28/2018 |  

(This space reserved for official comments.)
The center section is distinguished by a partial-width broad entry porch with a painted poured concrete slab foundation accessed from a front walkway by two steps with metal railing on either side. The porch is held up by two 4x4 in. vertical wooden posts and features irregular fenestration of a tripartite window with a center fixed window flanked by three-paned sidelights and a single-leaf entry door obscured by a security door. The right (western) section features a one-over-one window with wooden shutters on both sides and two louvered vents. The house’s southwestern elevation features two one-over-one windows with four small louvered vents below. Access to the rear (southeast) elevation was restricted. The northeastern elevation features irregular fenestration (l to r): a one-over-one window, a gas meter, a one-over-one window, a single-leaf side entry door, an electric meter, and a one-over-one window with two louvered vents below.

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including the single-family home located at 627 Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the recorded construction date of 1947. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in
the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)**

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.
Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to as Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible
under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roof, minimal detailing at the roofline, emphasis on practicality in design), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including the addition of a security door, reroofing, and replacement of the original garage door. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region
of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.
The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion
Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of the original garage door, the addition of a security door and reroofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Several alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material
integrity, including the addition of a security door, replacement of the original garage
door, and reroofing with composition shingles. All of these alterations introduced new
materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore,
the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s
skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations
to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple
residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of
the original single-family residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density
greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer
present. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore,
the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL
designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting,
feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or
workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to
warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.
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The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1947 facing onto Brice Avenue. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a cross-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles and a small brick chimney. Exterior walls are clad in stucco. The northwestern (main) elevation presents as two sections. The left (northern) section displays a concrete partial-width broad entry held up by three 4x4 in. vertical wooden posts. See Continuation Sheet
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*Required information
B1. Historic Name: 633 Brice Avenue
B2. Common Name: 633 Brice Avenue
B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence
B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence
B5. Architectural Style: Ranch
B6. Construction History:
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1947, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: plumbing permit for installation of dishwasher in 1954 (CCBP #830); reroof in 1981 (CCBP #1187); detached garage-demolition in 1990 (CCBP #3557); on site sewer line repair in 2000 (CCBP #00-01468); encroachment permit for repair sewer lateral in 2000 (CCBP #411226); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the replacement of the front door and window and the addition of a ramp.

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

B8. Related Features:


B10. Significance: Theme ____________________________ Area ____________________________

Period of Significance ______________ Property Type ______________ Applicable Criteria ____________

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References:
See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA
Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018
**P3a. Description:**

The fenestration is irregular featuring (l to r): a one-over-one window with false panes and two wooden shutters, a large tripartite picture window with false panes surrounded by two sidelights with false panes and wooden shutters, and a simple single-leaf entry door. The right (western) section extends approximately five feet from the main building and features a front-gable filled with horizontal wood siding and contains a louvered vent. The fenestration is irregular with a small single pane window and a one-over-one window with false panes and wooden shutters. Extending from the southwest elevation is a poured concrete ramp which extends up to the main (northwestern) entrance, also accessed by three concrete steps with metal handrails from a concrete path leading from the pedestrian sidewalk. The southwest and rear (southeast) elevations were not accessible for proper photo documentation. To the east of the main building is a small shed with a cantilevered roof. The northeast elevation features irregular fenestration (l to r): three one-over-one windows, a one-over-one window with false panes, and four small louvered vents below. Within the space between the roof’s eave and the main (northwestern) elevation is vertical wood siding.

**B10. Significance:**

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- L.G. Chrysler Jr. and Jean, no occupation listed, 1950-1951
- G.E. Carr and Dorothy R., Chico Granite and Marble Works, 1952
- Bruce C. Ogilvie and Martha, City Planning Commission member and Chico State College teacher, wife Martha, librarian at Chico State College, 1955-1957
- Marion F. Kay and Bruce C. Ogilvie, Marion F. Kay and Greeta listed as D N D Enterprises, Bruce is not listed in occupations section, 1958-1960
- Marion F. Kay, listed as Marion F. and Greeta, cabinetmaker Victor Industries, 1961-1964
- John Fimple and Elizabeth, truck driver lessen Kraft meats, 1966-1970
- Mrs. Suzy Lanford, Program Development Center, 1972
- Susan McCall, no occupation listed, 1974
- Janet Lombardi, student, 1975
- Sandy Otterbeck, salesclerk Mervyns, 1977-1978
- Nancy Jones, student, 1979
- Dona Brookshire, nurse, 1980

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including 633 Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).
By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017;
Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)**

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

**NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:**

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the
following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

**Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.**

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

**Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

**Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.**

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1947 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, use of large picture windows, integral porch), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors as well as the addition of a ramp and the removal of the original garage. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district.
For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

**California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance**

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

**The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).**

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1947. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.**

The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

**Location**: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

**Design**: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors, reroofing, the addition of a ramp to the main elevation, and the demolition of the original detached garage. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

**Setting**: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

**Materials**: Multiple alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors, the addition of a concrete ramp and reroofing. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the
subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Ranch-style residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present. In addition, the major alterations to the primary elevation has eliminated the majority of elements that contribute to the building being the Ranch-style. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:*


Chico City Directories Various Years.
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**Resource Name or #:** 855 Warner Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** □ Not for Publication  □ Unrestricted

a. **County:** Butte

b. **USGS 7.5' Quad Chico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1948 (PR 1978)</th>
<th>T 22N</th>
<th>R 1E</th>
<th>NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M.D.B.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. **Address:** 855 Warner Street (APN 003-120-012-000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>95926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. **UTM:** Zone 10S, 598416 mE/ 4398716 mN

e. **Other Locational Data:** Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.15 miles, subject property is on the west.

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

The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1940 with an effective date of 1950, facing onto Warner Street. The one-story building is irregular in plan, with a side-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles with an HVAC and brick chimney located on the roof. Exterior walls are clad in stucco.

**Resource Attributes:** HP2: Single Family Property

**Resources Present:** ■ Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other

**Date Constructed/Age and Source:** 1940 (Assessor)

**Owner and Address:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Chico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 West 1st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico, CA 95929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recorded by:**

| Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA |
| 38 N. Marengo Avenue |
| Pasadena, CA 91101 |

**Date Recorded:** 8/28/2018

**Survey Type:** Intensive Pedestrian Survey

**Report Citation:** Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project
California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).

**Attachments:** NONE □ Location 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 #**  855 Warner Street  
**NRHP Status Code**  6Z

B1. Historic Name:  
B2. Common Name: 855 Warner Street  
B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence  
B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence  

*B5. Architectural Style:* Minimal Traditional

*B6. Construction History:*  
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1940, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: request for inspection for permit 5860 for sewer work, inspection made 5/3/55 in 1955 (CCBP #5860); application for radio and television antenna in 1957 (CCBP #279); remove 2-small windows replace with 1-large plate glass window in 1960 (CCBP #2704); "sanitary sewer problem" city service request in 1966 (CCBP #4287, service request); electrical permit for service upgrade in 1981 (CCBP #1388); reroof in 1996 (CCBP #96-01009); reroof in 1997 (CCBP #97-01091); encroachment permit for drop box in 1998 (CCBP #410775); replace water heater in 1998 (CCBP #98-00945); new front porch in 1998 (CCBP #98-01008); conversion of garage to storage to correct code violation in 1999 (CCBP #99-00854); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP #414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the replacement of several windows, the front door and the installation of a large HVAC unit on the roof.

*B7. Moved?* ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown  

*B8. Related Features:*  

*B9a. Architect:*  
*b. Builder:*  

*B10. Significance:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Period of Significance  

Property Type  

Applicable Criteria  

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References:*  

See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator:* Sarah Corder, MFA  
*Date of Evaluation:* 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*P3a. Description:

The northeast (main) elevation presents as four sections. The left (eastern) section displays a one-over-one window with false grills and louvered shutters. The second section is distinguished by a partial-width broad entry porch supported by five wooden posts accessed by a single step concrete walkway featuring a tripartite window with a fixed central pane flanked by sidelights with false grills and louvered shutters. The central section is within the entry porch and extends approximately three feet from the main building and is accessed from two concrete steps to the southeast and three concrete steps from the northeast and contains the single-leaf main entry door with a decorative surround of dentil molding and two pilasters, and a security door with two oval openings. The right (northern) section is on the same plane as the entry and contains a one-over-one window with false grills and louvered shutters. The northwest elevation displays two one-over-one windows and a louvered vent. The rear (southwest) elevation presents as four sections. The farthest west contains a one-over-one window. The second section projects approximately four feet from the main building and displays a small one-over-one window. The center section projects approximately six feet from the main house and displays semi-regular fenestration along its northwest and southwest elevations of one-over-one windows, the southeast elevation of this section was not available for photo documentation. The furthest right (south) section of this elevation displays a half-glass single-leaf entry door accessed by a concrete walkway and four concrete stairs, a small one-over-one window, and a brick chimney. The northwest elevation contains two one-over-one windows. At the southwest corner of the property is a two-car-width garage with horizontal wood siding and a sliding glass door on the northwest elevation.

*B10. Significance:

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- Mrs. Lillian H. Hartman, no occupation listed, 1945-1947
- Wesley and Naomi Hetherington, 1948-1949
- Jas. A. and Marjorie Hertherington, 1950-1960
- Mrs. Buena Hetherington, wid. Wesley, 1961-1965
- Leslie Perkins and Marguerite B., field manager delta industries, 1966-1969
- Rev. Raymond P. Squire and Jean, 1971
- Fred and Marian Morgan, 1975-1978
- Verna L. Jules, retired, 1979
- Gregory Carpenter, student, 1980
- Craig Willis, 1981
- Mark Robertson, student, 1982-1983
- Ann Robertson, student, 1984-1985

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few structures on Warner Avenue. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the surrounding area, including the development of Warner Street. The aerial also shows a building on 855 Warner Way, which is consistent with the 1940 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up and by the 1980s was almost completely built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).
By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).
Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)
The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.
Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1940 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roof, rectangular shape in plan), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors, the addition of a large HVAC unit to the roof, as well as reroofing and the demolition of all adjacent buildings. The result is an altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.
Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1940. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria
City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors, reroofing, the addition of a large HVAC unit on the roof and the alteration of the original porch. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Multiple alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and reroofing with composition shingles, also the adding of a modern HVAC which disrupts the original roof line. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.
Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of all surrounding single-family Minimal Traditional-style residences around the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be viewed which is no longer present with empty lots on either side of the property. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.


*P2. Location: □ Not for Publication □ Unrestricted

a. County Butte

b. USGS 7.5' Quad Chico Date 1948 (PR 1978) T 22N ; R 1E ; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M.D.B.M.

c. Address 847 Warner Street (APN 003-120-017-000) City Chico Zip 95926

d. UTM: Zone 10S , 598440 mE/ 43988667 mN

e. Other Locational Data: Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.20 miles, subject property is on the west.

*P3a. Description:
The subject property has been altered beyond recognition, but was likely a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1940 facing onto Warner Street. The one-story building is ell-shaped in plan, with an exposed rafter cross-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior cladding includes vertical wood siding and stucco. The northeast (main) elevation presents as three sections.

See Continuation Sheet

*P3b. Resource Attributes: ◐ HP2: Single Family Property

*P4. Resources Present: □ Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other

*P5a. Photograph or Drawing

*P5b. Description of Photo: Main Elevation of 847 Warner Street; View Facing Southwest; IMG 8125

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: ■ Historic □ Prehistoric □ Both

1940 (Assessor)

*P7. Owner and Address:

CSU Chico
400 West 1st Street
Chico, CA 95929

*P8. Recorded by:

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
38 N. Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

*P9. Date Recorded: 8/28/2018

*P10.
B1. Historic Name: 847 Warner Street
B2. Common Name: 847 Warner Street
B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence
B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence
B5. Architectural Style: Altered beyond recognition
B6. Construction History:
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1940, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: remove and replace existing driveway approach in 1971 (CCBP #404726); reroof in 1978 (CCBP #A 0176); reroof in 1987 (CCBP #8666); repair sewer lateral and replace sidewalk (CCBP #409694); electrical permit for upgrade of service in 1991 (CCBP #113); plan check filed for conversion of space to storage in 1996 (CCBP Plan Check #96-01021); reroof in 2004 (CCBP #04-00753); letter sent out to owners from the City regarding fire damage at 847 Warner Street noting that a City Inspector will arrange a time to meet and review the damage to the property in 2007 (CCBP #2667 code violation); Dun-Rite Excavating Inc. filed for shoulder and sidewalk closure in 2018 (CCBP # 414688). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the replacement of several windows, the front door and the porch railings.

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

B8. Related Features:


B10. Significance: Theme ___________________________ Area ___________________________
Period of Significance ________________ Property Type ________________ Applicable Criteria ________________

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References: ___________________________
See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks: ___________________________

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA
Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
Property Name: 847 Warner Street

**P3a. Description:**

The farthest left (north) portion of the elevation is distinguished by a two-car-width garage with metal doors and a small roof peek extension clad in horizontal wood board. The second section features a breezeway identified by vertical board and batten siding, a square opening with wood latticework, and a small entry gate. The third section of the house is sided in horizontal wood board and features irregular fenestration consisting of an eight-over-eight window, a small roof peek clad in horizontal siding with a louvered vent, and the main entry with a single-leaf door obscured by a security door, which is accessed by two red tile stairs. The fourth section of the building is recessed five feet and features a 16 paned picture window. The farthest to the right (west) section is on the same plane as the main portion of the house and features one eight-over-five window and a louvered vent within the front-facing gable. The building’s southwest and rear (southeast) elevations were not accessible for proper photo documentation. The northeast elevation features horizontal wood siding and one small vent.

**B10. Significance:**

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- Walter and Dorothy Grunberg, grocer, 1945-1947
- Grace M. Carrigan (wid L.R.), 1948-1973
- Dave Withrow, 1974-1977
- Ford Michaels, student, 1978
- Paul Johnstone, 1979
- Rob Salisbury, student, 1980
- Kurt Anderson, student, 1981
- David Maur, student, 1983-1985

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few structures on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the surrounding area, including 847 Warner Way, which is consistent with the 1940 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up and by the 1980s was almost completely built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.
Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).
Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935–1950)

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment
of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

**Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

**Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.**

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1940 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roofline, use of cost effective materials), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors, replacement of the porch, reroofing and the demolition of all adjacent buildings. The result is an altered and unremarkable example residence that was likely a Minimal Traditional style home at one time. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.
In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

**The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).**

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1940. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.**

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**City of Chico Criteria**

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

**Integrity Discussion**

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period.
of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors, reroofing and alteration of the main elevation’s porch railing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Multiple alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and reroofing with composition shingles, and the replacement of the porch’s railings with new wood. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of all surrounding single-family Minimal Traditional-style residences around the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was
originally intended to be experienced which is no longer present. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.


**Resource Name or #:** 612 Stadium Way

### P1. Other Identifier:

- **Trinomial NRHP Status Code:** 6Z

### P2. Location:

- **County:** Butte
- **USGS 7.5’ Quad:** Chico
- **Address:** 612 Stadium Way (APN 003-120-008-00)
- **UTM:** Zone 10S, 598362 mE/ 4398757 mN
- **Other Locational Data:** Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.15 miles then turn right on Stadium Way. Subject property is on north side of Stadium Way.

### P3a. Description:

The subject property is a Ranch-style, single-family residence built in 1939 facing onto Stadium Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a cross-hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior walls are clad in stucco. The southeastern (main) elevation presents as three sections. The left (southern) section features a tall horizontal sliding window with three vents below. On the same plane, the center block of the house is distinguished by a partial-width broad-entry porch.

See Continuation Sheet

### P3b. Resource Attributes:

- **HP2:** Single Family Property

### P4. Resources Present:

- **Building**
- **Structure**
- **Object**
- **Site**
- **District**
- **Element of District**
- **Other**

### P5a. Photograph or Drawing

See Continuation Sheet

### P5b. Description of Photo:

Main Elevation of 612 Stadium Way; View Facing Southeast; IMG 7836

### P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:

- **1939 (Assessor)**

### P7. Owner and Address:

- **CSU Chico**
  - 400 West 1st Street
  - Chico, CA 95929

### P8. Recorded by:

- **Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA**
  - 38 N. Marengo Avenue
  - Pasadena, CA 91101

### P9. Date Recorded:

- **8/28/2018**

### P10. Survey Type:

- **Intensive Pedestrian Survey**

### P11. Report Citation:

- **Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project**
  - California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).

### Attachments:

- **NONE**
- **Location 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):**
B1. Historic Name:  
B2. Common Name: 612 Stadium Way  
B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence  
B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence  
B5. Architectural Style: Ranch  
B6. Construction History: 

According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1939, but no original building permits or permits for alterations were available for the property. Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the alteration and replacement of windows, the addition of a security door, reroofing, and the addition of a large HVAC unit on the roof.

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

B8. Related Features: 


B10. Significance: Theme ___________________________ Area ___________________________

Period of Significance ___________________________ Property Type ___________________________ Applicable Criteria ___________________________

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was predominately owned and occupied by E.W. Clark, listed as Earl W. and Fay Clark, whose occupation was listed as a meat cutter at the Chico Meat Company from its construction in 1940 until 1985 when the city directories were no longer available.

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References: See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks: 

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA  
Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*P3a. Description:

The integral porch has a painted poured concrete slab foundation accessed from a concrete front walkway by a single step, with three wood 4x4 in vertical posts supporting the roof with vertical wooden scalloped details on either end of the porch’s overhang. The center section’s fenestration includes (l to r): a single-leaf entry door obscured by a security door and two horizontal sliding windows. The right (east) section of the house projects approximately 2 feet from the central building and features two vents and a squared bay window with a small hipped-roof and exposed rafters. Within the bay window are three one-over-one windows and two wooden shutters featuring a raised biomorphic design. The northeast elevation features irregular fenestration (l to r): a horizontal sliding window, a single-leaf side door under a pentice roof which is held up by two vertical 4x4 in. wooden posts and is approached by two concrete steps accessed from a concrete and grass driveway, a one-over-one window, and an additional sliding window. To the north of the main building is a two-car-width garage with a hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles, wood siding and wooden sliding doors. The rear (northwestern) elevation was not accessible for proper photo documentation. The southwest elevation is distinguished by one sliding window and two one-over-one windows flanking a large brick chimney which rises approximately three feet above the roof peak. A large HVAC unit is mounted in the center of the roof.

*B10. Significance:

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including 612 Stadium Way, which is consistent with the 1939 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).
Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)

The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families.
Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico.
following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

**Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

**Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.**

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style. The subject property was constructed in 1939 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch style (i.e., one story in height, use of large picture windows, asymmetry in the façade), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including the replacement of the majority of the original windows, reroofing, and the addition of a large HVAC to the roof. The result is a relatively altered and unremarkable example of a Ranch-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

**California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance**

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

*The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).*
The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Ranch-style single-family residence constructed in 1939. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Ranch-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Ranch style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain
integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

**Location:** The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

**Design:** The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have compromised its integrity of design, including the replacement of original windows, reroofing, and the disruption of the roofline with an HVAC unit. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

**Setting:** Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

**Materials:** Numerous alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including reroofing with asphalt shingles and the replacement of wooden windows with modern ones. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Ranch style residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or
workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey, Evaluation, Registration, and Preservation of Cultural Resources. How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.</th>
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State of California & The Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION  
PRIMAR Y RECORD  
*Resource Name or #:  623 Stadium Way  
P1. Other Identifier:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

P2. Location:  
- Not for Publication  
- Unrestricted  

a. County: Butte  
b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Chico  
   Date: 1948 (PR 1978)  
   T 22N; R 1E; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M.D.B.M.  
c. Address: 623 Stadium Way (APN 003-120-010-000)  
   City: Chico  
   Zip: 95926  
   UTM: Zone 10S, 598375 mE/ 4395715 mN  
e. Other Locational Data: Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.15 miles then turn right on Stadium Way. Subject property is on south side of Stadium Way.  

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)  
The subject property has been altered beyond recognition, but was likely built as Ranch or Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1940 facing onto Stadium Way. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a complex roof form sheathed in composition shingles and exposed rafters. The exterior is clad in horizontal wood and vertical board and batten siding. The northwest (main) elevation presents as five sections. From the building’s far left (northern) corner to the main entry stairs is a partial-width broad-entry porch which is held up by four 4x4 in. vertical T-shaped wooden posts and two double wooden posts at the corners, which all sit on a red tile foundation and is accessed by a red tile walkway. See Continuation Sheet.  

*P3b. Resource Attributes:  
- HP2: Single Family Property  

*P4. Resources Present:  
- Building  
- Structure  
- Object  
- Site  
- District  
- Element of District  
- Other  

*P5a. Photograph or Drawing  

*P5b. Description of Photo:  
Main Elevation of 623 Stadium Way; View Facing Southeast; IMG 7841  

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:  
- Historic  
- Prehistoric  
- Both  
1940 (Assessor)  

*P7. Owner and Address:  
Foster Robert W. Revocable Trust et al.  
4239 Daybreak Lane  
Sacramento CA 95821  

*P8. Recorded by:  
Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA  
38 N. Marengo Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91101  

*P9. Date Recorded:  
8/28/2018  

*P10. Survey Type:  
Intensive Pedestrian Survey  

*P11. Report Citation:  
Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project  
California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).  

*Attachments:  
- NONE  
- Location 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):  

*Required information
**B1.** Historic Name: 623 Stadium Way

**B2.** Common Name: 623 Stadium Way

**B3.** Original Use: Single Family Residence

**B4.** Present Use: Single Family Residence

**B5.** Architectural Style: Altered beyond recognition

**B6.** Construction History:

According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1940, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: application for erection and repair of television antenna with a 5' mast in 1953 (CCBP #216); reroof with composition shingles in 1956 (CCBP #771); patio cover and place aluminum cover on existing trellis support on house and beam and posts in 1960 (CCBP #2667; encroachment permit "to put drop box at end of Stadium way" in 1971 (CCBP #404778); reroof (patch) existing structure in 1975 (CCBP #10079); 8 1/2 square comp reroof in 1991 (CCBP #783); repair on site sewer line in 1996 (CCBP #96-00168); encroachment permit for septic system/ sewer work in 1998 (CCBP #410868); move gas meter in 1999 (CCBP #9-00157); repair to sewer line in 1999 (CCBP #98-02065). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the replacement of several windows and the front door.

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

**B8.** Related Features:

**B9a.** Architect: b. Builder:

**B10.** Significance: Theme ___________________________ Area ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Significance</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Applicable Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**See Continuation Sheet**

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

**B12.** References:

**See Continuation Sheet**

**B13.** Remarks:

**B14.** Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA

**Date of Evaluation:** 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
**P3a. Description:**

The farthest left (north) portion of the elevation is distinguished by a two-car-width garage with metal doors and a small roof peek extension clad in horizontal wood board. The second section features a breezeway identified by vertical board and batten siding, a square opening with wood latticework, and a small entry gate. The third section of the house is sided in horizontal wood board and features irregular fenestration consisting of an eight-over-eight window, a small roof peek clad in horizontal siding with a louvered vent, and the main entry with a single-leaf door obscured by a security door, which is accessed by two red tile stairs. The fourth section of the building is recessed five feet and features a 16 paned picture window. The farthest to the right (west) section is on the same plane as the main portion of the house and features one eight-over-five window and a louvered vent within the front-facing gable. The building's southwest and rear (southeast) elevations were not accessible for proper photo documentation. The northeast elevation features horizontal wood siding and one small vent.

**B10. Significance:**

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- Charles and Leslie H. Creech, Clinical Laboratory and Butte County Milk and Dairy Inspector, 1945-1956
- Norman A. and Zuola M. Foster, clerk at Chico State College, 1946-1969
- Eug and Pat Tapie, 1970-1971
- Mrs. Zola Foster, listed as Wid. Norman, 1971-1974
- Ralph V. and Zuda M. Ganyon, salesman for Johnson's shoes, 1975-1985

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed by residential or commercial buildings, with the exception of a few structures on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the surrounding area, including 623 Stadium Way, which is consistent with the 1940 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up and by the 1980s was almost completely built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county's population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.
Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

**Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935-1950)**

The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing
needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

• One story in height
• Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
• Double-hung, multi-lite windows
• Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
• Wooden shutters with cutout features
• Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
• Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
• Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
• Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
• Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
• Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

Ranch Style (c. 1935–1975)
The Ranch house is a style of architecture that was popular starting in the 1930s and fell out of popularity by the 1980s. In the 1930s and early 1940s, the Ranch house was part of the Small House movement that was brought into fashion by the Federal Housing Administration. Like the Minimal Traditional house, the Ranch house could be constructed quickly and use modern materials that could be mass-produced. The style provided an easy option for large-scale housing tracts during the 1930s and 1940s to meet the needs of relocated war-effort workers and those of soldiers returning home and starting families. Following the war years, a new era of prosperity brought about a departure from the Small House movement, and the Ranch house became a popular house type throughout the late 1940s through the 1970s (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).

The Ranch house of the 1930s and 1940s maintained similar characteristics to newer versions, but small lot sizes in housing tracts made the concept of the rambling Ranch house almost impossible. In the 1950s, post-war prosperity combined with increased lot sizes made the larger and more recognizable Ranch house possible. The ability of the Ranch house to exist in different sizes and arrangements made it one of the most popular house choices throughout the United States across multiple social classes (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015).
Key characteristics of the Ranch style of architecture are the following (Gottfried and Jennings 2009; Hess 2004; McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs constructed with a low pitch and moderate overhang
- Offset entry points causing asymmetry in the façade
- Focus on horizontal and rambling forms
- Focus on informality
- Entry points are typically placed under the roof overhang on the façade
- Use of large picture-style windows on the façade
- Variations on the eave overhang, typically boxed eaves or exposed rafter tails, or the less-common boxed rafters
- Large chimneys
- Variety of exterior cladding, including brick and stone
- Attached garage, typically incorporated into the façade
- Front and rear yards
- Large rectangular blocks as the basis for plan design, as simply rectangular or a combination of rectangular blocks to create L, U, and T shapes

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with
significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style and the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1940 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Ranch and Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, rectangular in plan, simple roofline), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors as well as reroofing several times. The result is heavily altered residence that is no longer recognizable to an architectural style. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest and heavily altered example of what was likely a Ranch or Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1940. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Ranch-style or Minimal Traditional style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Ranch-style or Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of any architectural style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of the property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.
Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors and reroofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Multiple alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and reroofing with composition shingles. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Ranch-style residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present, particularly the demolition of the buildings directly to the property’s north. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

'B12. References:
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**P2. Location:**  ■ Not for Publication  □ Unrestricted

a. **County:** Butte

b. **USGS 7.5’ Quad:** Chico  **Date:** 1948 (PR 1978)  **T:** 22N ; **R:** 1E ; **NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; **M.D.B.M.

c. **Address:** 909 Warner Street (APN 003-120-007-000)  **City:** Chico  **Zip:** 95926

d. **UTM:** Zone 10S , 598378 mE/ 4398772 mN

e. **Other Locational Data:** Take the 99 North and exit on East 1st Avenue. Take East 1st Avenue for approximately 1.5 miles, turn left on Warner Street and continue for approximately 0.12 miles, subject property is on the west.

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

The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1938, facing onto Warner Street. The one-story building is L-shaped in plan, with a cross-hipped roof sheathed in composition shingles with a large HVAC unit in the center. Exterior walls are clad in stucco.

See Continuation Sheet

**P3b. Resource Attributes:**  HP2: Single Family Property

**P4. Resources Present:**  ■ Building  □ Structure  □ Object  □ Site  □ District  □ Element of District  □ Other

**P5a. Photograph or Drawing**

**P5b. Description of Photo:** Main Elevation of 909 Warner Street; View Facing Southwest; IMG 7973

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:**  ■ Historic  □ Prehistoric  □ Both  **1938 (Assessor)**

**P7. Owner and Address:**

CSU Chico

400 West 1st Street

Chico, CA 95929

**P8. Recorded by:**

Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA

38 N. Marengo Avenue

Pasadena, CA 91101

**P9. Date Recorded:**  **8/28/2018**

**P10. Survey Type:** Intensive Pedestrian Survey

**P11. Report Citation:** Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018).
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B1. Historic Name: 909 Warner Street

B3. Original Use: Single Family Residence

B4. Present Use: Single Family Residence

B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional

B6. Construction History:

According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1938, but no original building permits or permits for alterations were available for the property. Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates includes the addition of a large HVAC unit on the roof, replacement windows and shutters, replacement front door, and the addition of a semi-circular stoop overhang.

B7. Moved? ❋ No ❋ Yes ❋ Unknown

Date: ______________ Original Location: ___________

B8. Related Features:


B10. Significance: Theme __________________________ Property Type: ______________ Area: ______________

Period of Significance: ______________ Applicable Criteria: ______________

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned by G.T. Warrick, listed as George T and Grace, from 1940 until 1964. Mr. Warrick worked for the Chico Glass Company for the entirety of the time he occupied 909 Warner Street. Other occupants of the residence included students Mildred Erbin (1965), Alden and Marie Hinds (1966), Peter Salvato (1971), Michel Stinson (1981-82) and Jeff Williams (1983). In addition, in 1972 Jean Vaughan with no occupation listed and Keffer in 1976 with no other information listed. All other available years were either vacant or no listing.

See Continuation Sheet

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

B12. References:

See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA

Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*P3a. Description:

The main (northwestern) elevation presents as two sections. The left (eastern) contains a picture window with two shutters and an half-round entry-porch accessed by a concrete walkway and two concrete steps. Below a semi-circular porch overhang is a single-leaf main entry door with a small diamond paned window. The right (northern) section projects approximately eight feet from the main house and displays irregular fenestration of a horizontal sliding window with two shutters on the southeastern elevation and a large picture window with two shutters on the northeastern elevation. The house’s northwestern elevation displays irregular fenestration consisting of (I to r): a horizontal sliding window with two shutters, a smaller horizontal sliding window, a half-glass single-leaf entry door sheltered by a pentice roof with two 4x4 in. vertical wooden posts, and a window which could not be properly identified through photos. The rear (southwestern) elevation consists of a gas meter, a horizontal sliding window, a small one-over-one window and a horizontal sliding window. The southeast elevation features three irregularly placed horizontal sliding windows flanked by two shutters. At the property's southern corner facing onto Stadium Way is a one-car-width garage with a hipped-roof clad in composition shingles and stucco cladding.

*B10. Significance:

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Street including 909 Warner Street which is consistent with the date of construction on 1938. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts.
Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.
Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style and Minimal Traditional. The subject property was constructed in 1938 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., small scale, little amount of detailing, simple windows and roofline), the building exhibits very simple detailing and is an unremarkable example of the style. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.
Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest example of a Minimal Traditional single-family residence constructed in 1938. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.
City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building has been substantially altered with the addition of a large HVAC unit on the roof, replacement of windows and shutters, replacement of the front door, and the addition of a semi-circular stoop overhang which have altered the overall appearance of the building. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Several alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the introduction of a new HVAC unit and replacement windows, doors and shutters. These alterations introduced new materials to the subject property
that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building are not seen due to the nature of the architectural style. Minimal Traditional residences were intended to be minimal with little detailing and were quickly constructed, therefore the presence of workmanship integrity does not exist in conjunction with the amount of alterations to the building.

**Feeling:** The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple single-family Minimal Traditional residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.
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**P3a. Description:**

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

The subject property is a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence built in 1941 facing onto Warner Street. The one-story building is regular in plan, with a side-gabled roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior walls are clad in vertical and horizontal wood siding. See Continuation Sheet
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917 Warner St
Chico, CA
B1. Historic Name: 917 Warner Street

B2. Common Name: 917 Warner Street


*B5. Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional

*B6. Construction History:
According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1941, but no original building permits or permits for alterations were found. Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates include the replacement of several windows, the front door and reroofing.

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

*B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect: __________________________  Builder: __________________________

*B10. Significance: Theme __________________________  Area __________________________

Period of Significance __________________________  Property Type __________________________  Applicable Criteria __________________________

See Continuation Sheet

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

*B12. References:
See Continuation Sheet

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA
   Date of Evaluation: 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
**P3a. Description:**

The main (northeastern) elevation is distinguished by vertical siding and a full-length entry porch which is supported by four 4x4 in. vertical wooden posts with a painted poured concrete foundation. The fenestration across the main elevation (l to r) includes a six-over-one window with two board and batten shutters, an eight-over-one window with two board and batten shutters, a single-leaf main entry door obscured by a security door, an eight-over-one window with two board and batten shutters, and a six-over-one window with two board and batten shutters. The northwest elevation displays horizontal siding and irregular fenestration of a one-over-one window with an AC unit, a horizontal sliding window, a smaller horizontal sliding window, a one-over-one window, and a louvered vent below the gable end. To the west of the main building is a two-car-width garage with a front-facing gable sheathed in composition shingles and clad in horizontal wood siding. The rear (southwest) and southeast elevations were not available for proper photo documentation.

**B10. Significance:**

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- Mrs. Ione Dahl, listed as wid. Julian, clerk, 1962
- Mrs. Mildred Dahl, 1963-1973
- Steven Ricca, 1974
- Phil Dicks, 1975
- Wm. Dutter, student, 1976
- Shelia Kane, student, 1977-1978
- Kim Montague, student, 1979
- Brian Canady, student, 1980-1983
- Lynn K Canady, 1984-1985

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few structures on Warner Street including 917 Warner Street which is consistent with the 1941 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up and by the 1980s was almost completely built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NETR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban
compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).
Minimal Traditional Style (c. 1935–1950)
The Minimal Traditional architecture movement flourished during the 1940s in response to worker housing needs for World War II production facilities and to fulfill the housing needs for returning soldiers. The Minimal Tradition movement offered small, low-cost, and easy-to-produce housing forms. The Small House movement began after the Great Depression with the establishment of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its guidelines for new homes that could be easily built and insured. The work of the FHA helped revive the housing industry in the United States during the Depression and for many years after. The FHA also provided guidance on how to design and build these small houses as further incentive for American families to participate in the Small House movement. The groundwork laid by the FHA’s emphasis on small houses got people into the housing market, and helped to alleviate housing needs during the population boom following World War I and the need for worker housing during World War II in areas like Chico.

Minimal Traditional homes were often part of planned communities, but there are also examples spread throughout older neighborhoods in the United States. One of the most famous planned communities employing the Minimal Traditional style was Levittown, New York. The ease of construction and cost-effective nature of the materials used to construct Minimal Traditional homes made them popular with land developers and government entities needing a lot of housing in a short period of time. In postwar subdivisions, Minimal Traditional style homes often have overlap with early Ranch-style houses (sometimes referred to Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes). In addition to ease of construction and cost-effective materials, the following are characteristics of the Minimal Traditional style of architecture (McAlester 2015):

- One story in height
- Gabled or hipped roofs with minimal overhangs
- Double-hung, multi-lite windows
- Minimal detailing at the roofline, including scalloped trim
- Wooden shutters with cutout features
- Mass-produced and cost-effective materials
- Modern materials, including concrete and asbestos siding
- Rectangular or L-shaped in plan
- Emphasis on practicality in design; no overly designed features or elements
- Typically built by builders and not architect-designed
- Typically constructed as part of large tract developments in a variety of floor plans to provide choices for buyers

NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:
In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s–1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment
of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Minimal Traditional style. The subject property was constructed in 1941 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., one story in height, gabled roofline, cost effective materials), the building exhibits substantial alterations that have compromised its integrity, including replacement of windows and doors and reroofing. The result is an altered and unremarkable example of a Minimal Traditional-style residence. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.

Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.
California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

**The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).**

The subject property is a modest and altered example of a Minimal Traditional-style single-family residence constructed in 1941. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional-style residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.**

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.**

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional-style house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style, but is altered from its original form and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

**City of Chico Criteria**

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.
Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building was subjected to several alterations over time that have significantly compromised its integrity of design, including replacement of original windows and doors and reroofing. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Multiple alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the addition of non-historic windows and doors and reroofing with composition shingles. All of these alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building was compromised by the exterior alterations to the building. Therefore, the building no longer retains its integrity of workmanship.
Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of all surrounding single-family Minimal Traditional-style residences around the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be viewed which is no longer present with empty lots on either side of the property. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

Association: The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:


Chico City Directories Various Years.


P1. Other Identifier: "West Sacramento Avenue"

P2. Location: 
- Not for Publication
- Unrestricted
- County: Butte
- USGS 7.5' Quad: Chico
- Date: 1948 (PR 1978)
- T 22N; R 1E; NW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27; M.D.B.M.
- Address: 631 West Sacramento Avenue (APN 003-120-002-000)
- City: Chico
- Zip: 95926
- UTM: Zone 10S, 598316 mE/4398778 mN

P3a. Description:
The subject property is a Minimal Traditional style, single-family residence built in 1940 facing onto West Sacramento Avenue. The one-story building is irregular in plan with a gable-and-wing roof sheathed in composition shingles. Exterior walls are clad in wood clapboard. The northwestern (main) elevation presents as two sections: the left (western) features an eight-over-one window with wood trim and wood board shutters with cutout details and a front entry with a single-leaf door obscured by a security door below a pentice roof with wood scallop detailing approached by two concrete steps. See Continuation Sheet

P3b. Resource Attributes: HP2: Single Family Property

P5a. Photograph or Drawing

P5b. Description of Photo: Main Elevation of 631 West Sacramento Avenue; View Facing Southeast; IMG 7952

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source: Historic
- 1940 (Assessor)

P7. Owner and Address: Jeffries Susan V. Trust
- P.O. Box 9125
- Chico, CA 95927

P8. Recorded by: Dudek, Sarah Corder, MFA
- 38 N. Marengo Avenue
- Pasadena, CA 91101

P9. Date Recorded: 8/28/2018

P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian Survey

P11. Report Citation: Cultural Resources Report for the College Park Demolition Project
- California State University, Chico, Butte County, California (Dudek 2018)

Attachments: NONE Location 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 #** 631 West Sacramento Avenue  
**NRHP Status Code** 6Z

**B1.** Historic Name:

**B2.** Common Name: 631 West Sacramento Avenue

**B3.** Original Use: Single Family Residence  
**B4.** Present Use: Single Family Residence

**B5.** Architectural Style: Minimal Traditional

**B6.** Construction History:

According to Butte County Assessor records, the residence was constructed in 1940, but no original building permits were found. The following City of Chico Building Permits (CCBPs) were found for the property: new 100 A service & range outlet in 1960 (CCBP # 2129); install asbestos siding on residence in 1960 (CCBP # 2739); electrical permit in 1980 (CCBP # 9461); repair on site sewer line in 1996 (CCBP # 96-00168); encroachment permit for repair sewer lateral in 2006 (CCBP #412870). Observed alterations to the house with unknown dates includes the addition of a security door and the installation of a window a/c unit.

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

**B8.** Related Features:

**B9a.** Architect: __________________________  b. Builder: __________________________

**B10.** Significance:  
Theme __________________________  Area __________________________

Period of Significance ________________  Property Type ________________  Applicable Criteria ________________

See Continuation Sheet

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

**B12.** References:

See Continuation Sheet

**B13.** Remarks:

**B14.** Evaluator: Sarah Corder, MFA  
**Date of Evaluation:** 8/28/2018

(This space reserved for official comments.)
*P3a. Description:

The right (northern) section extends approximately five feet from the main building and displays a six-over-one window with wood trim and wood board shutters with cutout details. The southwest and rear (southeastern) elevations were inaccessible for proper photo documentation. The left elevation displays irregular fenestration (l to r): window with wood trim obscured by a screen, gas meter, a second window with wood trim obscured by a screen, a brick chimney which rises approximately two feet higher than the roof’s peek, and a one-over-one window with an AC unit set in.

*B10. Significance:

Research of all City directories from the date of construction showed that the house was owned or occupied by the following people throughout its history:

- W.G. Bender and Gladys G. Bender, salesman for Cal State Auto Association, 1940-1944
- Jas M. Moore, rancher, 1948-1954
- Ellis and Geneca H. Bonnett, 1955-1959
- Torki Sudairy and Lucille Sudairy, student, 1960
- DeLoss R. Linzey and Geraldine, manufacturing rep for Dearborne Co., 1961
- Jacob E. Rutherford, no occupation listed, 1963
- Mrs. Bernice Moore, no occupation listed, 1964-1965
- Dale Butler and Bebbie Butler, student, 1969-1970
- Donald E. Lewis and Nancy, management consultant, 1972-1973
- Mushabbad Algahtani, 1974
- Lori Rainwater, student, 1975
- Ramona Greer, student, 1976
- John Anderson, student, 1977-1979
- Michael Seegle and Janet, construction worker Am. Western, 1981-1982
- David Bate, student, 1985-1985

A review of historic maps and aerial photos was conducted as part of the archival research effort for this property. All Sanborn maps for the City of Chico were reviewed, and the project area was not included on any of the maps. Historic aerial photographs were reviewed for the property from the following years: 1941, 1947, 1952, 1962, 1969, 1972, 1998, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. In 1941, most of the area was not developed, with the exception of a few buildings on Warner Avenue. In 1941, the intersecting streets of Brice Avenue, La Vista Way, and Stadium Way are not visible. The 1947 aerial photograph indicates there was increased development in the area, including 633 Brice Avenue, which is consistent with the 1947 date of construction for the residence. In 1952 the neighborhood appeared relatively the same as it did in 1947, by 1962 the density in the neighborhoods around the site had begun to be built up (AAX-1952, 1952 and CAS-BUT, 1962). The remaining years of historic aerial photographs offer limited information, as the house is largely obscured by trees (NTR 2017).

By the 1920s, Chico had taken steps to make itself a modern city with the creation of paved streets, increased suburban development, public parks, and the planning of State Highway 99. In the 1920s, the City paved streets and removed wooden sidewalks. Chico Historian Debra Moon’s analysis of the Census information from 1900, 1910, and 1920 captures the essence of the City’s growth in the early 20th century, and helps show a shift from a predominately agrarian community to a modern urban city (Moon 2003):

A 1920 census for Chico showed a population of 15,517. Chico had grown more than expected
even through some rough times. The county’s population at that time was 42.2 percent urban compared to 1910, when the population was 27.9 percent urban, and 1900 when it was only 15.34 percent urban.

Although the growth of the population contributed to this shift, there were other factors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that helped to urbanize Chico. One such factor was the donation of Bidwell Park in 1905 by Annie Bidwell. The generous donation of more than 1,900 acres for use as a public park was a big step toward urbanization in Chico in the 20th century (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Other steps toward urbanization included construction of the Chico Municipal Building in 1916, which helped to create a city plaza concept with the combination of the municipal building and the post office. Downtown businesses also took steps toward modernization and urbanization with the removal of wooden awnings and posts from their storefronts. Healthcare advancements in Chico led to the start of the Enloe Hospital in 1913, which began a series of healthcare center developments spanning the 20th century, resulting in the modern medical complexes seen in Chico today. The many steps toward modernization attracted not only businesses and people to Chico, but also movie productions, including Robin Hood, Gone with the Wind, Kane, Last of the Cowboys, Folly of a Life of Crime, and Alamo Charlie. However, modernization and urbanization did not result in the goal for Chico of being the new county seat for Butte County in the 1914 county seat race (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Like other cities in the United States, advancements in aviation had a profound effect on Chico. In 1935, the City acquired land located immediately north of town to create a municipal airport. However, these plans were sidelined by World War II, since the War Department decided to lease the airport land for establishment of an Army Corps base. The decision by the War Department to lease the airport land was significant to residential and commercial development patterns of Chico, since it brought new people to the area for employment and training. At the height of its use, the Army base employed 4,000 people, and thousands of people received basic training or support training at the facility. The base continued in its operation until 1945, after which many of the people employed and/or trained at the base chose to make Chico their permanent home. To support this population boom, houses needed to be constructed quickly and cost effectively, so popular styles like the Ranch house became a feasible option (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003).

Development and increased suburbanization continued in Chico in the late 1940s and 1950s, and by 1961, an article from the San Francisco Examiner captured the essence of mid-20th century development in Chico (SFE 1961):

A tour of the city and its outskirts displays the growth of subdivisions, the establishment of shopping centers and the construction of factories for light industry.

The increased population also facilitated the need for churches, schools, service stations, and infrastructure improvements such as additional stoplights and parking meters. Historic aerial photographs from the 1940s show that neighborhoods were being plotted for increased residential developments, especially in the College Park area (Booth et al. 2005; DC 2017; Moon 2003; NETR 2017).

Another important institution growing throughout the first half of the 20th century was CSU Chico. Population increases, steps toward modernization, improvements in transportation, and the close of World War II were all significant to the growth and development of the City and CSU Chico. Development of the City and CSU Chico ran parallel to each other, and influenced larger patterns of residential, cultural, and economic development (Booth et al. 2005; Moon 2003).
NRHP/CRHR Designation Criteria:

In consideration of the project site’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the subject property not eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of national and state eligibility criteria.

Criterion A/1: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research did not find any associations with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history. The subject property is one of many single-family residences from approximately the same period of construction (1930s-1950s), and no historical associations or patterns of development were identified. Residential development in Chico followed industrial development with the rise of companies like the Diamond Match Company. Establishment of the Chico Army Air Field (Air Field) in the early 1940s created an increased military presence in Chico in the years leading up to World War II, which had a direct effect on residential development in Chico during and after the war. During the war, housing was needed for active-duty service members and their families. Following the war, housing was needed for returning service members who were ready to settle down and start families in Chico, and for service members who chose to stay in Chico following closure of the Air Field in 1945. These patterns of development were seen across the United States in the years leading up to and following World War II, when industry began to boom and residential development became a priority to house a growing post-war population. Due to a lack of significant associations with events important to history, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1.

Criterion B/2: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to indicate any associations with significant persons. For these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria B/2.

Criterion C/3: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

To support a rapidly growing population in the years surrounding World War II, builders in Chico turned to one of the most popular architectural styles of the time, the Ranch style and Minimal Traditional. The subject property was constructed in 1940 when Chico (and much of the United States) was experiencing a residential boom in response to local industrial and military-related growth. Although the subject property retains the most basic elements of the Minimal Traditional style (i.e., small scale, little amount of detailing, simple windows and roofline), the building exhibits very simple detailing and is an unremarkable example of the style. Archival building permit research did not identify the name(s) of the original builder or architect, but the building is not likely to be the work of a master architect or important creative individual. Finally, the subject property does not appear eligible as a contributor to a historic district. For all of these reasons, the subject property does not appear eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria C/3.
Criterion D/4: Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There is no evidence to suggest that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history, nor is it associated with a known archaeological resource. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criterion D/4.

California Historical Landmark Statement of Significance

In consideration of the subject property’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek finds the property not eligible for designation as a CHL based on the following significance evaluation and in consideration of CHL eligibility criteria.

The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).

The subject property is a modest example of a Minimal Traditional single-family residence constructed in 1940. The building represents a common residential house form that was popular throughout the United States following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. It is not the first or last Minimal Traditional residence to be constructed in Chico, nor is it a significant example of its type. The subject property is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, nor was it built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

All owner and occupant names identified with the subject property were researched for possible significance. Archival research failed to reveal any associations with significant individuals from the past. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or is one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder.

The building represents a common Minimal Traditional house that was popular throughout the United States in the years following World War II due to the ability to mass produce materials and plans. The subject property is not a prototype or outstanding example of its style. It exhibits the most basic design features of the Minimal Traditional style and cannot be considered a valuable example of the style. Furthermore, the building is not known to be the work of an important architect, builder, engineer, or designer, and is not known to have been built using an innovative construction technique. Therefore, the subject property is recommended not eligible for listing as a CHL under this criterion.

City of Chico Criteria

City of Chico historic resource designation criteria closely follow those of the NRHP and CRHR with regard to consideration of important events, people, and architectural merit. Based on the NRHP/CRHR/CHL criteria discussion above, the subject property is
recommended as not eligible for listing under all City of Chico designation criteria.

Integrity Discussion

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Similar stipulations apply to listing at the state level, but the threshold is lower for the CRHR, particularly if the site has potential to yield significant scientific or historic information. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. In consideration of the NRHP, historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Seven aspects or qualities, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NPS 1990). To retain historic integrity, a property generally possesses several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

The subject property’s integrity is as follows:

Location: The building is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of location.

Design: The building remains relatively the same in design with minor alterations such as the replacement of original siding with asbestos in 1960 and the addition of a security door. The primary elements to this residence such as windows and architectural details remain as originally designed. Therefore, the building retains integrity of design.

Setting: Although the subject property maintains its original property boundaries, the surrounding areas have changed significantly over time. The property’s integrity of setting was compromised by development of CSU Chico, as noted when comparing the 1969 historic aerial photograph to the 1998 historic aerial photograph. In 1969, there are large open parcels of land to the south and west of the neighborhood, but by 1998, there is significant development on these large parcels, including large campus buildings, access roads, and parking lots. Additionally, the areas to the south and west are now heavily landscaped and pedestrianized. Therefore, the property’s integrity of setting is present, but is diminished by development in and around the CSU Chico campus (NETR 2017).

Materials: Several alterations to the house have compromised the property’s material integrity, including the introduction of asbestos siding and reroofing. These alterations introduced new materials to the subject property that were not part of the original design. Therefore, the building does not maintain integrity of materials.

Workmanship: Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of a craftsman’s skills in constructing the original building are not seen due to the nature of the architectural style. Minimal Traditional residences were intended to be minimal with little detailing and were quickly constructed, therefore the presence of workmanship integrity does not exist.

Feeling: The alterations made to the neighborhood with the demolition of multiple
single-family Minimal Traditional residences surrounding the subject property has resulted in the loss of the feeling of the original residential neighborhood. The change in neighborhood density greatly affects how this building was originally intended to be seen which is no longer present, particularly in the lots to the east of the building that were demolished by 2014. Therefore, the property no longer retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** The property has no direct links with important events or people. Therefore, the building does not have integrity of association.

In summary, the subject property appears not eligible under all NRHP, CRHR, and CHL designation criteria. Further, the property exhibits diminished integrity of setting, feeling, and association, and no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship. Consequently, the property does not maintain the requisite integrity to warrant listing in the NRHP or CRHR, or as a CHL.

*B12. References:
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APPENDIX B

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
APPENDIX B
College Park Demolition Project
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that when a lead agency adopts a mitigated negative declaration, it shall prepare a monitoring or reporting program (MMRP) for all required mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). The MMRP, identified as Table 1, below, shall be maintained by CSU Chico’s designated Project Manager. The Table includes measures previously adopted as part of the 2005 Campus Master Plan Environmental Impact Report.

Table 1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.1-3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New lighting proposed for future projects as a result of implementation of the 2005 Master Plan shall be directed downward and shall not shine onto adjacent properties. Additionally, all new lighting shall adhere to the guidelines in the 2005 Master Plan, including:</td>
<td>Include mitigation measure in design specifications for lighting system Project Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>Design Review and Approval CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The off-site visibility and potential glare of the lighting will be restricted by specification of non-glare fixtures, and placement of lights to direct illumination into only those areas where it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Appropriate fixture selection and light placement shall minimize light pollution and enhance natural color rendition. All lighting shall utilize refractive lenses and be shielded to reduce glare into buildings and neighboring areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Walkway lighting fixtures shall not be mounted higher than twenty feet unless necessary for security reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.1-3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual developments associated with the 2005 Master Plan shall minimize lighting to areas required for safety, security, or normal operations on the main campus and at the ATRC [Agricultural Teaching and Research Center] and shield lighting from public view to the greatest extent possible. The direction and shielding of lighting shall be regulated to reduce light spillage, light pollution, and glare. Highly directional light fixtures shall be used with non-glare lighting fixtures. All lighting and light shields shall be installed and operated consistent with manufacturer’s specifications.</td>
<td>Include mitigation measure in design specifications for lighting system Project Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>Design Review and Approval CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

**Mitigation Measure 3.2-1**

- Consistent with BCAQMD Indirect Source Review Guidelines, the following construction dust and equipment exhaust emissions measures should be required in all construction contracts:
  - Watering should be used to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement.
  - Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site.
  - Use dust-proof chutes to load debris into trucks whenever feasible.
  - Water all active construction sites at least twice daily. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil and wind exposure.
  - Use chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days).
  - On-site vehicles limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved areas.
  - Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible.
  - Cover inactive storage piles.
  - Paved streets adjacent to the development site should be swept or washed at the end of each day as necessary to remove excessive accumulations of silt and/or mud which may have accumulated as a result of activities on the development site.
  - Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours. The telephone number of the BCAQMD shall also be visible to ensure compliance with BCAQMD Rule 201 and 207 (Nuisance and Fugitive Dust Emissions).
  - Provide temporary traffic control as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
  - Require contractors to minimize exhaust emissions by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications and by not allowing construction equipment to be left idling for long periods.

- Include dust and equipment exhaust emissions measures in project specifications
  - Project Manager

- (1) Confirm specifications prior to Construction Plans Approval
  - CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee

- (2) During demolition
  - Construction Inspector
### Table 1

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-1</strong></td>
<td>Conduct survey no more than 2 weeks prior to demolition and grading during the nesting season (Feb 1–Aug 30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To avoid impacts to special-status and native migratory birds protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), a nesting bird survey will be completed by a qualified biologist no earlier than 2 weeks prior to construction during the nesting season (February 1–August 30) to determine if any special-status or other native migratory birds are nesting on or near the site (including a 250-foot buffer for raptors and a 0.5-mile buffer for Swainson’s hawk). If any active nests are observed during surveys, an avoidance buffer will be determined and flagged by the qualified biologist based on species, location, and planned construction activity. These nests would be avoided until the chicks have fledged and the nests are no longer active. Any nesting habitat (i.e., trees and vegetation) will be removed outside of the breeding bird season to avoid impacts to nesting birds. If it is infeasible to remove trees or other vegetation outside of the breeding season, a survey will be performed no earlier than 1 week prior to removal to determine if active nests are present. (Note: This mitigation measure incorporates and supersedes Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b.)</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-2</strong></td>
<td>Conduct roosting bat survey no earlier than 30 days prior to demolition.</td>
<td>Prior to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To avoid impacts to special-status bat species, no sooner than 30 days prior to demolition, a preconstruction roosting bat survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist (i.e. a biologist with several years' experience performing roosting bat surveys, capable of identifying signs of roosting such as urine stains, guano piles, etc.) to determine if roosting bats or maternity colonies exist in any of the ten homes. If any active roosts are observed, consultation with CDFW will be sought to potentially develop an exclusion plan, under the direction of CDFW. If maternity roosts are observed, demolition should be postponed until the maternity colonies have dispersed, usually between late August and the end of September.</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Monitoring Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3</td>
<td>Future development projects that may occur as a result of implementation of the CSU Chico Campus Master Plan 2004 shall comply with Best Management Practices. Examples of Best Management Practices include, but are not limited to the following:</td>
<td>Include best management practices in project plans and specifications</td>
<td>Plan Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Placing fiber rolls around on-site drain inlets to prevent sediment and construction related debris from entering inlets.</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Placing fiber rolls along the perimeter of the site to reduce runoff flow velocities and prevent sediment from leaving the site.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Placing silt fences downgradient of disturbed areas to slow down runoff and retain sediment.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specifying that all disturbed soil will be seeded, mulched, or otherwise protected by October 15th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stabilizing construction entrance to reduce the tracking of mud and dirt onto public roads by construction vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applying hydraulic mulch that temporarily protects exposed soil from erosion by raindrop impact or wind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.9-3a</td>
<td>All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall be in good working order and have manufacturer installed mufflers.</td>
<td>Include measure in project specifications</td>
<td>Plan Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing implementation</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Monitoring Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9-3b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment warm up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located in an area as far away from existing residences as is feasible.</td>
<td>Include measure in project specifications</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9-3c</td>
<td></td>
<td>All construction shall be between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. daily except Sundays and holidays. Construction activities between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays shall meet at least one of the following noise limitations: 1. No individual piece of equipment shall produce a noise level exceeding 83 dBA at a distance of twenty-five feet from the source. If the device is housed within a structure on the property, the measurement shall be made outside the structure at a distance as close to twenty-five feet from the equipment as possible. 2. The noise level at any point outside of the property plan of the project shall not exceed 86 dBA.</td>
<td>Include measure in project specifications</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11-1a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently there are several “Blue Light” emergency telephones located throughout the campus which ring directly into the Communications Center of the University Police Department. These auto-dialing phones may be used to summon emergency police, fire or medical assistance. Before construction is completed on new facilities on the main campus, new “Blue Light” phones can be added to ensure safety at these locations. Community Service Officers (CSO) of the CSU Chico Police Department are student positions. The CSO provides support to the staff of sworn and non-sworn police personnel. Duties include parking enforcement, special event security, escort detail, bicycle licensing, property engraving, room unlocks, clerical dispatch support, and campus lot patrol. More of these positions can be created if needed to ensure proper enforcement of laws and safety concerns.</td>
<td>Determine need prior to construction</td>
<td>CSU Chico Executive Director of Facilities Management and Services or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project manager to coordinate with University Police Department</td>
<td>Prior to project completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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