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INTRODUCTION

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento (City) to prepare this Cultural Resources Technical Report on behalf of the City’s Department of Youth, Parks & Enrichment (YPCE) in support of the proposed Renfree Field Improvements Project (project), located within the Del Paso Regional Park at the northeast corner of the city’s boundaries. The proposed project involves the redevelopment of a segment of the park, including the demolition of Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field), and the construction of new sport playing fields, other recreational facilities, and associated improvements.

This report was prepared in support of the project in addressing potential impacts to cultural resources, as defined and required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This report was also prepared in support of planning, permitting, and approvals processes through the City, which is the lead agency for the purposes of review and compliance under CEQA.

Methodology

To identify cultural resources and assess potential impacts under CEQA, SWCA architectural historians and archaeologists that meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards prepared this report, which provides narrative description of the project area’s existing conditions, outlines relevant historic contexts, provides a summary of previous studies and pedestrian survey efforts, and includes an evaluation of historical significance of Renfree Field for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), designation as a Sacramento Landmark, and listing in the Sacramento Register of Historic Cultural Resources (Sacramento Register). The documentation and evaluation of these buildings is presented within this report, as well as accompanying California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms.

To inform this report, SWCA performed an in-house records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the North Central Information Center (NCIC), located at California State University, Sacramento, on December 5, 2022. The search included previous cultural resource studies and archaeological resources and historical resources within the project site and surrounding 0.25-mile area. SWCA also contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and requested a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) on November 22, 2022. On December 13, 2022, the NAHC responded stating that the SLF search had produced positive results, noting the presence of known sensitive sites within the project site or within the Rio Linda, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle. On January 27, 2023, SWCA submitted letters to the 10 tribal representatives identified on the NAHC list. These letters provided a general project description, associated project location maps, and a request for additional information regarding potential cultural resources located within the project area. Additional follow-up efforts by SWCA have been undertaken since the submission of the original information requests.

On December 7, 2022, SWCA conducted a pedestrian survey of the 8.33-acre project area, during which the property was documented extensively using digital photographs. The SWCA archaeologist walked the project area performing boot scrapes in areas of exposed soils, whereas the SWCA architectural historian focused specifically on documenting the existing conditions of the built environment, namely the recreational facilities and overall park landscape of the project area.

In preparing the original contexts and property histories, SWCA reviewed property-specific historical information and ethnographic literature to identify relevant background for the project area and its historical inhabitants. Research focused on a variety of primary and secondary materials, including
historical maps, aerial photographs, ethnographic reports, and technical reports prepared for the project. Sources and repositories consulted include the U.S. Bureau of Land Management General Land Office and USGS for historical topographic maps and geological surveys of the area, the Center for Sacramento History, the City of Sacramento Public Library, the California State Library California History Room, and a variety of online source materials, including the Online Archive of California, Newspapers.com, and Ancestry.com, among others.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park (Del Paso Park) in the northeast corner of the city of Sacramento. Del Paso Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes the baseball diamond and playing field, Renfree Field.

The project area is approximately 8.33 acres and is located at 3615 Auburn Boulevard, on the western portion of Sacramento County Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 240-0342-011, an approximately 76-acre parcel. The project area is bisected north–south by Bridge Road, which connects Auburn Boulevard to Park Drive. Overall, it is bound by Arcade Creek and Park Road to the north, the open space of the northeastern-most portion of Del Paso Park to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and the former Discovery Museum Science & Space Center (Discovery Museum) to the west (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

Project Description

The project area, which includes Renfree Field, is currently developed as a public park with a baseball field, a playground, and two parking lots, including a 126-space parking lot on the west side accessed via Auburn Boulevard and Bridge Road and a 21-space parking lot on the east side of Renfree Field accessed directly from Auburn Boulevard (Figure 3). The project area contains a walking trail and an equestrian trail loop that connects to the larger Del Paso Park.

The proposed project would renovate Renfree Field with two baseball fields (Field 1 and Practice Field 2) with an overlapping outfield area along the existing baseball field’s first base line between the play structure and eastern parking lot. Practice Field 2 would be located north of the eastern parking lot and would have 30-foot backstop fencing. A 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field would be striped and overlap in the outfield area. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced (Figure 4 and Figure 5).

The northern portion of the western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and four pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 77-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain. The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along the north side of Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. New lighting for the baseball fields would replace the existing light towers and would be oriented along the perimeter of the field to accommodate lighting for the two baseball fields and soccer field. There would be approximately eight
new sports light posts and each would be approximately 60 feet tall (roughly the same height as the existing light towers that would be removed).

There are existing utilities within the adjacent roadway network along Auburn Boulevard and Bridge Road. Existing utilities in proximity to the project site include natural gas, water, sewer, and telecommunications service. The existing Renfree Field and associated park features such are currently served by public utilities. The proposed project includes the extension/upgrade of utilities for electricity, domestic and irrigation water services, and storm drainage.

The proposed project would remove approximately 21 trees throughout the site for reasons including poor health, structural defects, or location within the proposed development footprint.¹ To mitigate the loss of the trees, the City would be required to plant replacement trees.

To construct the project, the site will require regrading and excavations of varying depths throughout the site (Figure 6). Ground disturbing activities and associated depths of disturbances are as follows:

- Four-foot-deep excavations would be required for light posts throughout the parking lots, and sport post footings. Sport post footings include nets for pickleball and hoops for basketball.
- Three-foot-deep excavations would be required for fencing around the bullpens at Field 1 and pickleball courts. The dugouts, bullpens and pickleball courts would be fenced with six- or eight-foot fencing.
- Two-to-three-foot-deep excavations would be required for the grating, utility and irrigation trenching for the outfield light posts.
- Nine-foot-deep excavations would be required for the 30-foot fencing and backboards along the southern extent of the two baseball fields.
- Three-foot-deep excavations would be required for the four-foot outfield fencing.

Figure 1. Project location.
Figure 2. Project area.
Figure 3. Existing conditions of the project area.
Figure 4. Project proposed site plan.
Figure 5. Project proposed landscaping plan
Figure 6. Renfree Field Improvement Project site plan with ground disturbing activity location and depth of disturbance overlay.
REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

Enacted in 1966 and amended in 2000, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) instituted a multifaceted program, administered by the Secretary of the Interior, to encourage sound preservation policies of the nation’s cultural resources at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA authorized the expansion and maintenance of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), established the position of State Historic Preservation Officer and provided for the designation of State Review Boards, set up a mechanism to certify local governments to carry out the goals of the NHPA, assisted Native American tribes to preserve their cultural heritage, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

National Register of Historic Places

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

- **Criterion A**: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- **Criterion B**: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past;
- **Criterion C**: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and/or
- **Criterion D**: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Ordinarily, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature, are not considered eligible for the NRHP, unless they satisfy certain conditions. In general, a resource must be 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.

In addition to meeting these criteria, a property must retain historic integrity, which is defined in National Register Bulletin 15 as the “ability of a property to convey its significance” (National Park Service [NPS] 1997:44). In order to assess integrity, the NPS recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, considered together, define historic integrity.

To retain integrity, a property must possess several, if not all, of these seven qualities, which are defined in the following manner in National Register Bulletin 15:
• **Location:** the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;

• **Design:** the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;

• **Setting:** the physical environment of a historic property;

• **Materials:** the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

• **Workmanship:** the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory;

• **Feeling:** a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time; and

• **Association:** the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Certain properties, which are not typically considered eligible for listing the NRHP, have specific criteria considerations that must be met in addition to exhibiting significance per the established criteria outlined above (NPS 1997:25). These Criteria Considerations include the following:

a. **Religious Properties** that derive primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical significance;

b. **Moved Properties**, meaning a building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event;

c. **Birthplaces or Graves** of historical figures of outstanding importance if there are no appropriate sites or buildings directly associated with their productive lives;

d. **Cemeteries** that derive primary significance of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events;

e. **Reconstructed Properties** when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived;

f. **Commemorative Properties** if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or

g. **Properties that have achieved significance within the last 50 years**, meaning that it of exceptional importance.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties**

Administered by the NPS and codified in 36 CFR Part 68, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (the Standards) are the established framework by which projects pertaining to historic buildings, structures, sites, and other resource types are reviewed. In addition to serving as the foundation by which federal agencies assess how a project may affect historic properties, the Standards have been adopted by state and municipal entities throughout the United States for similar analytical applications.

The Standards outline four potential treatment approaches that pertain to distinct project types and applications (36 CFR 68.2). The four treatments include the following:
• **Preservation:** the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.

• **Rehabilitation:** the act or process of making possible an efficient compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

• **Restoration:** the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

• **Reconstruction:** the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

Each treatment approach has its own unique collection of individual standards related to maintaining, repairing, or replacing historic materials and can be applied to all types of historic properties.

**State**

**California Environmental Quality Act**

CEQA requires a lead agency to analyze whether historic resources may be adversely impacted by a proposed project. Under CEQA, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21084.1). Answering this question is a two-part process: first, the determination must be made as to whether the proposed project involves cultural resources; second, if cultural resources are present, the proposed project must be analyzed for a potential “substantial adverse change in the significance” of the resource.

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, for the purposes of CEQA, historic resources are:

1. A resource listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the CRHR (PRC Section 5024.1; 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 4850 et seq.);
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significance in a historic resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); and
3. Any building, structure, object, site, or district that the lead agency determines eligible for national, state, or local landmark listing; generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant (and therefore a historic resource under CEQA) if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR (as defined in PRC Section 5024.1; 14 CCR Section 4852).

According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude the lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource (PRC Section 5024.1). Pursuant to CEQA, a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)).
California Register of Historical Resources

Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is “an authoritative guide in California 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 21083.2 and 21084.1). Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historical resources surveys or designated by local landmarks programs, may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c), a resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

- **Criterion 1:** It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
- **Criterion 2:** It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- **Criterion 3:** It 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.
- **Criterion 4:** It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to convey the reasons for their significance, known as integrity. Aspects of integrity assessed when determining potential eligibility include location, setting, materials, design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

In terms of archaeological resources, PRC 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.

If it can be demonstrated that a proposed project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC Sections 21083.2(a), (b), and (c)). CEQA notes that, if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological resource nor an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered to be a significant effect on the environment (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[c][4]).
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY BILL 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 of 2014 amended PRC Section 5097.94 and added PRC Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3.

Consultation with Native Americans

AB 52 establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes in the CEQA process, requiring the lead agency to initiate consultation with California Native American groups that are traditionally and of a decision to undertake a project or determination that a project is complete (e.g., prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report), lead agencies are required to notify tribes who previously requested placement on the notification list. Such notification will be in writing and will include, at a minimum, a brief description of the project, lead agency contact information, and notice that receipt of the letter serves as the initiation of a 30-day comment/response period. Consultation will occur at the Tribe’s request, and mitigation measures agreed upon during this consultation will be included in the environmental documentation. Consultation may be considered concluded when parties agree to mitigation measures to avoid a significant effect on a Tribal Cultural Resource (see following subsection) or when, after a reasonable effort, a party, in good faith, determines that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Section 4 of AB 52 adds Sections 21074(a) and (b) to the PRC, which address tribal cultural resources and cultural landscapes. Section 21074(a) defines tribal cultural resources as one of the following:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
   A. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
   B. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Section 1(a)(9) of AB 52 establishes that “a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource has a significant effect on the environment.” Effects on tribal cultural resources should be considered under CEQA. Section 6 of AB 52 adds Section 21080.3.2 to the PRC, which states that parties may propose mitigation measures “capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource.” Further, if a California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding project alternatives, mitigation measures, or significant effects to tribal cultural resources, the consultation shall include those topics (PRC Section 21080.3.2(a)). The environmental document and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (where applicable) shall include any mitigation measures that are adopted (PRC Section 21082.3(a)).
Treatment of Human Remains

The disposition of burials falls first under the general prohibition on disturbing or removing human remains under California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. More specifically, remains suspected to be Native American are treated under CEQA at CCR Section 15064.5; PRC Section 5097.98 illustrates the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If human remains are discovered during construction, no further disturbance to the site shall occur, and the County Coroner must be notified (CCR Section 15064.5 and PRC 5097.98).

Local

City of Sacramento Historic Preservation Ordinance

The City began implementing its historic preservation program in 1974 and officially adopted its first historic preservation ordinance the following year. In the decades since, the City has continued to amend and update its ordinance to boost the historic preservation program and its mission to identify, preserve, and promote cultural resources throughout the city.

Outlined in the City’s Government Charter under Section 17.604, Historic Preservation, the ordinance provides the framework for the City’s historic preservation program, including the establishment of the Preservation Commission, a Preservation Director, and supporting City staff; criteria and mechanisms for the survey, evaluation inventory; and recognition of cultural resources through the Sacramento Register and its criteria for eligibility; and the establishment of project review processes and design standards, consistent with federal and state standards, to protect and assess alterations related to maintenance and ongoing use of said resources. The City’s historic preservation ordinance also outlines enforcement measures, and a series of available historic preservation incentive programs, including Mills Act contracts, density provisions, use of the California State Historic Building Code, and other planning provisions.

Sacramento Register of Historic-Cultural Resources

As outlined under Sacramento City Code Section 17.604.210(A)(1)(a), in order for a property to qualify as a Sacramento Landmark and eligible for listing in the SRHCR, it must exhibit historical significance under at least one of several eligibility criteria. Based upon the NRHP and CRHR, the eligibility for listing in the SRHCR includes the following:

i. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the city, the region, the state or the nation;
ii. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the city’s past;
iii. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction;
iv. It represents the work of an important creative individual or master;
v. It possesses high artistic values; or
vi. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in the prehistory or history of the city, the region, the state or the nation.

As with the CRHR, a property must also retain sufficient historical integrity. However, the aspects of integrity differ slightly and include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association.
City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan

Adopted in March 2016 and building upon the previous 2030 General Plan, the City of Sacramento 2035 General Plan (City General Plan) serves as the City’s current comprehensive planning document that outlines the goals, policies, and implementation strategies and programs for the city’s development.

The goals and policies outlined in the City General Plan that are relevant to the project and the topic of cultural resources are located within the Historic and Cultural Resources Element. These goals and policies relevant to the project include the following:

Goal HCR 2.1 Identification and Preservation of Historic Cultural Resources.
Identify and preserve the city’s historic and cultural resources to enrich our sense of place and our understanding of the city’s prehistory and history.

Policies

HCR 2.1.1 Identification. The City shall identify historic and cultural resources, including individual properties, districts, and sites (e.g., archaeological sites), to ensure adequate protection of these resources.

HCR 2.1.2 Applicable Laws and Regulations. The City shall ensure compliance with City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes to protect and assist in the preservation of historic and archaeological resources, including the use of the California Historical Building Code as applicable. Unless listed in the Sacramento, California, or National registers, the City shall require discretionary projects involving resources 50 years and older to evaluate their eligibility for inclusion on the California or Sacramento registers for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

HCR 2.1.3 Consultation. The City shall consult with appropriate organizations and individuals (e.g., California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Information Centers, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), the CA Office of Planning and Research (OPR) “Tribal Consultation Guidelines”, etc.,) and shall establish a public outreach policy to minimize potential impacts to historic and cultural resources.

HCR 2.1.5 National, California, and Sacramento Registers. The City shall support efforts to pursue eligibility and listing for qualified resources including historic districts and individual resources under the appropriate National, California, or Sacramento registers.

HCR 2.1.6 Planning. The City shall take historical and cultural resources into consideration in the development of planning studies and documents.
HCR 2.1.7 Historic Resource Property Maintenance. The City shall encourage maintenance and upkeep of historic resources to avoid the need for major rehabilitation and to reduce the risks of demolition, loss through fire or neglect, or impacts from natural disasters.

HCR 2.1.9 City-Owned Resources. The City shall maintain all City-owned historic and cultural resources in a manner that is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

HCR 2.1.10 Early Project Consultation. The City shall minimize potential impacts to historic and cultural resources by consulting with property owners, land developers, and the building industry early in the development review process.

HCR 2.1.11 Compatibility with Historic Context. The City shall review proposed new development, alterations, and rehabilitation/remodels for compatibility with the surrounding historic context. The City shall pay special attention to the scale, massing, and relationship of proposed new development to surrounding historic resources.

HCR 2.1.12 Contextual Features. The City shall promote the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and/or reconstruction, as appropriate, of contextual features (e.g., structures, landscapes, street lamps, signs) related to historic resources.

HCR 2.1.14 Adaptive Reuse. The City shall encourage adaptive reuse of historic resources when the original use of the resource is no longer feasible.

HCR 2.1.15 Demolition. The City shall consider demolition of historic resources as a last resort, to be permitted only if rehabilitation of the resource is not feasible, demolition is necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its residents, or the public benefits outweigh the loss of the historic resource.

HCR 2.1.16 Archaeological & Cultural Resources. The City shall develop or ensure compliance with protocols that protect or mitigate impacts to archaeological and cultural resources including prehistoric resources.

City of Sacramento Department of Youth, Parks & Community Enrichment Planning Documents

In addition to citywide planning documents, the YPCE has developed specific documents related to the management of their facilities. Within these documents, certain sections and policies are specific to the ongoing management of cultural resources.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN 2005-2010 (TECHNICAL UPDATE 2009)

Specific policies, strategies, and goals within the YPCE’s most current Master Plan include the following:

**Policies**

12.15 Foster Public awareness of and ensure historic and cultural resources within the City’s parks and recreational facilities are identified, protected, preserved, and rehabilitated consistent with the City’s overall preservation objectives.

12.16 Strive to build a sense of place by protecting important environmental and cultural features as well as educating the public on the unique ecological qualities of the region.

12.33 Identify sites, facilities, structures, or landscapes of historic, cultural, or environmental significance which may influence site design.

**Implementation Strategies**

12.17 **Historic Preservation:** Consult with the City’s Historic Preservation Division when parks are located within historic districts or known to contain historic resources.

**PRE-CONTACT CONTEXT**

The project is situated in what is generally described as the Sacramento Valley Region, which is one of eight arbitrary organizational divisions of the state (Moratto 1984). Occupation in the Sacramento Valley during the Pre-contact Period is estimated to have occurred as early as 12,000 years ago; however, only a few archaeological sites have been identified that predate 5,000 years ago. It is possible that Holocene alluvial deposits buried many pre-contact sites in this area. For example, Moratto has estimated that as much as 10 meters of sediment accumulated along the lower stretch of the Sacramento drainage system during the last 5,000–6,000 years.

Pre-contact material culture in central California (including the Sacramento Valley) after the Paleoindian Period has been categorized according to “horizons” or “patterns” that define broad technological, economic, social, and ideological elements over long periods of time and large areas. The taxonomic system historically used for central California is a tripartite classification scheme with Early, Middle, and Late Horizons. This Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS) was the result of efforts of several researchers (e.g., Beardsley 1954; Heizer 1949), and was further developed after the advent of radiocarbon dating (Frederickson 1973, 1974; Heizer 1958:1–16; Ragir 1972).

Today, a series of generalized periods associated with regionally based “patterns” are typically used as part of the CCTS for the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta area, San Francisco Bay area, and North Coast Ranges (Bennyhoff and Frederickson 1969; Heizer 1949:1–83; Frederickson 1973, 1974). Smaller units of patterns are referred to as “aspects” and “phases.” Revisions of the widely accepted CCTS (Bennyhoff 1994; Fredrickson 1994a, 1994b) are found in a recent volume edited by Hughes.

Fredrickson (1973, 1974) defined several regionally based patterns, of which three are specific to Central Valley prehistory and the project area. Referred to as the Windmiller Pattern, Berkeley Pattern, and Augustine Pattern, each represents a general pattern of resource exploitation, as identified between 2500 B.C. and the beginning of Euro-American contact (A.D. 1769). These patterns are present within the
following horizon sequences: Early Horizon/Windmiller Pattern, Middle Horizon/Berkeley Pattern, and Late Horizon/Augustine Pattern.

**Early Horizon/Windmiller Pattern (2500–500 B.C.)**

Clearly documented evidence for human occupation in the general area is found at sites characteristic of the Windmiller Pattern, or Early Horizon. These sites date to as early as 4,500 years ago and as late as 2,500 years ago (2500–500 B.C.). Such sites often contain manos and metates (grinding stones), as well as many mortar fragments, indicating that acorns and/or various seeds formed an important part of the diet (Moratto 1984:201).

In addition to plant foods, the subsistence system included many other food resources, such as deer, elk, pronghorn, rabbits, and waterfowl. Numerous faunal remains have been documented at Windmiller Pattern sites, along with large quantities of projectile points. The presence of angling hooks and baked clay artifacts possibly used as net or line sinkers, along with the remains of sturgeon, salmon, and smaller fishes, indicate that fishing was an additional source of food (Frederickson 1973; Heizer 1949; Ragir 1972). Items made of baked clay included net sinkers, pipes, discoids, and cooking “stones.” Ground and polished charmstones, impressions of twined basketry, shell beads, and bone tools have also been found in Windmiller Pattern sites. Some items were obtained by trade, including shell beads, obsidian tools, and quartz crystals.

The archaeological record during the Windmiller Period indicates people practiced a mixed procurement strategy of both game and wild plants, with the addition of acorns and/or seeds. The mixed exploitation of a wide range of natural resources ties into a seasonal foraging strategy. Populations likely occupied the lower elevations of the Sacramento Valley in the winter months and shifted to higher elevations during the summer (Moratto 1984:206). Mortuary practices included burials, accompanied by grave goods, in cemeteries that were separate from the habitation sites.

**Middle Horizon/Berkeley Pattern (500 B.C.–A.D. 500)**

Over a 1,000-year period, the Windmiller Pattern began to shift to the more specialized, adaptive Berkeley Pattern, or Middle Horizon (500 B.C.–A.D. 500). A shift to a greater reliance on acorns as a dietary staple is interpreted during the Berkeley Pattern from the increase in mortars and pestles, along with a decrease in manos and metates. Mortars and pestles are better suited to crushing and grinding acorns, while manos and metates were used primarily for grinding wild grass grains and seeds (Moratto 1984:209–210).

As demonstrated by the artifact assemblage, hunting remained an important aspect of food procurement during the Berkeley Pattern (Frederickson 1973:125–126). The archaeological record, which consists of numerous large shell midden/mounds, also demonstrates that most Berkeley Pattern sites located near, or in the vicinity of, both fresh and salt water made intensive use of marine and estuarine resources. The artifact assemblage also includes shell beads and ornaments, as well as numerous types of bone tools. Interment continues to dominate mortuary practices, but a few cremations are also found at Berkeley Pattern sites.

Artifact assemblages and radiocarbon dating of sites from this period suggest this subsistence pattern may have developed in the San Francisco Bay region and later spread to surrounding coastal locales and into central California. Moratto (1984:207–211) suggests that this pattern is related to the expansion of Eastern Miwok populations from the San Francisco Bay area to the Sacramento Valley and Sierra foothills.
Augustine Pattern (A.D. 500–1769)

The Augustine Pattern (A.D. 500–1769) is evidenced by several changes in subsistence, foraging, and land use patterns that begin to reflect the use pattern known from Historic Period Native American groups in the area. A substantial increase in the intensity of subsistence exploitation, including fishing, hunting, and gathering (particularly the acorn), evidenced in the archaeological record correlates directly with an increase in population growth (Moratto 1984:211–214).

Tools and cooking implements included shaped mortars and pestles, hopper mortars, bone awls used for producing coiled baskets, and the bow and arrow. Pottery vessels, known as Cosumnes Brownware, are found in some parts of the Central Valley, and most likely developed during this period from the prior baked clay industry.

During this period, an increase in sedentism led to the development of social stratification, accompanied by a shift to elaborate ceremonial and social organization. Exchange networks, with the use of clamshell disk beads as currency, also developed during the Augustine Pattern. Mortuary practices during this period included flexed burials and pre-interment burning of offerings in a grave pit, as well as cremation of high-status individuals (Frederickson 1973:127–129; Moratto 1984:211). Additional items of material culture included flanged tubular pipes, harpoons, and small Gunther barbed series projectile points. The Augustine Pattern may represent the southward expansion of Wintu populations (Moratto 1984:211–214).

ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The project area is in the traditional territory of the Nisenan, who are also known as the Maidu, and lived in the southern extent of the Sacramento River and east into the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The term Maidu stems from the Native word for “person” or “human,” though it appears to include all living beings (Bibby 1994:325–326). The term Maidu is often used to describe three distinct Maiduan speaking peoples historically identified as Maidu (includes Northeastern Maidu or Mountain Maidu) of Plumas and Lassen Counties, Konkow (Northwestern Maidu, Concow, or Koyongkauwi) of Butte and Yuba Counties, and Nisenan (Southern Maidu) of Yuba, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, and El Dorado Counties (Bibby 1994:325).

The traditional territories of the Nisenan included the drainages of the Yuba, Bear, and American Rivers, along with the lower drainage of the Feather River to the east and extending to the Cosumnes River in the south. Linguistically, they are closely related to the neighboring Konkow and Maidu languages, which together form the Maiduan Language Family (Mithun 2001), a subgroup of the Penutian language stock (Wilson and Towne 1978:387–397). Nisenan consisted of four dialects, each of which was found in geographically distinct areas of their territory, namely the Valley, Southern Hill, Central Hill, and Northern Hill. Their neighbors included the Southern Patwin to the west across the Sacramento River beyond the Yolo Basin, the Plains Miwok in the Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta region, the Konkow to the north, and the Washoe to the east in the Sierra Nevada.

The Valley Nisenan generally established semi-permanent settlements or winter villages on low, natural rises along streams and rivers or on gentle, south-facing slopes (Wilson and Towne 1978:388). Communities were composed of a larger, central village with several smaller, outlying villages. The number of houses varied from three to seven in smaller villages and from 40 to 50 houses in larger villages. Houses were circular dome-shaped or conical, 10 to 15 feet in diameter, earth-covered semi-subterranean structures. Smaller brush shelters were used in the summer when more activities occurred outdoors. Structures also included large dance houses, sweathouses, and acorn granaries. Village populations ranged from a couple families to over 100 individuals (Kroeber 1925). Numerous primary Nisenan villages were located along the banks of the American, Bear, Feather, and Sacramento Rivers.
and in the foothills. Although the exact location of Nisenan village sites is unknown, Wilson and Towne (1978) depict the village sites of Yukulu, Bamon, and Polunkit in the general region of the project area.

It appears that each community, whether a single village with satellite houses or a cluster of villages, controlled and managed the natural resources of its region. Although the position of headman carried authority, it was not direct authority, but required the support and agreement of the villagers and shaman (Wilson and Towne 1978:393). The headman position was often hereditary, though it could also be elected by a council of household heads. Among his duties to maintain the functioning of his community, the headman advised his people, called and directed special festivities, arbitrated disputes, hosted ceremonial gatherings, and called heads of family into council to discuss matters of community import. Feuds within a community might be ultimately resolved through one family moving away. Relations between communities were generally friendly and often resources were shared. But disputes over trespass into gathering and hunting areas sometimes arose. Deceased Nisenan were cremated, and their remains were buried in a designated cemetery area (Wilson and Towne 1978:392).

The fundamental economy of the Nisenan was one of subsistence hunting, fishing, and collecting plant foods in an area where abundant natural resources varied seasonally. Like most native Californians, the Nisenan relied on acorns as a staple food, which were collected during the fall and stored in granaries. Other vegetal resources, such as pine nuts, hazelnuts, buckeye nuts, fruits, berries, underground onions and tubers, and seeds, supplemented the diet. Salmon and other fish, shellfish, birds, grasshoppers and other insects, and large and small mammals were also harvested or hunted and consumed. Deer, elk, antelope, and black bears were among the large animals that were hunted by the Nisenan.

A wide variety of tools, implements, and enclosures were employed by the Nisenan to gather and collect food resources. These included the bow and arrow, traps, nets, slings, and blinds for hunting land mammals and birds, along with harpoons, hooks, and nets, and tule balsa and log canoes for fish. Throwing sticks were typically used to hunt rabbits and hares, and large nets and clubs were used during communal drives. Woven tools, including seed beaters, burden baskets, and carrying nets, as well as sharpened digging sticks, were used to collect a wide array of plant resources.

The Nisenan processed food resources with a variety of tools, including portable stone mortars, bedrock mortars and pestles, anvils, woven strainers and winnowers, leaching baskets and bowls, woven parching trays, wooden mortars, and knives. Unprocessed acorns were stored in large granaries. Trade was common between Nisenan groups for various resources and implements and with neighboring groups for finely made shell ornaments and money beads, steatite, and obsidian.

Spanish explorers first crossed into Nisenan territory in 1808, but there is no record of Nisenan peoples being removed from their lands to Spanish missions at this time (Wilson and Towne 1978:396). Trappers entered the Sacramento Valley in the late 1820s and began more frequent incursions into Nisenan territory. As a direct result of the introduction of foreign diseases, an estimated 75 percent of the Valley Nisenan were decimated during the great epidemic that swept the Sacramento Valley in 1833. With entire villages wiped out, Valley Nisenan survivors retreated into the hills (Cook 1955:322).

The discovery of gold in 1848, at Sutter’s Mill near Coloma on the American River, had a devastating impact on the lives of indigenous Californians in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and all along the foothills of the Sierra Nevada (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). Coloma was in the heart of Nisenan territory. With the tens of thousands of gold seekers came the mass introduction and concentration of diseases, the loss of land and territory (including traditional hunting and gathering locales), violence, malnutrition, and starvation (Grunsky 1989). Traditional lands of the Hill Nisenan were overrun in the early 1850s, and Nisenan survivors had little choice but to live at the margins of foothill towns and work for agricultural, logging, and ranching industries (Wilson and Towne 1978:396).
Although few descendants of the Valley Nisenan were recorded in the 1960 United States Census, several Hill Nisenan families resided in El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, and Yuba Counties in the 1970s (Wilson and Towne 1978:396–397). Today, there are approximately 2,500 Maiduan people (including the Maidu of Plumas and Lassen Counties, Konkow of Butte and Yuba Counties, and Nisenan of El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, and Yuba Counties) who live primarily on the rancherias of Auburn, Berry Creek, Chico, Enterprise, Greenville, Mooretown, Shingle Springs, and Susanville, as well as on the Round Valley Reservation (White 2005). The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) is located approximately 36 kilometers (22 miles) from the project area whereas the Wilton Rancheria are located approximately 26 kilometers (17 miles), and the Shingle Springs Rancheria approximately 80 (50 miles).

**Development of Sacramento**

Before European colonization, the Nisenan and Plains Miwok Indians called the Sacramento area home. Spanish colonization, which primarily occurred along the southern and central coast, did not instantly affect the native Indians of the Central Valley. The first recorded European expedition into the interior of California occurred in 1808 by Gabriel Moraga. Moraga surveyed the region to find suitable locations for a future mission and named the valley and river Sacramento, after the Spanish word for Sacrament. The Spanish never colonized the area but awarded rancho land grants to loyal citizens and soldiers to populate the region. This practice continued after Mexican Independence in 1821, and the influx of American settlers to the valley altered the landscape. The area saw multiple ranchos and land grants to Mexicans, Americans, and Europeans, like John Sutter, who developed a trading post between the American and Sacramento Rivers (Page & Turnbull 2019b). Sutter’s trading post, known as New Helvetia after Sutter’s homeland in present-day Switzerland, served as the foundation for early Sacramento.

Almost immediately after the annexation of California by the United States in 1848, gold was discovered at a lumber mill owned by Sutter along the American River near present-day Coloma in El Dorado County. This discovery spurred the California Gold Rush, which led to the rapid transformation of California as a sparsely populated western frontier to a center of industry, commerce, and trade. As the gateway to the Sierra Nevada and the goldfields of the foothills, Sacramento quickly became a transportation hub and nexus of Gold Rush economic activity. In December 1848, John Sutter Jr. and Sam Brannan hired topographical engineer Captain William H. Warner and Lieutenant William Sherman to survey and layout “Sacramento City.” Named after the river and meant to differentiate John Sutter Jr.’s pursuits from that of his father, John Sutter Sr. The original city grid consisted of 26 lettered (A to Z, today C to Broadway) and 31 numbered (1st to 31st, today Front to Alhambra) streets. Sacramento’s city grid was built directly at the base of the American River flood basin, where centuries of Sierra Nevada snowmelt created temporary lakes each spring, well into the 1840s. Sacramento’s original townsite was laid out as a 5-square-mile area, with each street 80 feet wide (except for Front and M), and each block 320 to 340 feet long. Lots comprised each block and many blocks were divided by 20-foot-wide alleys (Figure 7) (Owens 2013:32–33, 42–43; Hallam 2013:63–64).

Although Sacramento grew through 1850, the population was not stable. With the excitement of new Gold Rush diggings and news of new claims, Sacramento’s population remained largely transient aside from the core of merchants and hotel owners. California’s population was undoubtedly increasing, but the population of Sacramento grew sluggishly due in part to the transient nature of the early Gold Rush miners, flooding, and fires that destroyed buildings. In September 1849, a destructive fire swept through the business district, destroying several blocks of canvas tent and wood frame structures, followed by a major flood in January 1850. In 1852 fire again swept through the business district, destroying over 55 blocks of the city. Original buildings in Sacramento were wood frame and canvas, but as fires and floods became a way of life, citizens began to erect buildings of brick and raised the street level, leaving the original street level below grade (Owens 2013:48–50).
Figure 7. 1874 surveyor’s map of the city of Sacramento, California. The public squares associated with the original 1849 plan for the city have been outlined in blue. Source: California State Railroad Museum and Archives.

In 1854 Sacramento became the capital of California. This rise in prominence, coupled with the city’s strategic location and early commercial importance in the development of California, resulted in Sacramento becoming the western terminus for the first transcontinental railroad, which began construction in 1863. The Central Pacific Railroad Company, which later became the Southern Pacific Railroad and then Union Pacific, was founded by a group of merchants and businessmen known as “the Big Four,” who were based in Sacramento, or had strong ties to the region. This development solidified Sacramento as a center for transportation in California, providing immediate links to San Francisco and the growing agricultural hinterlands of the central valleys with the rest of the United States (Owens 2013:48–50).

Through the 1870s and into the 1900s, growth continued eastward away from the original core along the embarcadero and K Street. The patterns of growth were often reflective of the types of amenities in given neighborhoods including schools and parks. Utilizing the knowledge of parks within urban spaces Sacramento’s grid was developed utilizing these ideals. John Sutter Jr., the primary driving force for the
development of Sacramento, had the city laid in a grid pattern with spaces specifically for city plazas (see Figure 6). These plaza parks provided residents with publicly accessible spaces within an urban core.

As growth continued, pushed by the development of streetcars which connected new neighborhoods with the urban commercial core, the main city grid began to fill. By the 1890s, speculators had begun to eye land outside of the main grid for development. This led to development of Sacramento’s first residential suburban tracts of Oak Park, Elmhurst, and East Sacramento (Kremer 2012). The trend of suburban expansion and growth of the city towards the east, south, and eventually north would continue throughout the remainder of the twentieth century, particularly during the population boom years following World War II (WWII).

**Del Paso and North Sacramento**

Del Paso is a community within the northern portion of the city of Sacramento. Located on the north side of the American River, the area was originally part of Mexican-era land grant of Rancho del Paso. Awarded to Eliab Grimes on December 20, 1844, Rancho del Paso was a 44,000-acre property that extended along the north bank of the American River and covered an area consistent with the northern areas of the city of Sacramento and the unincorporated communities of Del Paso Heights, Arden Arcade, Rio Linda, and others in present-day northwest Sacramento County (Page & Turnbull 2019a; American Institute of Architects [AIA] 2014); Eliab partnered with John Sinclair to harvest wheat and cattle on the land. The ownership of the ranch changed in 1848 when Eliab died and passed the rancho to his nephew Hiram, and in 1849, John Sinclair sold his share of the rancho back to Hiram, who in turn sold the land to Samuel Norris, a San Francisco trader. Throughout the 1850s, Norris remained embattled with Eliab’s descendants, who contested Norris’ rightful claim to the rancho. In 1860 the U.S. Supreme Court sided with Norris, though the trials placed him in deep debt with his lawyers, forcing him to sell the rancho to James Ben Ali Haggin and Lloyd Tevis, forming the Haggin-Tevis Partnership. This partnership consisted of two brothers-in-law from San Francisco, who utilized the land for pasturing sheep, cattle, and horses while growing crops of grain, hay, and hops along the American River. The partnership also bred racehorses; by 1886 the rancho had over 100 horses in training.

In 1889 the partnership formed the Rancho Del Paso Land Company, which intended to subdivide and sell the entire rancho to a single buyer. After proving unsuccessful, the company ultimately sold the land in 1905 to the Sacramento Valley Colonization Company (SVCC), which was a collection of 10 local investors who aimed to subdivide and sell the land for development (Page & Turnbull 2019a; AIA 2014). The subdivisions created by the SVCC formed the foundation for the area as it’s known today, adding names like Rio Linda, Del Paso Heights, and North Highlands to the map. While many of these areas remained overwhelmingly agricultural in the initial decades of the twentieth century, a concentrated community directly north of the city of Sacramento began to grow. Known as North Sacramento, the growing townsite saw an increase in commercial and residential development after the initial subdivision by the SVCC. The growth of the community was spurred further in 1915 with the opening of the Sacramento Northern, which was a streetcar line that connected the North Sacramento area with the central core of south-adjacent Sacramento. In 1924, North Sacramento officially incorporated as its own municipality (Figure 8) (North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce 2022).

Despite its growth, the North Sacramento community remained relatively small with a modest commercial district and suburban homes, all of which was surrounded by agricultural lands. The outlying areas beyond the city’s boundaries, known as Del Paso Heights, was predominantly ranchland, and much of the initial development was uneven, with irregularly shaped commercial and industrial areas, long and dense residential blocks, and inconsistent infrastructure development. This urban development represents much of the regions surrounding Del Paso, as much of the land outside downtown Sacramento was used for agricultural purposes (City of Sacramento 2009).
Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the neighborhood’s racial makeup was primarily white. However, during the Great Depression, there was an influx of African American residents to the region from the southern states seeking work due to economic hardships of the period. Many African American men found work with the Southern Pacific Railroad at the Sacramento Railyards north of downtown. Racial covenants and other discriminatory housing policies, most commonly known as “redlining” prevented many people of color from residing and purchasing homes in some of the more desirable areas of Sacramento, including North Sacramento. While North Sacramento would remain predominantly white over the following decades, the availability of land in the Del Paso Heights area presented an opportunity for many people of color to purchase homes, ultimately changing the overall demographic makeup of the community over to African American and eventually Latino majorities (Page & Turnbull 2022:26).

By the early 1960s, the City was annexing piecemeal areas surrounding North Sacramento, including portions of Del Paso Heights and other unincorporated communities. In 1964, the City of North Sacramento too was annexed following an election where the decision to join the City was made by a slim margin of votes. Annexation and the dilution of public services, combined with the opening of US Highway 160 and the closing of the nearby McClellan Air Force Base, is perceived to have brought economic hardship to the neighborhood. During the 1970s, the community became economically isolated and experienced rising crime and poverty. By the early 1990s, the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) adopted the Del Paso Heights Redevelopment Project Area and began investing in infrastructure, street, and sewer improvements. This redevelopment invested millions into the
neighborhood through 2001 (Page & Turnbull 2022:26; University of California, Santa Barbara [UCSB] 2023).

Parks and Recreation in Sacramento

Early Plazas, Public Parks, and Pleasure Grounds (1845–1901)

Public park spaces have been an integral part of Sacramento’s urban fabric since its earliest development. Associated with the planning and surveying efforts of John Sutter, Jr. in 1849, the city’s foundational grid included entire city blocks set aside as public plazas, rationally located throughout. The initial plan included 10 plazas, nine of which still exist including Plaza Park (today, Cesar E. Chavez Plaza), Roosevelt Park, Fremont Park, Winn Park, Marshall Park, Stanford Park, Grant Park, Muir Playground, and Sacramento Memorial Auditorium (Figure 9 and Figure 10) (Kremer 2012). The original iterations of these plazas were consistent with similar park spaces found throughout the United States during this period. They were often defined by a perimeter walking path with axial, insular walking paths tending into the park space and converging upon a central element, such as a fountain, statue, or similar feature. The interstitial landscape would include a mixture of open space with turf, low-profile plantings, and larger shrubs and trees serving as screening and anchoring elements, either oriented in sporadic or formal configurations.

In addition to the original city’s public plaza spaces, the State of California (State) was also an important part of developing Sacramento’s public parks. In a bid to cement Sacramento’s selection as the state capital in 1854, the City offered land at Plaza Park for the State Capitol building. However, the site was ultimately infeasible and a new, larger location was provided to the southwest. The initial landscape around the State Capitol was formal with concentric axial pathways radiating from its four façades. However, through the effort of the State, additional lands spanning over 10 city blocks were acquired for a new grand park. Throughout the 1870s, Capitol Park was landscaped in the Victorian tradition with a symmetrical, oval-shaped carriage route, expansive lawns, and over 800 trees and other plants spread
throughout the landscape (Page & Turnbull 2019a:164–165). In the following years, Capitol Park would be added to with several amenities, including exhibition halls and pavilions for the State Fair.2

As tastes changed towards the late nineteenth century, these early plazas and public parks were often redeveloped to include more naturally appearing plantings and “picturesque” landscapes with meandering pathways (Figure 11). This coincided with the concept of the “pleasure ground,” which became the model for the development of public parks in Sacramento. Characterized by their romantic and idyllic picturesque qualities, the pleasure ground and wilderness parks were born out of the American Transcendentalist movement of the late nineteenth century, which promoted natural and open spaces as a regenerative experience in contrast to the conditions within industrialized urban centers of the period (Prosser 2017:7–8). Although intended to be natural settings, pleasure ground parks were carefully designed and maintained to create the illusion of a natural, organic setting.

In Sacramento, like so many cities throughout the United States, these park types also had a practical role in redeveloping land that had no profitable use or was perceived as undevelopable, either through uneven terrain, poor drainage, or other site conditions that impeded construction. In many cases, these parks also were used as a real estate speculation tool, turning poor-quality land into a desirable public amenity, which spurred the subdivision and sale of the surrounding lands as new neighborhoods. The earliest example of the pleasure ground park is McKinley Park. Originally known as East Park, the property was a low-lying slough located on the outskirts of Sacramento. The land was purchased by the Sacramento Street Railway Company in 1871 and transformed into a park over the following year. Upon opening in 1872, the park was celebrated for its collection of plantings and meandering avenues and walkways. Over time, additional amenities were added, including conversion of the slough into a picturesque lake and the addition of a zoo, flower gardens, and picnic grounds (Figure 12). The park became an incredibly popular destination and ultimately as a catalyst for residential development in early East Sacramento (Nelson 2018:8.24–8.26).

---

2 In addition to Capitol Park, the State founded the State Agricultural Park during the same period in 1861. Located in the present-day neighborhood of Boulevard Park, Agricultural Park was the early fairgrounds and featured a prominent horse racing track and agricultural exhibition space. While a notable public space, the property was specifically developed as a fairground and not a public park.
Municipal Parks and Public Recreation (1905–1941)

During the early twentieth century, the public park evolved from the pleasure ground to a more modern iteration of the municipal park. In addition to planned and manicured open spaces—expressed in a mixture of picturesque and formal compositions—municipal parks began featuring a series of amenities and facilities that catered to a variety of recreational uses, marking a shift from a “passive enjoyment of the landscape” to more developed activities and amenities (Prosser 2017:11). Consistent with the Progressive-era reforms of the early twentieth century, the municipal park model of the Reform Park Movement would often feature various educational and cultural programs, as well as the promotion of the outdoors and sport, all through purpose-built buildings, structures, playing fields, and other well-defined facilities separate from the general open and more naturalistic spaces of the park (Prosser 2017:11; Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:8).

Early examples of the municipal park model came through the re-imagining and partial redevelopment of the existing pleasure ground parks through the introduction of new amenities and facilities. This was evident at McKinley Park. By 1902 upkeep of the park was prohibitively expensive, relying on non-profit organizations to first manage, and later own, the park. In 1911 the City annexed East Sacramento and took ownership and control of McKinley Park. By then, the park had been expanded to include running tracks, a deer park, a clubhouse, and early sporting fields for baseball, tennis, and basketball (Nelson 2018:8.24–8.26).

Another major early municipal park in Sacramento was Southside Park. Similar to McKinley Park, Southside Park was constructed on low-lying land with poor drainage. The area, which had been prone to flooding, was protected by a series of levees in 1902, opening south of downtown Sacramento to development. With the intent of creating a new regional park, the City purchased the land in 1905 and hired San Francisco-based landscape architect John McLaren, designer of Golden Gate Park, to create Southside Park in the emerging municipal park vein, which mixed elements of the pleasure ground model with new recreational amenities. Using the low lying land, the design for the park had a central lake with large open spaces, picnic grounds, prominently placed shade trees, meandering pathways, and a clubhouse facility (Figure 13). Southside Park initially opened to the public in 1907 and would continue to evolve over the following decades to include a variety of amenities, including bocce courts, a bandstand, and playgrounds (Burg 2017:8.10–8.12).
In 1911 the City sought to explore potential areas for new, grand parks. The city purchased 800 acres of land along Arcade Creek well north of the city’s boundaries at present-day Del Paso Park and hired Boston-based planner John Nolen to provide a new development plan for the new parkland, and later a broader Sacramento park system plan. Nolen ultimately recommended the expansion of over 100 new parks and open spaces throughout the city, with Del Paso Park being the central unifying component. However, the plans never came to fruition, due in large part to the relatively remote location of Del Paso Park from the city (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:13–14).

The full realization of the municipal park model came soon after. The same year that the City purchased the land for Del Paso Park, William Land, a successful businessman and civic leader, passed away and donated a large area of land south of the city for use as a public park. William Land Park was slow to be developed, but ultimately came to fruition by the mid-1920s. In addition to expansive, open park space, William Land Park featured a number of amenities, including athletic fields, curved pleasure drives, playgrounds, a large pond, a golf course, and the Sacramento Zoo (Figure 14). The park would continue to evolve over the following years with improvements conducted by the City, and later federal work relief programs under the New Deal-era, namely the Works Progress Administration (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:15–20). Today, William Land Park remains one of the preeminent municipal parks in Sacramento.
Figure 14. 1939 aerial photograph of the southwest corner of William Land Park, view north. Source: Center for Sacramento History.

Postwar Parks and Recreation (1945–Present)

The postwar period in Sacramento, as elsewhere throughout California and the broader United States, was defined by increased suburbanization, which in turn led to new parks outside of the traditional urban and municipal parks of the previous decades. This, coupled with an emphasis on increased recreation, play, sport, and fitness driven in part by federal policy, led to an expansion of playgrounds, playing fields, and other sporting facilities throughout the Sacramento area (Figure 15) (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:10).
With the construction of new communities, the neighborhood park would become the dominant model for park development. These were essential, unifying elements within each community. Often a few acres in size, these parks provided playgrounds, sporting fields or courts (baseball diamonds, basketball courts, tennis courts, etc.), picnic spaces, and occasionally community centers or clubhouses, all surrounded by landscaped open park space. Another inherent element of the neighborhood park was the parking lot. Despite being within a neighborhood, the automobile had become ubiquitous with postwar life, and parking lots to provide park access were essential in postwar neighborhood parks. In addition to the neighborhood parks, the postwar period saw the rise of the regional recreation center. Larger in size, these parks would be designed around expanded recreational facilities, including public swimming pools, complexes of athletic fields, gymnasiums, and golf courses (Prosser 2017:29–30). Examples of postwar, neighborhood parks and regional recreation centers include Tahoe, Glenn Hall, Belle Coolidge, Northgate, Woodbine, and George Sim Parks.

While postwar parks utilized the modernist architectural vocabulary and focused on a variety of recreational amenities and sports facilities, later postwar parks in Sacramento would revert to a more picturesque and natural aesthetic. This was reflected in new greenbelt-focused parks, which exhibit more naturally apparent landscapes as part of the promotion of outdoor education and a more tranquil experience, marking a return to a more wilderness park and pleasure ground-based ethos within the context of the emerging environmental conservation concerns (Prosser 2017:38). Examples include Frank Seymour Park, Bannon Creek Park and Parkway, and Sutter’s Landing Regional Park.
PROPERTY HISTORY

Del Paso Regional Park

As outlined in previous sections, Del Paso Park was initially established in 1911, when the City purchased around 800 acres in the Del Paso Heights area from the SVCC for the purposes of creating a grand public park (Figure 16). The City Trustees agreed on the name “Del Paso Park” in honor of the Mexican-era rancho, of which the property had once been a part of. While the park remained largely natural and undeveloped for the early decades of the park, some early amenities were constructed, including walking trails, picnic tables, lighting, and playground equipment (Figure 17) (Cardno 2015).

![Figure 16. Excerpted portion of a 1916 map of suburbs in the North Sacramento area, showing the City-owned park property that would become Del Paso Park. Source: California State Library, California History Room.](image-url)
In 1914 the City of Sacramento hired planner John Nolen to grand park layout. That next year, Nolen submitted his plan, an ambitious turn-of-the-century “garden city” that would include botanical gardens, a Greek theater, a lake, and an athletic field in the growing, progressive municipal park model, which would be integrated into a larger park and greenbelt system along the American River. However, the plan proved too expensive, and the distance of Del Paso Park from the then-city boundaries south of the American River presented a logistical challenge; the City never implemented Nolen’s design. Instead, City planners initiated plans to develop the park grounds into public recreational facilities. The first of these developments occurred in 1926 when the City leased 20 acres to the Sacramento Trap Shooting Club. In 1932 the City established an 18-hole golf course on the park’s east side. Originally called the Sacramento Municipal Golf Course, the now-named Haggin Oaks Golf Course was designed by Alister McKenzie, a prominent golf course designer and landscape architect responsible for the Cypress Point Golf Course in Monterey, California, and the U.S Masters Course at the Augusta National Golf Club in Augusta, Georgia (Morton 2014; Swesey 2022; The Sacramento Bee 2008; UCSB 2023).

By 1940 Watt Avenue was constructed and extended into the park, ultimately bisecting it into east and west sections (Figure 18). The park experienced more development in 1946 when the Sacramento Horsemen’s Association (SHA) obtained a 20-year lease for a clubhouse and stables on the park property. Initially formed as the Sacramento Sherriff’s posse in 1937, the SHA sponsored horse shows and rodeo events around the Sacramento area, including at their facilities in Del Paso Park. The club expanded in 1956 with the construction of the Saddle Oaks Clubhouse, a new barn in 1962, and a small arena in the 1970s. The expansion of the SHA and enlargement Haggins Oaks brought more residents to the park, which prompted the city to create more recreational facilities. By 1963 the Capital City Highway, the business loop section of Interstate 80, further separated the two sections of the park (The Sacramento Bee 1942; SHA 2022).
As the economic prosperity of the postwar years brought more Americans outside, the demand for recreational activities in public spaces increased. The City began developing the western portion of the park in the late 1960s, as previous improvements primarily occurred on the east side of the property. In 1968 the City constructed a baseball field in memory of Harry Renfree, who worked for the City’s Recreation and Parks Department for 30 years. Construction cost around $250,000, and a dedication service occurred on May 12, 1968. This project was the first significant development on the park’s east side and helped usher in new projects that attracted people to the area (The Sacramento Bee 1951a, 1968a, 1968b). Use of the east portion of Del Paso Park intensified further in 1976, when the Discovery Museum moved its location from Cal Expo to Del Paso Park. Initially founded by the California Science Museum in 1951, the museum served as a “place where children and adults could both touch and be touched by the wonders of science and nature.” The museum operated at Cal Expo for over 20 years before the site became no longer favorable due to the California State Fair moving to the location. The museum changed names again to the Sacramento Science Center and Junior Museum, which reflected the changing scope of programs and exhibits in natural and physical science.

Throughout the 1980s, Del Paso Park continued to evolve. To expand sporting opportunities, the City constructed a softball complex paid for by a grant from the California DPR under the California Park Land Bond Act of 1984. The Sacramento Softball Complex features four diamonds, a restaurant, picnic area, parking lot, and a two-lane bridge across Arcade Creek (The Sacramento Bee 1951b; Johnson 1991; SMUD Museum of Science and Curiosity [MOSAC] 2022; Smith 2022).

The park continued to serve as a popular recreation center throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. However, with California’s rising homeless problem, the park became subject to illegal encampments, particularly along the park boundaries adjoining the freeways and the Union Pacific Railroad alignment to the west. In 2020 the Discovery Museum relocated to Downtown Sacramento and was renamed the MOSAC, and the city transformed the former museum building at Del Paso Park into a homeless respite center. In 2004 the City began leasing land on the west position of the park to a Honda dealership, which represents a recent example of multiple incursions along the peripheries of both the east and west sections of the park (The Sacramento Bee 2000; Clift 2022; Lillis 2016; Lindelof 2004).
Harry Renfree Field

Renfree Field is a baseball diamond facility that was constructed at Del Paso Park in 1967 and officially opened in 1968. Commissioned in part by the City and funded through private and non-profit donors, the baseball facility was noted as an early recreational baseball diamond with field lighting that would allow for night games. The baseball diamond and facilities were constructed for approximately $250,000, and was officially dedicated on May 12, 1968, by the City’s Recreation Director who died suddenly in the years prior.

Initial planning for what would become Renfree Field began as late as 1965 (McDermott 2013). Community members and advocates for recreational baseball approached Renfree about the construction of a new baseball diamond with lighting that could facilitate nighttime games and play. Renfree would take the request and approach a number of organizations and individuals within the local baseball community to begin advocating to City Council. Among those included Sal H. Gomez, a noteworthy local businessman and promoter of sports in Sacramento, who helped push the funding drive for the facility, raising over $15,000 for the construction of bleachers and a restroom facility (McDermott 2013). Following the completion of the field in 1968, the facilities included the baseball field with perimeter fencing, dugouts, bleacher seating that could accommodate 800 spectators, a public restroom building, a standalone concession building, and a two-story clubhouse building with team lockers and a press box (Figure 19) (Conlin 1981).

Figure 19. 1971 aerial photograph showing Renfree Field soon after completion. Note the clubhouse building and clearly defined bleachers, dugout spaces, clubhouse and press box building, and restrooms; north is up. Source: UCSB 2023; Frame Finder, Flight CAS_3069, Frame 4-167.

The opening game at the facility featured a mixture of major and minor league players, who played alongside members of the original Sacramento Solons, an early Sacramento minor league baseball team that played sporadically between the late nineteenth century and mid-twentieth century. While the opening game and others hosted during the initial years of its operation drew large crowds of thousands of spectators, the majority of the baseball diamond’s use was recreational with a number of different
competitive, amateur and recreational baseball teams and leagues using the facility. However, despite this initial fanfare, the facility was beginning to lose its luster by the mid-1970s, as leagues—college, amateur, high school, and recreational—began using other, newer facilities (Bodding 1975).

In the 1980s, Renfree Field was often mentioned as a site for potential minor league, professional baseball. Following the end of the Solons in the early 1970s, Sacramento was absent a professional baseball team. Some efforts to establish a new team examined Renfree Field as a potential location, in addition to Cal Expo and other prominent areas within the city. However, despite the publicity around the notion, it is clear that the idea of using Renfree Field was never viable. On numerous occasions, issues around space constraints on the site and costs to make the necessary improvements were beyond what the City was willing to pay (The Sacramento Bee 1981; Conlin 1981, 1987).

The 1990s saw some renovations occur at Renfree Field for the first time since construction. The renovation included new sod, infield dirt, and decomposed granite, while the bleachers and backstop also underwent repair work. In the early 2000s, the playground was constructed immediately south of the baseball field and the Renfree Field parking lot was resurfaced (Figure 20). Despite the limited interventions, the facility continued to a state of decline and disrepair, which became more pronounced after the City made cuts to their Department of Parks and Recreation in the aftermath of the Great Recession. In 2012 following a fire in the press box related to vandalism, Renfree Field was closed. Plans from the non-profit and private sector to reinvest in Renfree Field would be common over the following years, although concrete plans did not materialize (Lillis 2012).

Figure 20. 2011 satellite image of Renfree Field, illustrating the conditions when it retained the original buildings and bleachers and was in continued use for baseball. Source: Google Earth Pro.
In 2018 the City constructed the second parking lot and walking path for the playground, located at the southeast corner of Renfree Field. The following year, the original buildings and bleachers were removed from Renfree Field, leaving only the backstop, chain-link fences, dugout benches, field lighting, and scoreboard (Figure 21).

![Figure 21. 2022 satellite image showing existing conditions at Renfree Field. Source: Google Earth Pro.](image)

**INDIVIDUALS**

**Harry Renfree**

Born in Sacramento on November 14, 1915, Alfred Harry Renfree spent his life as a public servant to the City. Son of Reginald H. Renfree, Alfred was a first-generation American as his family had migrated to the United States from England around 1900. One of five siblings, Alfred participated in numerous municipal sports leagues where he acquired a love for intramural activities. Alfred attended Sacramento High School and worked at the Sacramento Saw Works and Lyon-Darwin Hardware Company in Oak Park throughout the 1930s. In June of 1937, Alfred married Laura Shoemaker in Sacramento. Together the couple would have three daughters. Alfred’s career in recreational sports began on a part-time basis in 1937 when he became manager of the Clunie Swimming Pool in McKinley Park. The City recreational department also utilized Alfred to officiate baseball, basketball, soccer, and volleyball leagues sponsored by the city (Ancestry 2023a, 2023b, 2023c).

The involvement of the United States in WWII forced many young men to put their lives on hold to fight against the Axis powers in Europe and the Pacific. A heart condition kept Alfred from wartime service. However, his brother Reginald who served as Superintendent of Sports for the City was drafted, and Harry took over the position temporarily. Upon Reginald’s return in 1946, Harry became a recreational supervisor for the City and, in 1951, became the Sports Superintendent. Alfred’s duties expanded in 1962 to take on adult activities such as golf and different senior programs. Outside work, Alfred was involved with various Masonic organizations, including the Washington Lodge No. 20, Scottish Rite bodies, and the Ben Ali Shrine. Alfred continued as superintendent until his death on December 7, 1966. Alfred
collapsed during a meeting with his boss and brother Reginald. Coworkers attempted mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Alfred was pronounced dead at the Sacramento Hospital. Because of Alfred’s lengthy service to the Recreation Department, the City dedicated a baseball park in his name at Del Paso Park in 1968 (The Sacramento Bee 1966a, 1966b).

Salvador H. Gomez

Salvador “Sal” Hurtado Gomez was a noteworthy restauranteur, businessman, and promoter of professional and junior sports in the Sacramento area during the second half of the twentieth century (Figure 22). Sal Gomez was born in Hayden, Arizona in 1915 to parents Niacario and Maria Gomez, both of whom were from Jalisco, Mexico and immigrated to the United States ca. 1912. Gomez’ father worked as a laborer in a smelting plant before the family ultimately resettled in Los Angeles, California ca.1927 (Ancestry 2023d). While Gomez’s father worked in street construction, Sal took a job working in the wholesale food industry. By 1940 Sal was working as a foreman and salesman for the West Coast Banana Distributors in Los Angeles (Ancestry 2023e). By 1941, he was enlisted into the U.S. Army and served in the 339th Engineers unit during WWII. Gomez met his wife in Corona, where she was working in a war time defense supplies factory, and they were married in 1942. Upon returning from the war, Sal Gomez found that his prior position was no longer available, and he ultimately began working for an uncle who ran a small tortilla making factory called “La Tolteca,” located in the Boyle Heights neighborhood of Los Angeles (Castro 1992).

In 1947 Sal and Lucy Gomez moved to Sacramento, where they opened their own tortilla factor located at 1406 5th Street. The La Fiesta Tortilleria grew steadily over the following decades as Sal and Lucy Gomez continued to produce and market their product around the Sacramento area to both restaurants and grocery stores. They ultimately outgrew their original location and constructed a new purpose-built facility located at 9th and X Streets, near Stockton Boulevard (Figure 23). The new facility allowed them to meet impressive demands, including being distributed by Safeway grocery stores all Northern and Central California (Castro 1992). In addition to mass producing tortillas, Sal and Lucy Gomez opened their own restaurants known as the “La Fiesta Mexicatessen.” The restaurant would experience notable success with several locations throughout the Sacramento area, including the former west end of downtown Sacramento, Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael (Figure 24).
In addition to Sal Gomez’s success in business, he was a notable promoter of professional and recreational sports throughout Sacramento. He began playing golf for the networking opportunities and to advance his business interests, and was often involved in many golf tournaments throughout Sacramento. Gomez was also a charter member of the Northridge Country Club and the Mexican American Golf Association. Gomez was also involved in boxing promotion and was a notable promoter for baseball in the Sacramento region, sponsoring a variety of amateur and recreational teams, and leading the drive to finance the lighting at Renfree Field (Gibson 1996).

Gomez’s involvement in civics extended beyond sport and recreation and included serving in a variety of organizations and committees, including the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, the West End Citizens Committee for Redevelopment, and the Lions Club (The Sacramento Bee 1954). In 1970 Gomez ran for election in the 8th California Assembly District as a Republican, but ultimately lost to Democratic incumbent and former May of North Sacramento Walter W. Powers (The Sacramento Bee 1970). While Gomez does not appear to have sought out elected office again, he continued to be a notable civic figure in Sacramento until his passing in 1996.

IDENTIFICATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

North Central Information Center Records Search

On December 5, 2022, SWCA performed an in-house records search at the CHRIS NCIC, located at California State University, Sacramento, to identify known cultural resources and previous cultural resource studies within 0.25 mile of the project. The records search results are included in Appendix A.

Previous Cultural Resource Studies

Seven previously conducted cultural resource studies were identified within 0.25 mile of the project, including studies that produced several different reports (Table 1; Appendix A). None of these studies
intersect the project area, and all were written more than 10 years ago. Therefore, they are insufficient for the purposes of this study.

### Table 1. Previous Studies within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCIC Report Number</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000127</td>
<td>Present Status of Archaeological Resources in Sacramento County</td>
<td>Johnson, Jerald J.</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000176</td>
<td>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Sewer Alignments for the Natomas Interceptor System, Sacramento, California</td>
<td>Dondero, Steven</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000314</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Watt Avenue/State Route 41 Overcrossing Widening Project 03-SAC-51 PM 8.0/8.1 03290-253400</td>
<td>Weigel, Lawrence E.</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000614</td>
<td>Park Road Sewage Pumping Station Demolition</td>
<td>Keefer, Margaret</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006385</td>
<td>Re: Results of Archaeological Monitoring for the Park Road Sewage Pumping Station (S-14)</td>
<td>Tremaine, Kim</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013886</td>
<td>Section 106 Approval for FY08/09 RTP Non-Motorized Project RT-34-016, Improving Del Paso Regional Park’s Trails, City of Sacramento (FHWA101014A)</td>
<td>Coombs, James, Susan Stratton, and Milford Wayne Donaldson</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013886A</td>
<td>Section 106 Impact Analysis for the Del Paso Park Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>Dice, Michael</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-Designation</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP Evaluation</th>
<th>Distance to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-34-000228</td>
<td>CA-SAC-000201</td>
<td>Pre-contact</td>
<td>Ground stone and points in creek bed</td>
<td>Unevaluated</td>
<td>Outside APE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-004267</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Del Paso Regional Park</td>
<td>Unevaluated</td>
<td>In APE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

Two previously recorded cultural resources were identified within a 0.25-mile radius of the APE (Table 2; see Appendix A). One previously recorded cultural resource intersects the APE, P-34-004267, while the other, P-34-000228 (CA-SAC-000201) is outside the APE. Resource P-34-004267 represents Del Paso Park, which includes 83 developed acres, 709 acres in open space golf courses, and additional facilities, such as picnic areas, walking and equestrian trails, play areas, a softball complex, and restroom facilities. Resource P-34-000228 (CA-SAC-000201) is a pre-contact site consisting of ground stone and two projectile points (similar to Gypsum Cave points) found in Arcade Creek. The site was recorded by Curtice in 1955, but could not be relocated when it was revisited by Cultural Resources Unlimited in 2001 (Derr and Derr 2001).

### Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search

SWCA also contacted the NAHC and requested a search of the SLF on November 22, 2022, with the intent of identifying culturally sensitive areas and obtaining a list of native American Contacts who many have specific knowledge of the project vicinity. On December 13, 2022, the NAHC responded stating that the SLF search had produced positive results, meaning that there are known sites of sensitivity within the project site or its vicinity (Appendix B). The NAHC requested that the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria be contacted for information, in addition to providing a comprehensive
list of various tribal representatives that may retain further knowledge of cultural resources within the project vicinity.

NATIVE AMERICAN INFORMATIONAL OUTREACH

On January 27, 2023, SWCA submitted letters to the 10 tribal representatives included within the list provided by NAHC (Appendix C). These letters provided general a general project description, associated project location maps, and a request for additional information regarding potential cultural resources located within the project area. On February 14, 2023, SWCA conducted follow-up telephone calls to each of the tribal representatives to confirm receipt of the initial letter and to solicit information or knowledge related to potential resources or areas of sensitivity (Appendix D). Voicemails were left with nearly all of the tribal contacts, except for one where a conversation occurred. The representative stated that the Arcade Creek area has heightened pre-contact sensitivities, stated that special consideration should be paid to areas where depth of disturbance exceeds 3 feet below grade, and identified a Most Likely Descendant.

AB-52 CONSULTATION

As the lead agency under CEQA, the City has been concurrently consulting with Native American Tribes on the project, as required under AB 52. Specifically, the City has been consulting with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) and soliciting feedback related to potential resources within the project vicinity, as well as the overall heightened sensitivity of the area.

Through consultation with the City, the UAIC has provided guidance on approaches for desired mitigation measures specific to tribal resources. The City has provided general information to SWCA to inform the development of this technical report and inclusion in the appropriate mitigation measures. Specifics related to the conversations under AB 52 consultation have been omitted for confidentiality purposes.

Field Investigations

The project area is located within Del Paso Park, which is an expansive recreational park located in the northeast corner of the city of Sacramento’s boundaries at the eastern confluence of the Interstate 80 and Business 80 Freeways. Del Paso Park is noted for its various recreational facilities and amenities, including sports playing fields and softball complex, golf course and driving range, walking and hiking trails, equestrian trials, picnic areas, playgrounds, general open space, natural habitats and interpretive trails, the Discovery Museum, and a number of support and operations facilities.

The following provides observations and supporting documentation related to the field investigations for both archaeological and historical resources. Qualified archaeologists and architectural historians performed intensive field investigations on December 7, 2022; all photographs included were taken by SWCA on that day and are on-file at SWCA’s Sacramento office.

Archaeological Resources

The archaeological survey covered the project area using pedestrian transects spaced 10 feet apart where vegetation conditions and safety considerations allowed. Periodic boot scrages were employed to expose soils when vegetation obscured the ground surface. The project area is generally divided into an east and west section, bisected by Bridge Road, which extends north–south through the area. The west section of the project area is defined by open space, which features a mixture of exposed soils and low-profile grasses (Figure 25). Various shrubs and trees, notably oaks, are located sporadically through the property,
but primarily along the perimeter. While appearing natural, the uniform grade at the site and structural
encroachments with fencing along the west perimeter and bollards along Bridge Road suggests that the
site has undergone varying degrees of disturbance. This is emphasized further through vehicle tread
marks, informal walking paths, and evidence of human encampments (Figure 26). No cultural resource
materials historic or pre-contact in nature were observed in this section of the project area.

The eastern portion of the project area is defined primarily by the baseball diamond of Renfree Field and
other associated recreational developments. At the westernmost end of this portion, the landscape is
characterized by a large, paved surface parking lot (Figure 27). The area adjacent to the parking lot
features a mixture of turf-covered open spaces and hardscape associated with the park pathways and
foundations of pre-existing buildings and structures associated with the baseball diamond (Figure 28).
Informal dirt walkways were also observed towards the north end of this portion of the project area
(Figure 29 and Figure 30). Ground visibility was moderate, with exposed soils located along the north and
western periphery of the area. However, the area has been evidently disturbed by the development and
ongoing maintenance of the park.
Historical Resources

The project area is located within the northeast section of Del Paso Park, roughly bounded by Park Road to the north and east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west. Specifically, the project area is centered along Renfree Field, which is a recreational baseball diamond and playing field with support facilities that is accessed by Bridge Road (Figure 31).

Bridge Road is a simple roadway that bisects the project area north–south. It is accessed from Auburn Boulevard to the south and Park Road to the north, the latter of which has a bridge crossing over Arcade Creek, which largely parallels Park Road and forms the norther boundary of the project area.
The western portion of the project area, which is located west of Bridge Road, is defined by open space with grasses and periodic oak trees. The western-most boundary of this area features a chain-link fence, which encloses the Discovery Museum grounds to the west. The eastern portion of the project area is centered around Renfree Field, its facilities, a playground, and other recreational elements.

A large rectangular surface parking lot is immediately east Bridge Road and provides facility access to Renfree Field (Figure 36). There are two metal gates at the center and northwest corner parking lot along Bridge Road, and a chain-link fence enclosing the parking lot’s north, south, and west sides. The east side of the parking lot is open and provided access to Renfree Field, a typical recreational baseball diamond that is oriented northeast from home plate, which is near the southeast corner of the parking lot (Figure 37). The backstop of the diamond consists of wood beams stacked horizontally behind the home plate and attached to a tall chain-link fence that extends down both foul lines (Figure 38). There are six metal outfield lights across the grass line behind the field (Figure 39). Located on the north and east corner of the diamond are two outfield poles. Behind the backstop on the west and south side are two benches meant for a home and away teams. A chain-link fence encloses the visitor’s dugout bench on the west side. There is a concrete pad in a U-shape behind the diamond that connects the benches (Figure 40).
Directly north of the field is an elevated scoreboard with metal beams supporting the square metal board (Figure 41 through Figure 43). The baseball field includes rubber home, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd bases. Two circular metal water fountains are located on the west and south sides by the team benches, and multiple signs are attached to the chain-link fence indicating team dugouts and field usage.

Figure 36. Surface parking lot with Renfree Field, view northeast.

Figure 37. Baseball diamond at Renfree Field with backstop at center, view northeast.
Figure 38. Renfree Field home plate and backstop, view southwest.

Figure 39. Typical chain-link fencing, lighting, and foul ball post at Renfree Field’s left field, view north.
Figure 40. Concrete pad and dugout bench at southwest corner of Renfree Field, view south.

Figure 41. Renfree Field's center field with outfield lighting and scoreboard, view northeast.
To the west of the elevated scoreboard is a utility shed that features a low-pitched roof with a slight eave overhang and open (Figure 44). The shed sits on a low-to-ground concrete foundation. Its walls are vertical wood boards laid in a joint pattern. On the west-facing façade is a metal door with wood casing and a small metal vent. On the north side of the shed, there is a concrete slab.
South of the baseball field is a playground encased by a concrete sidewalk that extends from the western parking lot (Figure 45). The playground contains multiple slides, climbing bars, and other activities for children. Two cloth awnings supported by metal beams shade the playground. Wood bark covers the surface of the playground. The concrete sidewalk continues east past a set of two concrete tables to the south to another set of tables with a concrete foundation (Figure 46). The sidewalk ends past the tables at an oval-shaped parking lot connecting to Auburn Boulevard. There are multiple accessible parking signs and other park signage. A swinging metal gate is at the entrance to the parking lot from Auburn Boulevard (Figure 47).
Beyond the outfield in the northeast corner of the park is a well that features a plastic aboveground storage water tank, elevated by concrete blocks, and an adjoining pumphouse shed clad with corrugated metal panels (Figure 48). The pumphouse shed sits on a concrete slab foundation and features a flat roof comprised of the same metal as the walls. Multiple pipes extend from pumphouse into the ground, and a chain-link fence surrounds the facility.
Properties within the Project Area

Previously Identified Resources

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY

While the NCIC records search found no previously recorded archaeological resources within the project area and the pedestrian survey found no other studies conducted in the vicinity, the positive SLF results and subsequent information provided by Native American tribal representatives suggest that the project area has a high sensitivity for archaeological resources. This means that although no known archaeological resources are located within the project area, and despite the evidence of extensive disturbance associated with grading activities at the park, there is the potential for unknown resources to be extant. This is particularly true at a depth of at least 3 feet below grade.

DEL PASO REGIONAL PARK

The NCIC records search results revealed that, in 2010, the northeast portion of Del Paso Park was surveyed and evaluated as part of a cultural resources assessment in support of the NHPA Section 106 consultation related to the “Del Paso Redevelopment Project,” which primarily involve upgrades to the walking trail network. The documentation of Del Paso Park documented the northeast portion of the park and conducted an evaluation of potential eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Overall, the study found that Del Paso Park did not qualify as eligible due to lack of historical significance, particularly within the period between the park’s acquisition by the City in 1911 and 1939.

While a full intensive survey and evaluation of the park was not conducted as part of this effort, particularly within the framework of the CRHR and Sacramento Register, the likelihood that Del Paso Park collectively qualifies as a historical resource is low. Since 1939, the park continued to evolve through the construction of numerous amenities and facilities, dynamically changing the built environment and aspects of the landscape. As such, Del Paso Park generally reflects ongoing trends in recreational development and does not represent a specific pattern of recreational development that would collectively qualify as significant. Similarly, the lack of cohesive design and ad hoc evolution of the park from 1911 to the present day suggests that Del Paso Park does not embody a specific recreational property type, reflect artistic value, or represent the work of a master designer, landscape architect, or builder. While the overall park does not represent a cohesive landscape reflective of any one particular period in history, individual buildings, structures, or sites within Del Paso Park may qualify as eligible under the CRHR or Sacramento Register. As such, further evaluation of the facilities within the project area, namely Renfree Field, is warranted.

Resources Requiring Evaluation

To satisfy the requirements for historical resources under CEQA, Renfree Field was documented and evaluated for potential historical significance using the eligibility criteria for the CRHR, as well as for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register. California DPR 523 Series forms were prepared for the Renfree Field and include physical descriptions of the existing conditions, a property history and required information, relevant historic contexts, and evaluations per the eligibility criteria for listing in the CRHR and Sacramento Register (Appendix E).
HARRY RENFREE FIELD

California Register of Historical Resources

Criterion 1

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 1. Constructed in 1968 as a municipal baseball field catering to amateur recreation, Renfree Field has no significant associations with the development of Sacramento, nor the surrounding neighborhoods in North Sacramento, all of which predate the property’s construction. Similarly, Renfree Field has no significant associations with the development of parks and recreation in the Sacramento area. Parks were an essential part of Sacramento’s initial development, and the construction of Renfree Field within that context is reflective of the general emphasis on sport as recreation in the postwar period, during which dozens of baseball diamonds were constructed throughout the city, region, and elsewhere in California and the broader United States. Although Renfree Field is notable for its use for local baseball in the amateur and recreational level during the period after its construction, particularly in relation to the development of many professional baseball players hailing from Sacramento, this is reflective of general patterns of use and is typical of many recreational facilities. As such, the association with the development of future professional athletes does not appear to rise to a level of significance under this criterion.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Renfree Field’s history is its status as the first recreational and publicly accessible baseball facility in Sacramento that had field lighting, allowing for night games and extended play. While this development is noteworthy, it does not appear to rise to a level of significance under this criterion. The use of lighting provided extended playing time, which was a notable for the facility’s use, but does not reflect a broader shift in the patterns of development of recreational baseball or sport. The installation of the lighting is simply a facility improvement that prolonged an existing recreational use beyond typical daytime hours, and is reflective of the general development of recreation through improved amenities and facilities. As such, the use of lighting at Renfree Field as an amenity does not individually rise to a level of significance related to recreation in Sacramento.

Lastly, Renfree Field is not associated with any one specific event that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 2. Although the baseball facilities are named after Harry Renfree, who was an important promoter of sport and recreation in Sacramento during the postwar period, the naming of the field is purely commemorative in nature. Renfree, who was a superintendent of the City’s parks and recreational facilities during the 1960s, had passed away suddenly in 1966, 2 years prior to the construction of the subject baseball field. Although he was involved in the early planning and promotion of the facility, this is true of all recreational facilities in Sacramento during this period. Furthermore, there is no direct association between Harry Renfree and Renfree Field that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

More inherently involved with the development of Renfree Field was Sal H. Gomez. Gomez was a noteworthy businessman, promoter of local sports, and civicly involved individual in Sacramento during the second half of the twentieth century. Most associated with founding of the “La Fiesta” brand of tortillas, which were manufactured in Sacramento and distributed throughout Northern California, Gomez was a celebrated entrepreneur and leader within the Sacramento business community. Gomez was also heavily involved in the promotion of sports, particularly golf and baseball. While Gomez was involved as
a leading personality in the funding drive for constructing Renfree Field, particularly the support facilities at the field, this association is representative of just one of his multiple efforts and initiatives within Sacramento. Although there is the potential for Gomez to be considered a locally significant individual, the contributions made by Gomez to history appear to be better reflected in other properties. Renfree Field, and specifically Gomez’s involvement in the funding driving to facilitate its construction, with a particular focus on the restrooms and other support facilities, is reflective of Gomez’s general civic engagement and does not appear to rise to a level of significance within the context of his contributions to Sacramento.

Lastly, the subject property does not appear to be significantly associated with any specific professional baseball player. While many future major and minor league baseball players from Sacramento in the 1970s onwards would use these facilities, this is a function typical of all baseball fields, of which there are dozens throughout the Sacramento area. Additionally, the status of these players as professional does not equate to significance under this criterion. Any association with Renfree Field is simply its use as a sporting facility with no likely contributions that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 2.

**Criterion 3**

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 3. Constructed in 1968 as a typical, municipal baseball field, the property is generally characterized by its vernacular qualities that are consistent with similar facilities located throughout Sacramento, California, and the broader United States. It does not retain any design elements or features related to a particular style or method of construction that would rise to a level of significance under this criterion. Similarly, Renfree Field appears to be a typical example of the baseball field property type. While it was noted at the time of construction for featuring lighting to allow for night games, this is a typical aspect of many baseball fields, which coincides with the other elements of Renfree Field that generally reflect established forms, features, and elements found in community-focused baseball facilities throughout all localities in the United States. The addition of lighting, while a noteworthy amenity to the field’s overall function and capacity as a sporting facility, does not rise to a level of significance under this criterion as an example of the pervasive baseball field property type. There is also no specific architect associated with Renfree Field, and it does not appear to reflect the work of a master designer.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3.

**Criterion 4**

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as historically significant under this criterion. The “potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of California” typically relates to archaeological resources; however, built environment resources can be considered historically significant if they are a source of information related to evolution and understanding of construction or similar historical themes. The subject recreational property is a typical, twentieth century municipal baseball field, the construction of which is well studied and documented.

Therefore, Renfree Field is not eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 4.
City of Sacramento Landmark Designation

i. **It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the city, the region, the state or the nation.**

As stated previously, Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s and is reflective of the established postwar trend of increased sport as a predominant form of recreation. While baseball diamonds were found in Sacramento park facilities decades prior to WWII, the rise of the neighborhood park and regional recreation center led to the construction of numerous baseball fields throughout the city in the postwar period, of which there were dozens by the time Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s. Although Renfree Field is noted as the first lighted baseball diamond in the Sacramento area, this does not appear to rise to a level of historical significance under this criterion. Rather, the use of lighting is a noteworthy amenity that contributed to the facility’s initial success by accommodating additional league play beyond typical hours. While this marked an expanded service capability, this does not appear to qualify as significant. Rather, it perpetuated an existing and well established recreational use and primarily provided scheduling flexibility, particularly during the winter months where daylight was at its shortest.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion i.

ii. **It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the city’s past.**

As described in the CRHR evaluation under Criterion 2, Renfree Field does not appear to have associations with individuals in a way that would qualify as significant under these criteria. Named after Harry Renfree, the director of the City’s parks in the postwar period who died prior to the subject property’s construction, the facility at Renfree Field is primarily commemorative in nature. While Renfree was involved in the initial plans for the facility, the same can be said of all recreational facilities throughout the city during his employment at the City. Furthermore, Renfree Field was not entirely an effort by the City, but was rather facilitated by a number of people in the private sector, as well as the general public. Of those, Sal H. Gomez was the most notable. A prominent businessman, civic leader, and promoter of sport and recreation, Gomez was part of the initial funding drive for the development of Renfree Field. Specifically, Gomez spearheaded the effort to raise funds for specific facilities at Renfree Field, including the bleachers and restroom building, both of which are no longer extant. While Gomez was an important part in boosting the viability of Renfree Field, he was involved in multiple civic efforts throughout the city, in addition to his longstanding contributions to Sacramento’s business community and the broader development of sports and recreation. As such, Renfree Field does not appear to rise to a level of significance for its associations with Sal H. Gomez under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion ii.

iii. **It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction.**

Overall, Renfree Field is a typical baseball field and recreational facility from the second half of the twentieth century. Although baseball diamonds have been a fixture of parks and recreational facilities in Sacramento since the late nineteenth century, they came to particular prominence during the first half of the twentieth century and the first decade of the postwar period. By the time Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s, the baseball field was a ubiquitous recreational property type found at nearly all parks throughout the city. While Renfree Field originally demonstrated elevated amenities and features, including restrooms, concession stand, clubhouse with locker rooms, and a press box, this too was characteristic of baseball fields and does not specifically embody the distinctive characteristics of the
property type in a significant fashion. This is exacerbated further by the loss of these facilities, all of which are no longer extant. Perhaps the most notable amenity at Renfree Field was the addition of field lighting, which allowed for extended hours of play. While this is noted as the first use of lighting at a recreational field in Sacramento, these features do not significantly embody a property type, but rather reflect an additional amenity to a pre-existing property type.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion iii.

iv. It represents the work of an important creative individual or master.

Renfree Field is not associated with a creative individual or master architect, designer, or builder. It is a typical recreational baseball field that reflects generic and common construction practices.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion iv.

v. It possesses high artistic values.

As noted above, Renfree Field is a typical municipal baseball field and recreational facility. It lacks any design features or other inherently artistic qualities that would rise to a level of significance under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion v.

vi. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in the prehistory or history of the city, the region, the state, or the nation.

Renfree Field is a typical municipal baseball facility. Constructed in the late 1960s and reflective of the established trends of increased sport as recreation during the postwar period, the documentation and understanding regarding the construction of similar facilities is well documented and understood.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion vi.

Summary

Renfree Field does not individually exhibit any historical significance under any of the criteria for eligibility for listing in the CRHR or Sacramento Register. Therefore, Renfree Field does not individually qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of environmental review under CEQA.

IMPACTS ASSESSMENT

Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

Although no previously identified archaeological resource is located within the project area, and no evidence of potential below-ground archaeological resources were observed during the pedestrian survey, the project area has the potential for unknown below-ground resources to be extant. Furthermore, the project area falls within an area identified as having a high sensitivity for archaeological resources. This is due in part to its proximity to previously documented resources within the vicinity, as well as the positive
SLF results received from the NAHC. Informational outreach to Native American tribal representatives and official AB 52 consultation has confirmed areas of heightened sensitivity within the project area. Specifically, the northwestern boundary of the project area that parallels Arcade Creek and is located north of the previously disturbed areas of the Renfree Field baseball diamond, is noted for having heightened sensitivity for undiscovered below-ground tribal cultural resources, as are areas that exceed three feet below the existing grade. The heightened sensitivity overlaying with the project area suggests that the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to unknown below ground archaeological and tribal cultural resources.

However, these potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant through the execution of specific mitigation measures.

**Historical Resources**

Based on the CHRIS records search results from the NCIC, including a review of previous studies and other background documentation, no previously recorded historical resource is known to exist within the project area. Del Paso Park was documented and previously evaluated and found ineligible for listing in the NRHP. These efforts focused on the northeast portion of the park, which coincides with the project area, and the park’s overall development from the earliest planning efforts in 1914 through 1939. While full documentation of Del Paso Park was not within the scope of this report, an in-depth review of the park’s history and existing conditions suggests that the ineligibility of Del Paso Park extends to the CRHR and Sacramento Register level as well. As outlined briefly in this report, Del Paso Park reflects the general evolution of parks in the city and does not appear to rise to a level of historical significance under associated criteria. Similarly, the park’s evolution over the last century does not reflect a single, cohesive plan or design, but rather an organic development that has transitioned to meet the shifting needs and trends in public recreation. Similarly, the park is not associated with any one individual and is unlikely to yield significant information. As such, Del Paso Park does not appear to qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Specific to Harry Renfree Field, the intensive survey of the property found that the recreational baseball facilities at the center of the project area do not qualify as individually eligible for listing in the CRHR or Sacramento Register as a designated Sacramento Landmark due to lack of historical significance. Similarly, the property does not appear to be a contributor to a larger Del Paso Park property. As such, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of environmental review under CEQA.

Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on historical resources.

**Mitigation Measures**

The impacts to cultural resources identified above are specific to the perceived high sensitivity for archaeological resources and the potential for significant tribal cultural resources in the project vicinity, as illustrated in the positive SLF search results and through informational outreach efforts. To reduce the potential impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level on cultural resources within the project area, the following mitigation measures are proposed.
Archaeological Resource Mitigation Measures

CUL-1: PRECONSTRUCTION CULTURAL RESOURCE SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Prior to the start of any subsurface excavations that would extend beyond previously disturbed soils, the City shall require the contractor to provide a cultural and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEAP]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The training will be developed in coordination with qualified cultural resources specialists. The City may invite Native American tribal representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to participate, including the UAIC. The training shall be conducted before any construction activities begin on the project site. The program will include relevant information regarding sensitive tribal cultural resources and archaeological resources, including applicable regulations, protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations.

The WEAP training will also describe appropriate avoidance and minimization measures for resources that have the potential to be located on the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential tribal cultural resources or archaeological resources or artifacts are encountered.

The program will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values.

CUL-2: ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTION MONITORING

A qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology shall be on-site to monitor for potential unknown archaeological resources in areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity during ground-disturbing construction activities. These areas of sensitivity are identified site wide as areas where the depth of excavation exceeds three feet (see Figure 6), as well as any ground disturbing activities exceeding six inches in areas located north of the current Renfree Field outfield, towards Arcade Creek. In the event that cultural materials are identified during monitoring, the qualified monitor and construction crew shall adhere to all relevant unanticipated discovery protocols.

CUL-3 UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY PROTOCOLS

If buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, work will be stopped immediately in that area until the archaeologist and Native American monitor can evaluate the nature and significance of the find. The City and identified Native American tribal representatives will be notified immediately and appropriate next steps will be enacted. Avoidance is the preferred treatment wherever feasible, although other treatments, including additional testing, excavation, data recovery, and reburial may be explored in close consultation with qualified City staff, consulting archaeologists, and representatives of Native American tribes.

Where further study, survey, and testing methods are required, a Testing and Data Recovery Plan shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and provided to the City and Native American tribal representatives for review and approval. All testing and data recovery efforts will be documented in an Archaeological Resources Testing Report, which will be submitted to the City. Only following the execution of the testing program, or through the approval by the City and Native American tribal representatives, shall construction resume. Construction monitoring shall continue throughout the duration of all ground-disturbing activities.
CUL-4: UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS

In accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98, if human remains are encountered during construction, all work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity (within 50 feet) of the find. If the on-site archaeological monitor, Native American monitor, and principal investigator suspect that a discovery includes human remains, the City and the Sacramento County Coroner shall be contacted immediately.

The Coroner would have two working days to examine the remains after being notified in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American and are not subject to the Coroner’s authority, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC of the discovery.

The NAHC would immediately designate and notify the Native American Most Likely Descendant, who will have 48 hours after being granted access to the location of the remains to inspect them and make recommendations for their treatment and disposition. Work will be suspended in the area of the find until the landowner, in consultation with the Native American Most Likely Descendant, approves the proposed treatment of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. In addition, the City will ensure that the remains are protected from damage or further disturbance of any sort until such decisions can be made and actions can be undertaken.

Tribal Cultural Resources

TCR-1: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES SENSITIVITY AWARENESS TRAINING

The WEAP training outlined under mitigation measure CUL-1 will be developed in coordination with the consulting and/or culturally affiliated Native American tribes to ensure appropriate information is presented to contractor and field staff related to tribal cultural resources. The WEAP training shall also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential tribal cultural resources are encountered. The WEAP will emphasize the requirement for confidentiality and culturally appropriate treatment of any discovery of significance to Native Americans and will discuss appropriate behaviors and responsive actions, consistent with Native American tribal values.

TCR-2: NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL MONITORING

A Native American Tribal Monitor (Tribal Monitor) shall be contracted to perform construction monitoring duties as representatives of associated Tribal governments, specifically the UAIC. The use of the Tribal Monitor shall only occur in areas where ground disturbing activities are occurring at locations or depths identified as having heightened significance. Generally, monitoring would be required where the depth of disturbance exceeds three feet below grade; however, activities within the northern boundary beyond the current Renfree Field outfield that exceed a depth of disturbance of six inches below grade would also trigger Tribal Monitoring.

Consulting Tribes, including the UAIC, shall be notified at least two (2) weeks prior to the triggering ground disturbing activities are scheduled to occur so that a qualified Tribal Monitor may be contracted. Notification for the selected Tribal Monitor to mobilize shall be provided 48 hours prior to the ground disturbing activity.

The Tribal Monitor will document monitoring activities in a Tribal Monitor log, which will be compiled and provided to the City and/or contractor as part of the administrative record. In the event that cultural materials are identified as part of the monitoring process, only the Tribal Monitor or other qualified
representative of a consulting Native American Tribe has the expertise to formally identify any Tribal Cultural Resources or other objects,

**TCR-3: UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY PROTOCOLS**

Similar to mitigation measure CUL-2 related to inadvertent discoveries, tribal cultural resources (such as structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, artifacts, or human remains) are encountered at the project site during construction, work shall be suspended within 100 feet of the find (based on the apparent distribution of cultural resources), and the construction contractor shall immediately notify the project’s City representative. Avoidance and preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources. This will be accomplished, if feasible, by several alternative means, including:

- **Planning construction to avoid tribal cultural resources, archaeological sites and/or other cultural resources:** incorporating cultural resources within parks, green-space or other open space; covering archaeological resources; deeding a site to a permanent conservation easement; or other preservation and protection methods agreeable to consulting parties and regulatory authorities with jurisdiction over the activity.

- **Recommendations for avoidance of tribal cultural resources** will be reviewed by the City representative, interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and other appropriate agencies, in light of factors such as costs, logistics, feasibility, design, technology and social, cultural and environmental considerations, and the extent to which avoidance is consistent with project objectives. Avoidance and design alternatives may include realignment within the project site to avoid tribal cultural resources, modification of the design to eliminate or reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources or modification or realignment to avoid highly significant features within a cultural resource or tribal cultural resource.

- **Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes will** be notified to review and comment on these analyses and shall have the opportunity to meet with the City representative and its representatives who have technical expertise to identify and recommend feasible avoidance and design alternatives, so that appropriate and feasible avoidance and design alternatives can be identified.

- **If the discovered tribal cultural resource can be avoided,** the construction contractor(s) will install protective fencing outside the site boundary, including a 100-foot buffer area, before construction restarts. The boundary of a tribal cultural resource will be determined in consultation with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes and tribes will be notified to monitor the installation of fencing. Use of temporary and permanent forms of protective fencing will be determined in consultation with Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes.

- The construction contractor(s) will maintain the protective fencing throughout construction to avoid the site during all remaining phases of construction. The area will be demarcated as an “Environmentally Sensitive Area”.

If a tribal cultural resource cannot be avoided, the following performance standard shall be met prior to continuance of construction and associated activities that may result in damage to or destruction of tribal cultural resources:

- **Each resource will be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources- (CRHR) eligibility through application of established eligibility criteria** (California Code of Regulations 15064.636), in consultation with consulting Native American Tribes, as applicable.
If a tribal cultural resource is determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, the City will avoid damaging effects to the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21084.3, if feasible. The City shall coordinate the investigation of the find with a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology) approved by the City and with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that respond to the City’s notification. As part of the site investigation and resource assessment, the City and the archaeologist shall consult with interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes to assess the significance of the find, make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary and provide proper management recommendations should potential impacts to the resources be determined by the City to be significant. A written report detailing the site assessment, coordination activities, and management recommendations shall be provided to the City representative by the qualified archaeologist. These recommendations will be documented in the project record. For any recommendations made by interested culturally affiliated Native American tribes that are not implemented, a justification for why the recommendation was not followed will be provided in the project record.

Native American representatives from interested culturally affiliated Native American Tribes and the City representative will also consult to develop measures for long-term management of any discovered tribal cultural resources. Consultation will be limited to actions consistent with the jurisdiction of the City and taking into account ownership of the subject property. To the extent that the City has jurisdiction, routine operation and maintenance within tribal cultural resources retaining tribal cultural integrity shall be consistent with the avoidance and minimization standards identified in this mitigation measure.

If the City determines that the project may cause a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource, and measures are not otherwise identified in the consultation process, the following are examples of mitigation capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to the resource. These measures may be considered to avoid or minimize significant adverse impacts and constitute the standard by which an impact conclusion of less-than significant may be reached:

- Avoid and preserve resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
- Treat the resource with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the Tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Protect the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
  - Protect the traditional use of the resource.
  - Protect the confidentiality of the resource.
- Establish permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or using the resources or places.
- Protect the resource.

**TCR-4 TRIBAL-CULTURAL PROTOCOLS FOR INADVERTENT DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS**

As outlined under mitigation measure CUL-4, if an inadvertent discovery of human remains is made at any time during project-related construction activities or project planning, the City will ensure that the following performance standards shall be met prior to implementing or continuing actions such as
construction, which may result in damage to or destruction of human remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the City shall immediately halt potentially damaging excavation in the area of the remains and notify the Sacramento County Coroner and a professional archaeologist to determine the nature of the remains. The Coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or State lands (HSC Section 7050.5[b]).

If the human remains are of historic age and are determined to be not of Native American origin, the City will follow the provisions of the HSC Section 7000 (et seq.) regarding the disinterment and removal of non-Native American human remains.

If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours of making that determination (HSC Section 7050[c]). After the Coroner’s findings have been made, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant (MLD), in consultation with the landowner, shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains. The responsibilities of the City for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California PRC Section 5097.9 et seq.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project calls for the redevelopment of the 1968 Renfree Field and adjacent parklands within the eastern portion of Del Paso Park in northeastern Sacramento. This cultural resources technical report included a CHRIS records search, an NAHC SLF search request, an archaeological pedestrian survey, and an intensive survey of the built environment to identify potential cultural resources for the purposes of environmental review under CEQA.

Specific to the built environment and historical resources, the project area was surveyed and the facilities at Renfree Field were evaluated for potential historical significance using the eligibility criteria for listing in the CRHR and Sacramento Register. The property history, existing conditions, and associated historical contexts suggest that Renfree Field does not qualify as eligible for either inventory program and, therefore, does not appear to be a historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Regarding archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, efforts to identify previous resources using a variety of sources and methods found that while there are no known resources within the project area, there is a high sensitivity for unknown archaeological resources to be present, particularly at a below-grade depth of at least 3 feet.

An impacts assessment of the project found that while the project will have no impact on historical resources, there is the potential for significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources, particularly during ground-disturbing activities during construction. However, through the implementation of mitigation measures, as outlined in this document, these potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Therefore, for the purposes of review under CEQA, SWCA recommends that the project will have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources with implementation of the mitigation measures.
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1966b Rites are Slated for Harry Renfree. *The Sacramento Bee* December 8.

Sacramento Horsemen’s Association (SHA)

Smith, Lee
2022 Science Center Celebrates 40th Year. *The Sacramento Bee* November 14.

SMUD Museum of Science and Curiosity (MOSAC)

Swesey, Ben

University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)

White, Phillip M.
Wilson, Norman L., and Arlean H. Towne
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APPENDIX A

NCIC Records Search Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000314</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Weigel, Lawrence E.</td>
<td>Archeological Survey Report for the Proposed Watt Avenue/State Route 51 Overcrossing Widening Project 03-SAC-51 PM 8.0/8.1 03290 - 253400.</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000614</td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Keefer, Margaret</td>
<td>Park Road Sewage Pumping Station Demolition</td>
<td>Sacramento County Department of Environmental Review and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006385</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Tremaine, Kim</td>
<td>Re: Results of Archaeological Monitoring for the Park Road Sewage Pumping Station (S-14)</td>
<td>Tremaine &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>34-000228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013886</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>James Combs, Susan Stratton, and Milford Wayne Donaldson</td>
<td>Section 106 Approval for FY08/09 RTP Non-Motorized Project RT-34-016, Improving Del Paso Regional Park's Trails, City of Sacramento (FHWA101014A)</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation; OHP</td>
<td>34-004267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013886A</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Michael Dice</td>
<td>Section 106 Impact Analysis for the Del Paso Park Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>Michael Brandman Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-34-000228</td>
<td>CA-SAC-000201</td>
<td>Resource Name - Arcade Creek Site</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>AP16</td>
<td>1955 (Curtice, Sacramento State College, American River Junior College); 2001 (Eleanor, Richard Derr, Cultural Resources Unlimited)</td>
<td>000127, 006385, 006393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-004267</td>
<td>Resource Name - Del Paso Park; Other - Del Paso Regional Park; Other - Rancho Del Paso Thoroughbred Farm</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP19; HP25; HP29; HP30; HP31</td>
<td>2010 (Michael H. Dice, michael Brandman Associates)</td>
<td>013886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

NAHC Sacred Land Files Search Request Response
December 13, 2022

Brandon Foster
SWCA Environmental Consultants

Via Email to: brandon.foster@swca.com

Re: Renfree Field Renovations at Del Paso Park Project, Sacramento County

Dear Mr. Foster:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information submitted for the above referenced project. The results were positive. Please contact the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria on the attached list for information. Please note that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the SLF, nor are they required to do so. A SLF search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with a project’s geographic area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites, such as the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) archaeological Information Center for the presence of recorded archaeological sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. Please contact all of those listed; if they cannot supply information, they may 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 or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Pricilla.Torres-Fuentes@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Pricilla Torres-Fuentes

Pricilla Torres-Fuentes
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment
Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians
Rhonda Morningstar Pope, Chairperson
1418 20th Street, Suite 200  Me-Wuk
Sacramento, CA, 95811
Phone: (916) 491-0011
Fax: (916) 491-0012
rhonda@buenavistatribe.com

Ione Band of Miwok Indians
Sara Dutschke, Chairperson
9252 Bush Street  Miwok
Plymouth, CA, 95669
Phone: (209) 245 - 5800
consultation@ionemiwok.net

Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians
Regina Cuellar, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1340  Miwok
Shingle Springs, CA, 95682
Phone: (530) 387 - 4970
Fax: (530) 387-8067
rcuellar@ssband.org

Tsi Akim Maidu
Grayson Coney, Cultural Director
P.O. Box 510  Maidu
Browns Valley, CA, 95918
Phone: (530) 383 - 7234
tsi-akim-maidu@att.net

United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson
10720 Indian Hill Road  Maidu
Auburn, CA, 95603
Phone: (530) 883 - 2390
Fax: (530) 883-2380
bguth@auburnrancheria.com

Wilton Rancheria
Jesus Tarango, Chairperson
9728 Kent Street  Miwok
Elk Grove, CA, 95624
Phone: (916) 683 - 6000
Fax: (916) 683-6015
jtarango@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov

Wilton Rancheria
Steven Hutchason, THPO
9728 Kent Street  Miwok
Elk Grove, CA, 95624
Phone: (916) 683 - 6000
Fax: (916) 683-6015
shutchason@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov

Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe
Pamela Cubbler, Treasurer
P.O. Box 4884  Maidu
Auburn, CA, 95604  Miwok
Phone: (530) 320 - 3943
pcubbler@colfaxrancheria.com

Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe
Clyde Prout, Chairperson
P.O. Box 4884 none  Maidu
Auburn, CA, 95604  Miwok
Phone: (916) 577 - 3558
miwokmaidu@yahoo.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 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 assessment for the proposed Rentree Field Renovations at Del Paso Park Project, Sacramento County.
APPENDIX C

SWCA Request for Information Letters to Tribal Representatives
January 27, 2023

Clyde Prout, Chairperson  
Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe  
P.O. Box 4884  
Auburn, CA 95604

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Clyde Prout:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with **positive** results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
Attachment 1 – Project Maps
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Project Maps
USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Regional project location map.

Figure 1.
Project Vicinity
January 27, 2023

Dahlton Brown, Director of Administration
Wilton Rancheria
9728 Kent Street
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Director of Administration Dahlton Brown:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
Attachment 1 – Project Maps
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USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Regional project location map.
January 27, 2023

Grayson Coney, Cultural Director
tsi akim maidu
P.O. Box 510
Brown Valley, CA 95918

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Cultural Director Grayson Coney:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Regional project location map.
January 27, 2023

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

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Gene Whitehouse:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Regional project location map.
January 27, 2023

Jesus Tarango, Chairperson
Wilton Rancheria
9728 Kent Street
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Jesus Tarango:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Regional project location map.
January 27, 2023

Pamela Cubbler, Treasurer  
*Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe*  
P.O. Box 4884  
Auburn, CA 95604  

**Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845**

Dear Treasurer Pamela Cubbler:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with **positive** results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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Regional project location map.
January 27, 2023

Regina Cuellar, Chairperson  
Shingle Spring Band of Miwok Indians  
P.O. Box 1340  
Single Springs, CA 95682

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Regina Cuellar:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
Figure 1. Project Vicinity

Regional project location map.
January 26, 2023

Rhonda Morningstar Pope, Chairperson  
Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians  
1418 20th Street, Suite 200  
Sacramento, CA 95811

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Ronda Morningstar Pope:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with positive results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso
Senior Project Manager
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USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
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January 27, 2023

Sara Dutschke, Chairperson
Ione Band of Miwok Indians
9252 Bush Street
Plymouth, CA 95669

Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845

Dear Chairperson Sara Dutschke:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with **positive** results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Christina Alonso  
Senior Project Manager  
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USGS 7.5-Minute Aerial Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Map of Sacramento County, California, depicting the project area.
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January 27, 2023

*Steven Hutchason, THPO*
*Wilton Rancheria*
*9728 Kent Street*
*Elk Grove, CA 95624*

**Re: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Renfree Field Renovation Project, Sacramento County, California / SWCA Project No. 74845**

Dear Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Steven Hutchason:

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was contracted by the City of Sacramento to prepare a cultural resources technical report in support of the Renfree Field Renovation Project (project) located in Sacramento, California. The project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the City of Sacramento will be the lead agency.

The proposed project is located within the larger Del Paso Regional Park in the northwest portion of the City of Sacramento. Del Paso Regional Park is an approximately 630-acre, multi-use park and includes Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field). The park is bounded by Park Road to the north, the on and off ramps to Highway 244 to the east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west.

The proposed project would replace Renfree Field with two baseball fields oriented opposite each other and develop a 210-foot-by-330-foot soccer field, which would be striped and overlap the outfields. The new orientation would be developed in the northeast portion of the project site. Associated infrastructure such as bleachers, bullpens, shaded dugouts, lighting, and connecting sidewalks would be replaced.

The northern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to include a full-sized asphalt basketball court and two pickleball courts with benches and fencing. The southern portion of the existing western parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate an approximately 36-space vehicle parking lot with two-way access via Bridge Road. A parking gate would be placed at the entry and a bio-swale would be sited to provide stormwater filtration prior to entering the storm drain.

The proposed on-site walkway and right-of-way improvements along Auburn Boulevard would extend from the east at the existing children’s playground west across Bridge Road to the edge of the Owl Creek riparian area and would connect the new and existing park features. The proposed project would also include new lighting for the walkway, parking lot, sports courts, and baseball fields. Existing improvements such as the playground and the parking lot on the east side of the project site will remain.
A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was submitted on November 22, 2022, with **positive** results.

SWCA is requesting any additional information you may have regarding properties, features, or cultural materials within the Project area (see attached) that may be of concern to local Native Americans.

Any comments you may have regarding cultural resources in this area would be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, or if you have additional questions about the project. You may reach me by phone at (925)399-9220 or email me at Christina.Alonso@swca.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christina Alonso  
Senior Project Manager  
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APPENDIX D

SWCA Call Log for Native American Outreach Efforts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe Representative and Tribal Affiliation</th>
<th>Outreach Email send date</th>
<th>Outreach Email received</th>
<th>USPS letter send date</th>
<th>Outreach Phone Call Date</th>
<th>Response received</th>
<th>Follow-up call</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Rancheria of the Miwuk Indians</td>
<td>Rhonda Morningstar Pope, Chairperson 1418 20th Street, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA, 95811 Phone: (916) 491-0011 Fax: (916) 491-0012 <a href="mailto:rhonda@buenaustintribe.com">rhonda@buenaustintribe.com</a></td>
<td>1/27/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>Out of office; message left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ione Band of Miwok Indians</td>
<td>Sara Dutchie, Chairperson Plymouth, CA, 95669 Phone: (209) 245-5800 <a href="mailto:consultation@tonemiwok.net">consultation@tonemiwok.net</a></td>
<td>1/28/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>Out of office; message left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle Springs Bank of Miwok Indians</td>
<td>Regina Cuellar, Chairperson P.O. Box 1340 Shingle Springs, CA, 95872 Phone: (530) 387-4970 Fax: (530) 387-8067 <a href="mailto:rcuellar@ssband.org">rcuellar@ssband.org</a></td>
<td>1/29/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsi Akim Maidu</td>
<td>Grayson Coney, Cultural Director P.O. Box 510 Browns Valley, CA, 95918 Phone: (530) 383-7214 <a href="mailto:tsi-akim-maidu@att.net">tsi-akim-maidu@att.net</a></td>
<td>1/30/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>Tribe recently received federal recognition, and are unable to professionally comment on project at this time. May be able to comment on projects in 6 months or so. Chairperson Grayson Coney would be considered an MLD for the area. He stated that there would be prehistoric villages within 1.5 miles of Arcade Creek. If crews dig below three feet they should keep an eye on soil changes that might indicate buried material. This portion of taho valley is a rich fossil area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson 10720 Indian Hill Road Auburn, CA, 95603 Phone: (530) 883-2380 Fax: (530) 883-2380 <a href="mailto:bguth@auburnrancheria.com">bguth@auburnrancheria.com</a></td>
<td>1/31/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>Out of office; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Rancheria</td>
<td>Dalilton Brown, Director of Administration 9728 Kent Street Elk Grove, CA, 95624 Phone: (916) 683-6000 <a href="mailto:dbrown@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov">dbrown@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov</a></td>
<td>2/1/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Rancheria</td>
<td>Jesus Tarango, Chairperson 9728 Kent Street Elk Grove, CA, 95624 Phone: (916) 683-6000 Fax: (916) 683-6015 <a href="mailto:jtarango@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov">jtarango@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov</a></td>
<td>2/2/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Rancheria</td>
<td>Steven Hutchison, THPO 9728 Kent Street Elk Grove, CA, 95624 Phone: (916) 683-6000 Fax: (916) 683-6015 <a href="mailto:shutchison@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov">shutchison@wiltonrancheria-nin.gov</a></td>
<td>2/3/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax-Todd Valley Consolidated Tribe</td>
<td>Pamela Cuddler, Treasurer P.O. Box 4884 Auburn, CA, 95604 Phone: (530) 320-3943 <a href="mailto:pcuddler@colfaxrancheria.com">pcuddler@colfaxrancheria.com</a></td>
<td>2/4/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax-Todd Valley Consolidated Tribe</td>
<td>Clyde Prout, Chairperson P.O. Box 4884 Auburn, CA, 95604 Phone: (916) 577-3558 <a href="mailto:miwokmauid@yahoo.com">miwokmauid@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>2/5/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>No response; voicemail left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

California DPR 523 Series Forms for Del Paso Regional Park and Renfree Field Prepared by SWCA
P-34-004267 was originally recorded on August 26, 2010, by Michael Dice of Michael Brandman Associates. The site is Del Paso Regional Park (Del Paso Park), which encompasses 83 developed acres and 790 acres of open space or golf courses, including picnic areas, walking and equestrian trails, play areas, restroom facilities, a softball complex, and Harry Renfree Field. At that time, Dice only recorded the northeastern portion of Del Paso Park near Bridge Street and Park Road. Because no historic elements were located in this area that dated to the period of significance (1900–1920), Dice suggested that the site was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The site was revisited on December 7, 2022, by SWCA staff archaeologist Brandon Foster as part of a pedestrian survey. The portion of P-34-004267 investigated during this survey is the same portion of the park recorded by Dice in 2010. Although not described in the 2010 site record, Harry Renfree Field encompasses much of this portion of the park. Harry Renfree Field was named after the Sacramento City Recreation and Parks Department employee Harry Renfree, and it was opened in May 1968 (The Sacramento Bee 10 May 1968:64). Harry Renfree Field is located east of Bridge Road, southeast of Arcade Creek, and northwest of Auburn Boulevard. It is bounded on the northwest, northeast, and southeast by recreation trails. A large parking lot abuts its southwest side. Renfree Field Playground and a smaller parking lot are located on its southeast side. The remainder of this portion of P-34-004267 is characterized by open space bounded by an oak woodland.

During the December 2022 pedestrian survey, no historic elements were identified. As well, no apparent impacts to the overall integrity of the site were noted. Documentation of Renfree Field as an individual element was completed by qualified SWCA architectural historians through separate DPR 523 Forms.

Photo 1: Harry Renfree Field sign; Photo oriented northeast.
Photo 2: Interior of Harry Renfree Field taken from the catcher’s box. Photo oriented northeast.

Photo 3: Overview of a recreational trail located north of Harry Renfree Field. Photo oriented southwest.
**Resource Name or #** (Assigned by recorder) Del Paso Park (Segment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Required information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of California — The Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUATION SHEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3 of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Recorded by*: Brandon Foster

*Date*: 12/7/2022

*Photo 4: Overview of open space and parking lot southwest of Harry Renfree Field. Photo oriented east-northeast.*
Harry Renfree Field (Renfree Field) is a baseball diamond and recreational facility located within the northeast section of Del Paso Regional Park (Del Paso Park), roughly bounded by Park Road to the north and east, Auburn Boulevard to the south, and Watt Avenue to the west. Specifically, the property is centered along Renfree Field, which is a recreational baseball diamond and playing field with support facilities that is accessed by Bridge Road. Bridge Road is a simple roadway that extends north–south west of the property. It is accessed from Auburn Boulevard to the south and Park Road to the north, the latter of which has a bridge crossing over Arcade Creek, which largely parallels Park Road. (Photograph 1; see Continuation Sheet)
**Building, Structure, and Object Record**

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): Harry Renfree Field  
*NRHP Status Code 6Z

**B1.** Historic Name: Harry Renfree Field  
**B2.** Common Name: Renfree Field  
**B3.** Original Use: Recreation  
**B4.** Present Use: Recreation  
**B5.** Architectural Style: Vernacular  
**B6.** Construction History: Constructed 1967-1968  
**B7.** Moved? ☒No ☐Yes ☐Unknown  
**B8.** Related Features: None  
**B9a.** Architect: City of Sacramento  
**b.** Builder: Unknown  
**B10.** Significance: Theme n/a  
**Period of Significance n/a**  
**Property Type n/a**  
**Applicable Criteria n/a**  
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural)  

This intensive survey and evaluation find that Renfree Field does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the Sacramento Register of Historic Cultural Resources (Sacramento Register) because of a lack of historical significance. The property has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA), using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code and does not appear to be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA (see continuation sheet).

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

**B12.** References:  
See Continuation Sheet.

**B13.** Remarks:

**B14.** Evaluator: Sayre Borden and Daniel Herrick, SWCA Environmental Consultants  
**Date of Evaluation:** February 2023  

This space reserved for official comments.
P3a. Description (Continued):

A large rectangular surface parking lot is immediately east Bridge Road and provides facility access to Renfree Field (Figure 1). There are two metal gates at the center and northwest corner parking lot along Bridge Road, and a chain-link fence enclosing the parking lot's north, south, and west sides. The east side of the parking lot is open and provided access to Renfree Field, a typical recreational baseball diamond that is oriented northeast from home plate, which is near the southeast corner of the parking lot (Figure 2). The backstop of the diamond consists of wood beams stacked horizontally behind the home plate and attached to a tall chain-link fence that extends down both foul lines (Figure 3). There are six metal outfield lights across the grass line behind the field (Figure 4). Located on the north and east corner of the diamond are two outfield poles. Behind the backstop on the west and south side are two benches meant for a home and away teams. A chain-link fence encloses the visitor’s dugout bench on the west side. There is a concrete pad in a U-shape behind the diamond that connects the benches (Figure 5). Directly north of the field is an elevated scoreboard with metal beams supporting the square metal board (Figure 6 through Figure 8). The baseball field includes rubber home, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd bases. Two circular metal water fountains are located on the west and south sides by the team benches, and multiple signs are attached to the chain-link fence indicating team dugouts and field usage.

Figure 1. Surface parking lot with Renfree Field, view northeast.
Figure 2. Baseball diamond at Renfree Field with backstop at center, view northeast.

Figure 3. Renfree Field home plate and backstop, view southwest.
Figure 4. Typical chain-link fencing, lighting, and foul ball post at Renfree Field’s left field, view north.

Figure 5. Concrete pad and dugout bench at southwest corner of Renfree Field, view south.
Figure 6. Renfree Field’s center field with outfield lighting and scoreboard, view northeast.

Figure 7. Renfree Field scoreboard located in the outfield, view northeast.
To the west of the elevated scoreboard is a utility shed that features a low-pitched roof with a slight eave overhang and open (Figure 9). The shed sits on a low-to-ground concrete foundation. Its walls are vertical wood boards laid in a joint pattern. On the west-facing façade is a metal door with wood casing and a small metal vent. On the north side of the shed, there is a concrete slab.

South of the baseball field is a playground encased by a concrete sidewalk that extends from the western parking lot (Figure 10). The playground contains multiple slides, climbing bars, and other activities for children. Two cloth awnings supported by metal beams shade the playground. Wood bark covers the surface of the playground. The concrete sidewalk continues east past a set of two concrete tables to the south to another set of tables with a concrete foundation (Figure 11). The sidewalk ends past the tables at an oval-shaped parking lot connecting to Auburn Boulevard. There are multiple accessible parking signs and other park signage. A swinging metal gate is at the entrance to the parking lot from Auburn Boulevard (Figure 12).

Beyond the outfield in the northeast corner of the park is a well that features a plastic aboveground storage water tank, elevated by concrete blocks, and an adjoining pumphouse shed clad with corrugated metal panels (Figure 13). The pumphouse shed sits on a concrete slab foundation and features a flat roof comprised of the same metal as the walls. Multiple pipes extend from pumphouse into the ground, and a chain-link fence surrounds the facility.
Figure 9. Utility Shed located north of Renfree Field, view southeast.

Figure 10. Renfree Field playground located south of Renfree Field, view east.
Figure 11. Pathway between the Renfree Field Playground (background) and the southeast adjacent surface parking lot, view west.

Figure 12. Entrance to the Renfree Field Playground surface parking lot, view north from Auburn Boulevard.

Figure 13. Pumphouse and aboveground storage tank at the northeast corner of the property, view east.
B10. Significance (Continued):

Historic Context

Development of Sacramento

Before European colonization, the Nisenan and Plains Miwok Indians called the Sacramento area home. Spanish colonization, which primarily occurred along the southern and central coast, did not instantly affect the native Indians of the Central Valley. The first recorded European expedition into the interior of California occurred in 1808 by Gabriel Moraga. Moraga surveyed the region to find suitable locations for a future mission and named the valley and river Sacramento, after the Spanish word for Sacrament. The Spanish never colonized the area but awarded rancho land grants to loyal citizens and soldiers to populate the region. This practice continued after Mexican Independence in 1821, and the influx of American settlers to the valley altered the landscape. The area saw multiple ranchos and land grants to Mexicans, Americans, and Europeans, like John Sutter, who developed a trading post between the American and Sacramento Rivers (Page & Turnbull 2019b). Sutter’s trading post, known as New Helvetia after Sutter’s homeland in present-day Switzerland, served as the foundation for early Sacramento.

Almost immediately after the annexation of California by the United States in 1848, gold was discovered at a lumber mill owned by Sutter along the American River near present-day Coloma in El Dorado County. This discovery spurred the California Gold Rush, which led to the rapid transformation of California as a sparsely populated western frontier to a center of industry, commerce, and trade. As the gateway to the Sierra Nevada and the goldfields of the foothills, Sacramento quickly became a transportation hub and nexus of Gold Rush economic activity. In December 1848, John Sutter Jr. and Sam Brannan hired topographical engineer Captain William H. Warner and Lieutenant William Sherman to survey and layout “Sacramento City.” Named after the river and meant to differentiate John Sutter Jr.’s pursuits from that of his father, John Sutter Sr. The original city grid consisted of 26 lettered (A to Z, today C to Broadway) and 31 numbered (1st to 31st, today Front to Alhambra) streets. Sacramento’s city grid was built directly at the base of the American River flood basin, where centuries of Sierra Nevada snowmelt created temporary lakes each spring, well into the 1840s. Sacramento’s original townsite was laid out as a 5-square-mile area, with each street 80 feet wide (except for Front and M), and each block 320 to 340 feet long. Lots comprised each block and many blocks were divided by 20-foot-wide alleys (Figure 14) (Owens 2013:32–33, 42–43; Hallam 2013:63–64).

Although Sacramento grew through 1850, the population was not stable. With the excitement of new Gold Rush diggings and news of new claims, Sacramento’s population remained largely transient aside from the core of merchants and hotel owners. California’s population was undoubtedly increasing, but the population of Sacramento grew sluggishly due in part to the transient nature of the early Gold Rush miners, flooding, and fires that destroyed buildings. In September 1849, a destructive fire swept through the business district, destroying several blocks of canvas tent and wood frame structures, followed by a major flood in January 1850. In 1852 fire again swept through the business district, destroying over 55 blocks of the city. Original buildings in Sacramento were wood frame and canvas, but as fires and floods became a way of life, citizens began to erect buildings of brick and raised the street level, leaving the original street level below grade (Owens 2013:48–50).
In 1854 Sacramento became the capital of California. This rise in prominence, coupled with the city’s strategic location and early commercial importance in the development of California, resulted in Sacramento becoming the western terminus for the first transcontinental railroad, which began construction in 1863. The Central Pacific Railroad Company, which later became the Southern Pacific Railroad and then Union Pacific, was founded by a group of merchants and businessman known as “the Big Four,” who were based in Sacramento, or had strong ties to the region. This development solidified Sacramento as a center for transportation in California, providing immediate links to San Francisco and the growing agricultural hinterlands of the central valleys with the rest of the United States (Owens 2013:48–50).

Through the 1870s and into the 1900s, growth continued eastward away from the original core along the embarcadero and K Street. The patterns of growth were often reflective of the types of amenities in given neighborhoods including schools and parks. Utilizing the knowledge of parks within urban spaces Sacramento’s grid was developed utilizing

---

**Figure 14.** 1874 surveyor’s map of the city of Sacramento, California. The public squares associated with the original 1849 plan for the city have been outlined in blue. Source: California State Railroad Museum and Archives.
these ideals. John Sutter Jr., the primary driving force for the development of Sacramento, had the city laid in a grid pattern with spaces specifically for city plazas (see Figure 6). These plaza parks provided residents with publicly accessible spaces within an urban core.

As growth continued, pushed by the development of streetcars which connected new neighborhoods with the urban commercial core, the main city grid began to fill. By the 1890s, speculators had begun to eye land outside of the main grid for development. This led to development of Sacramento’s first residential suburban tracts of Oak Park, Elmhurst, and East Sacramento (Kremer 2012). The trend of suburban expansion and growth of the city towards the east, south, and eventually north would continue throughout the remainder of the twentieth century, particularly during the population boom years following World War II (WWII).

**Del Paso and North Sacramento**

Del Paso is a community within the northern portion of the city of Sacramento. Located on the north side of the American River, the area was originally part of Mexican-era land grant of Rancho del Paso. Awarded to Eliab Grimes on December 20, 1844, Rancho del Paso was a 44,000-acre property that extended along the north bank of the American River and covered an area consistent with the northern areas of the city of Sacramento and the unincorporated communities of Del Paso Heights, Arden Arcade, Rio Linda, and others in present-day northwest Sacramento County (Page & Turnbull 2019a; American Institute of Architects [AIA] 2014); Eliab partnered with John Sinclair to harvest wheat and cattle on the land. The ownership of the ranch changed in 1848 when Eliab died and passed the rancho to his nephew Hiram, and in 1849, John Sinclair sold his share of the rancho back to Hiram, who in turn sold the land to Samuel Norris, a San Francisco trader. Throughout the 1850s, Norris remained embattled with Eliab’s descendants, who contested Norris’ rightful claim to the rancho. In 1860 the U.S. Supreme Court sided with Norris, though the trials placed him in deep debt with his lawyers, forcing him to sell the rancho to James Ben Ali Haggin and Lloyd Tevis, forming the Haggins-Tevis Partnership. This partnership consisted of two brothers-in-law from San Francisco, who utilized the land for pasturing sheep, cattle, and horses while growing crops of grain, hay, and hops along the American River. The partnership also bred racehorses; by 1886 the rancho had over 100 horses in training.

In 1889 the partnership formed the Rancho Del Paso Land Company, which intended to subdivide and sell the entire rancho to a single buyer. After proving unsuccessful, the company ultimately sold the land in 1905 to the Sacramento Valley Colonization Company (SVCC), which was a collection of 10 local investors who aimed to subdivide and sell the land for development (Page & Turnbull 2019a; AIA 2014). The subdivisions created by the SVCC formed the foundation for the area as it’s known today, adding names like Rio Linda, Del Paso Heights, and North Highlands to the map. While many of these areas remained overwhelmingly agricultural in the initial decades of the twentieth century, a concentrated community directly north of the city of Sacramento began to grow. Known as North Sacramento, the growing townsite saw an increase in commercial and residential development after the initial subdivision by the SVCC. The growth of the community was spurred further in 1915 with the opening of the Sacramento Northern, which was a streetcar line that connected the North Sacramento area with the central core of south-adjacent Sacramento. In 1924, North Sacramento officially incorporated as its own municipality (Figure 15) (North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce 2022).

Despite its growth, the North Sacramento community remained relatively small with a modest commercial district and suburban homes, all of which was surrounded by agricultural lands. The outlying areas beyond the city’s boundaries, known as Del Paso Heights, was predominantly ranchland, and much of the initial development was uneven, with irregularly shaped commercial and industrial areas, long and dense residential blocks, and inconsistent infrastructure development. This urban development represents much of the regions surrounding Del Paso, as much of the land outside downtown Sacramento was used for agricultural purposes (City of Sacramento 2009).
Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the neighborhood’s racial makeup was primarily white. However, during the Great Depression, there was an influx of African American residents to the region from the southern states seeking work due to economic hardships of the period. Many African American men found work with the Southern Pacific Railroad at the Sacramento Railyards north of downtown. Racial covenants and other discriminatory housing policies, most commonly known as “redlining” prevented many people of color from residing and purchasing homes in some of the more desirable areas of Sacramento, including North Sacramento. While North Sacramento would remain predominantly white over the following decades, the availability of land in the Del Paso Heights area presented an opportunity for many people of color to purchase homes, ultimately changing the overall demographic makeup of the community over to African American and eventually Latino majorities (Page & Turnbull 2022:26).

By the early 1960s, the City was annexing piecemeal areas surrounding North Sacramento, including portions of Del Paso Heights and other unincorporated communities. In 1964, the City of North Sacramento too was annexed following an election where the decision to join the City was made by a slim margin of votes. Annexation and the dilution of public services, combined with the opening of US Highway 160 and the closing of the nearby McClellan Air Force Base, is perceived to have brought economic hardship to the neighborhood. During the 1970s, the community became economically isolated and experienced rising crime and poverty. By the early 1990s, the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) adopted the Del Paso Heights Redevelopment Property and began investing in

Figure 15. Ca. 1940 map of North Sacramento and vicinity; note the “Sacramento City Park” area at the top-right corner, which corresponds with present-day Del Paso Park.
Source: Center for Sacramento History.
infrastructure, street, and sewer improvements. This redevelopment invested millions into the neighborhood through 2001 (Page & Turnbull 2022:26; University of California, Santa Barbara [UCSB] 2023).

**Parks and Recreation in Sacramento**

*Early Plazas, Public Parks, and Pleasure Grounds (1845-1901)*

Public park spaces have been an integral part of Sacramento’s urban fabric since its earliest development. Associated with the planning and surveying efforts of John Sutter, Jr. in 1849, the city’s foundational grid included entire city blocks set aside as public plazas, rationally located throughout. The initial plan included 10 plazas, nine of which still exist including Plaza Park (today, Cesar E. Chavez Plaza), Roosevelt Park, Fremont Park, Winn Park, Marshall Park, Stanford Park, Grant Park, Muir Playground, and Sacramento Memorial Auditorium (Figure 16 and Figure 17) (Kremer 2012). The original iterations of these plazas were consistent with similar park spaces found throughout the United States during this period. They were often defined by a perimeter walking path with axial, insular walking paths tending into the park space and converging upon a central element, such as a fountain, statue, or similar feature. The interstitial landscape would include a mixture of open space with turf, low-profile plantings, and larger shrubs and trees serving as screening and anchoring elements, either oriented in sporadic or formal configurations.

**Figure 16.** Ca. 1890 photograph of Plaza Park, now Cesar Chavez Park in downtown Sacramento. Source: Sacramento Public Library.

**Figure 17.** 1905 photograph of Winn Park in Sacramento. Source: University of California, Berkeley.

In addition to the original city’s public plaza spaces, the State of California (State) was also an important part of developing Sacramento’s public parks. In a bid to cement Sacramento’s selection as the state capital in 1854, the City offered land at Plaza Park for the State Capitol building. However, the site was ultimately infeasible and a new, larger location was provided to the southwest. The initial landscape around the State Capitol was formal with concentric axial pathways radiating from its four façades. However, through the effort of the State, additional lands spanning over 10 city blocks were acquired for a new grand park. Throughout the 1870s, Capitol Park was landscaped in the Victorian tradition with a symmetrical, oval-
shaped carriage route, expansive lawns, and over 800 trees and other plants spread throughout the landscape (Page & Turnbull 2019a:164–165). In the following years, Capitol Park would be added to with several amenities, including exhibition halls and pavilions for the State Fair.¹

As tastes changed towards the late nineteenth century, these early plazas and public parks were often redeveloped to include more naturally appearing plantings and “picturesque” landscapes with meandering pathways (Figure 18). This coincided with the concept of the “pleasure ground,” which became the model for the development of public parks in Sacramento. Characterized by their romantic and idyllic picturesque qualities, the pleasure ground and wilderness parks were born out of the American Transcendentalist movement of the late nineteenth century, which promoted natural and open spaces as a regenerative experience in contrast to the conditions within industrialized urban centers of the period (Prosser 2017:7–8). Although intended to be natural settings, pleasure ground parks were carefully designed and maintained to create the illusion of a natural, organic setting.

In Sacramento, like so many cities throughout the United States, these park types also had a practical role in redeveloping land that had no profitable use or was perceived as undevelopable, either through uneven terrain, poor drainage, or other site conditions that impeded construction. In many cases, these parks also were used as a real estate speculation tool, turning poor-quality land into a desirable public amenity, which spurred the subdivision and sale of the surrounding lands as new neighborhoods. The earliest example of the pleasure ground park is McKinley Park. Originally known as East Park, the property was a low-lying slough located on the outskirts of Sacramento. The land was purchased by the Sacramento Street Railway Company in 1871 and transformed into a park over the following year. Upon opening in 1872, the park was celebrated for its collection of plantings and meandering avenues and walkways. Over time, additional amenities were added, including conversion of the slough into a picturesque lake and the addition of a zoo, flower gardens, and picnic grounds (Figure 19). The park became an incredibly popular destination and ultimately as a catalyst for residential development in early East Sacramento (Nelson 2018:8.24–8.26).

¹ In addition to Capitol Park, the State founded the State Agricultural Park during the same period in 1861. Located in the present-day neighborhood of Boulevard Park, Agricultural Park was the early fairgrounds and featured a prominent horse racing track and agricultural exhibition space. While a notable public space, the property was specifically developed as a fairground and not a public park.
Figure 18. 1905 photograph of Marshall Park in Sacramento. Source: University of California, Berkeley Bancroft Library.

Figure 19. 1912 photograph of three women overlooking the lake at McKinley Park. Source: Center for Sacramento History.

Municipal Parks and Public Recreation (1905-1941)

During the early twentieth century, the public park evolved from the pleasure ground to a more modern iteration of the municipal park. In addition to planned and manicured open spaces—expressed in a mixture of picturesque and formal compositions—municipal parks began featuring a series of amenities and facilities that catered to a variety of recreational uses, marking a shift from a “passive enjoyment of the landscape” to more developed activities and amenities (Prosser 2017:11). Consistent with the Progressive-era reforms of the early twentieth century, the municipal park model of the Reform Park Movement would often feature various educational and cultural programs, as well as the promotion of the outdoors and sport, all through purpose-built buildings, structures, playing fields, and other well-defined facilities separate from the general open and more naturalistic spaces of the park (Prosser 2017:11; Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:8).

Early examples of the municipal park model came through the re-imagining and partial redevelopment of the existing pleasure ground parks through the introduction of new amenities and facilities. This was evident at McKinley Park. By 1902 upkeep of the park was prohibitively expensive, relying on non-profit organizations to first manage, and later own, the park. In 1911 the City annexed East Sacramento and took ownership and control of McKinley Park. By then, the park had been expanded to include running tracks, a deer park, a clubhouse, and early sporting fields for baseball, tennis, and basketball (Nelson 2018:8.24–8.26).

Another major early municipal park in Sacramento was Southside Park. Similar to McKinley Park, Southside Park was constructed on low-lying land with poor drainage. The area, which had been prone to flooding, was protected by a series of levees in 1902, opening south of downtown Sacramento to development. With the intent of creating a new regional park, the City purchased the land in 1905 and hired San Francisco-
based landscape architect John McLaren, designer of Golden Gate Park, to create Southside Park in the emerging municipal park vein, which mixed elements of the pleasure ground model with new recreational amenities. Using the low lying land, the design for the park had a central lake with large open spaces, picnic grounds, prominently placed shade trees, meandering pathways, and a clubhouse facility (Figure 20). Southside Park initially opened to the public in 1907 and would continue to evolve over the following decades to include a variety of amenities, including bocce courts, a bandstand, and playgrounds (Burg 2017:8.10–8.12).

![Figure 20. Ca. 1915 photograph of Southside Park, Sacramento. Source: Center for Sacramento History.](image)

In 1911 the City sought to explore potential areas for new, grand parks. The city purchased 800 acres of land along Arcade Creek well north of the city’s boundaries at present-day Del Paso Park and hired Boston-based planner John Nolen to provide a new development plan for the new parkland, and later a broader Sacramento park system plan. Nolen ultimately recommended the expansion of over 100 new parks and open spaces throughout the city, with Del Paso Park being the central unifying component. However, the plans never came to fruition, due in large part to the relatively remote location of Del Paso Park form the city (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:13–14).

The full realization of the municipal park model came soon after. The same year that the City purchased the land for Del Paso Park, William Land, a successful businessman and civic leader, passed away and donated a large area of land south of the city for use as a public park. William Land Park was slow to be developed, but ultimately came to fruition by the mid-1920s. In addition to expansive, open park space, William Land Park featured a number of amenities, including athletic fields, curved pleasure drives, playgrounds, a large
pond, a golf course, and the Sacramento Zoo (Figure 21). The park would continue to evolve over the following years with improvements conducted by the City, and later federal work relief programs under the New Deal-era, namely the Works Progress Administration (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:15–20). Today, William Land Park remains one of the preeminent municipal parks in Sacramento.

Figure 21. 1939 aerial photograph of the southwest corner of William Land Park, view north. Source: Center for Sacramento History.

Post-war Parks and Recreation (1945-Present)

The postwar period in Sacramento, as elsewhere throughout California and the broader United States, was defined by increased suburbanization, which in turn led to new parks outside of the traditional urban and municipal parks of the previous decades. This, coupled with an emphasis on increased recreation, play, sport, and fitness driven in part by federal policy, led to an expansion of playgrounds, playing fields, and other sporting facilities throughout the Sacramento area (Error! Reference source not found.) (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:10).

With the construction of new communities, the neighborhood park would become the dominant model for park development. These were essential, unifying elements within each community. Often a few acres in size, these parks provided playgrounds, sporting fields or courts (baseball diamonds, basketball courts, tennis courts, etc.), picnic spaces, and occasionally community centers or clubhouses, all surrounded by landscaped open park space. Another inherent element of the neighborhood park was the parking lot.
Despite being within a neighborhood, the automobile had become ubiquitous with postwar life, and parking lots to provide park access were essential in postwar neighborhood parks. In addition to the neighborhood parks, the postwar period saw the rise of the regional recreation center. Larger in size, these parks would be designed around expanded recreational facilities, including public swimming pools, complexes of athletic fields, gymnasiums, and golf courses (Prosser 2017:29–30). Examples of postwar, neighborhood parks and regional recreation centers include Tahoe, Glenn Hall, Belle Coolidge, Northgate, Woodbine, and George Sim Parks.

Figure 22. Little league game at Tahoe Park, 1960. Source: Center for Sacramento History.

While postwar parks utilized the modernist architectural vocabulary and focused on a variety of recreational amenities and sports facilities, later postwar parks in Sacramento would revert to a more picturesque and natural aesthetic. This was reflected in new greenbelt-focused parks, which exhibit more naturally apparent landscapes as part of the promotion of outdoor education and a more tranquil experience, marking a return to a more wilderness park and pleasure ground-based ethos within the context of the emerging environmental conservation concerns (Prosser 2017:38). Examples include Frank Seymour Park, Bannon Creek Park and Parkway, and Sutter’s Landing Regional Park.

Property History

*Del Paso Regional Park*
As outlined in previous sections, Del Paso Park was initially established in 1911, when the City purchased around 800 acres in the Del Paso Heights area from the SVCC for the purposes of creating a grand public park (Figure 23). The City Trustees agreed on the name “Del Paso Park” in honor of the Mexican-era rancho, of which the property had once been a part of. While the park remained largely natural and undeveloped for the early decades of the park, some early amenities were constructed, including walking trails, picnic tables, lighting, and playground equipment (Figure 24) (Cardno 2015).

In 1914 the City of Sacramento hired planner John Nolen to grand park layout. That next year, Nolen submitted his plan, an ambitious turn-of-the-century “garden city” that would include botanical gardens, a Greek theater, a lake, and an athletic field in the growing, progressive municipal park model, which would be integrated into a larger park and greenbelt system along the American River. However, the plan proved too expensive, and the distance of Del Paso Park from the then-city boundaries south of the American River presented a logistical challenge; the City never implemented Nolen’s design. Instead, City planners initiated plans to develop the park grounds into public recreational facilities. The first of these developments occurred in 1926 when the City leased 20 acres to the Sacramento Trap Shooting Club. In 1932 the City established an 18-hole golf course on the park’s east side. Originally called the Sacramento Municipal Golf Course, the now-named Haggin Oaks Golf Course was designed by Alister McKenzie, a prominent golf course designer and landscape architect responsible for the Cypress Point Golf Course in Monterey, California, and the U.S Masters Course at the Augusta National Golf Club in Augusta, Georgia (Morton 2014; Swesey 2022; *The Sacramento Bee* 2008; UCSB 2023).

![Figure 23. Excerpted portion of a 1916 map of suburbs in the North Sacramento area, showing the City-owned park property that would become Del Paso Park. Source: California State Library, California History Room.](image-url)
By 1940 Watt Avenue was constructed and extended into the park, ultimately bisecting it into east and west sections (Figure 25). The park experienced more development in 1946 when the Sacramento Horsemen’s Association (SHA) obtained a 20-year lease for a clubhouse and stables on the park property. Initially formed as the Sacramento Sherriff’s posse in 1937, the SHA sponsored horse shows and rodeo events around the Sacramento area, including at their facilities in Del Paso Park. The club expanded in 1956 with the construction of the Saddle Oaks Clubhouse, a new barn in 1962, and a small arena in the 1970s. The expansion of the SHA and enlargement Haggins Oaks brought more residents to the park, which prompted the city to create more recreational facilities. By 1963 the Capital City Highway, the business loop section of Interstate 80, further separated the two sections of the park (*The Sacramento Bee* 1942; SHA 2022).
As the economic prosperity of the postwar years brought more Americans outside, the demand for recreational activities in public spaces increased. The City began developing the western portion of the park in the late 1960s, as previous improvements primarily occurred on the east side of the property. In 1968 the City constructed a baseball field in memory of Harry Renfree, who worked for the City’s Recreation and Parks Department for 30 years. Construction cost around $250,000, and a dedication service occurred on May 12, 1968. This project was the first significant development on the park’s east side and helped usher in new projects that attracted people to the area (The Sacramento Bee 1951a, 1968a, 1968b). Use of the east portion of Del Paso Park intensified further in 1976, when the Discovery Museum moved its location from Cal Expo to Del Paso Park. Initially founded by the California Science Museum in 1951, the museum served as a “place where children and adults could both touch and be touched by the wonders of science and nature.” The museum operated at Cal Expo for over 20 years before the site became no longer favorable due to the California State Fair moving to the location. The museum changed names again to the Sacramento Science Center and Junior Museum, which reflected the changing scope of programs and exhibits in natural and physical science.

Throughout the 1980s, Del Paso Park continued to evolve. To expand sporting opportunities, the City constructed a softball complex paid for by a grant from the California DPR under the California Park Land Bond Act of 1984. The Sacramento Softball Complex features four diamonds, a restaurant, picnic area, parking lot, and a two-lane bridge across Arcade Creek (The Sacramento Bee 1951b; Johnson 1991; SMUD Museum of Science and Curiosity [MOSAC] 2022; Smith 2022).
The park continued to serve as a popular recreation center throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. However, with California’s rising homeless problem, the park became subject to illegal encampments, particularly along the park boundaries adjoining the freeways and the Union Pacific Railroad alignment to the west. In 2020 the Discovery Museum relocated to Downtown Sacramento and was renamed the MOSAC, and the city transformed the former museum building at Del Paso Park into a homeless respite center. In 2004 the City began leasing land on the west position of the park to a Honda dealership, which represents a recent example of multiple incursions along the peripheries of both the east and west sections of the park (The Sacramento Bee 2000; Clift 2022; Lillis 2016; Lindelof 2004).

Harry Renfree Field

Renfree Field is a baseball diamond facility that was constructed at Del Paso Park in 1967 and officially opened in 1968. Commissioned in part by the City and funded through private and non-profit donors, the baseball facility was noted as an early recreational baseball diamond with field lighting that would allow for night games. The baseball diamond and facilities were constructed for approximately $250,000, and was officially dedicated on May 12, 1968, by the City’s Recreation Director who died suddenly in the years prior.

Initial planning for what would become Renfree Field began as late as 1965 (McDermott 2013). Community members and advocates for recreational baseball approached Renfree about the construction of a new baseball diamond with lighting that could facilitate nighttime games and play. Renfree would take the request and approach a number of organizations and individuals within the local baseball community to begin advocating to City Council. Among those included Sal H. Gomez, a noteworthy local businessman and promoter of sports in Sacramento, who helped push the funding drive for the facility, raising over $15,000 for the construction of bleachers and a restroom facility (McDermott 2013). Following the completion of the field in 1968, the facilities included the baseball field with perimeter fencing, dugouts, bleacher seating that could accommodate 800 spectators, a public restroom building, a standalone concession building, and a two-story clubhouse building with team lockers and a press box (Figure 26) (Conlin 1981).

The opening game at the facility featured a mixture of major and minor league players, who played alongside members of the original Sacramento Solons, an early Sacramento minor league baseball team that played sporadically between the late nineteenth century and mid-twentieth century. While the opening game and others hosted during the initial years of its operation drew large crowds of thousands of spectators, the majority of the baseball diamond’s use was recreational with a number of different competitive, amateur and recreational baseball teams and leagues using the facility. However, despite this initial fanfare, the facility was beginning to lose its luster by the mid-1970s, as leagues—college, amateur, high school, and recreational—began using other, newer facilities (Bodding 1975).
In the 1980s, Renfree Field was often mentioned as a site for potential minor league, professional baseball. Following the end of the Solons in the early 1970s, Sacramento was absent a professional baseball team. Some efforts to establish a new team examined Renfree Field as a potential location, in addition to Cal Expo and other prominent areas within the city. However, despite the publicity around the notion, it is clear that the idea of using Renfree Field was never viable. On numerous occasions, issues around space constraints on the site and costs to make the necessary improvements were beyond what the City was willing to pay (The Sacramento Bee 1981; Conlin 1981, 1987).

The 1990s saw some renovations occur at Renfree Field for the first time since construction. The renovation included new sod, infield dirt, and decomposed granite, while the bleachers and backstop also underwent repair work. In the early 2000s, the playground was constructed immediately south of the baseball field and the Renfree Field parking lot was resurfaced (Figure 27). Despite the limited interventions, the facility continued to a state of decline and disrepair, which became more pronounced after the City made cuts to their Department of Parks and Recreation in the aftermath of the Great Recession. In 2012 following a fire in the press box related to vandalism, Renfree Field was closed. Plans from the non-profit and private sector to reinvest in Renfree Field would be common over the following years, although concrete plans did not materialize (Lillis 2012).
Figure 27. 2011 satellite image of Renfree Field, illustrating the conditions when it retained the original buildings and bleachers and was in continued use for baseball. Source: Google Earth Pro.

In 2018 the City constructed the second parking lot and walking path for the playground, located at the southeast corner of Renfree Field. The following year, the original buildings and bleachers were removed from Renfree Field, leaving only the backstop, chain-link fences, dugout benches, field lighting, and scoreboard (Figure 28).

Figure 28. 2022 satellite image showing existing conditions at Renfree Field. Source: Google Earth Pro.
**Associated Individuals | Harry Renfree**

Born in Sacramento on November 14, 1915, Alfred Harry Renfree spent his life as a public servant to the City. Son of Reginald H. Renfree, Alfred was a first-generation American as his family had migrated to the United States from England around 1900. One of five siblings, Alfred participated in numerous municipal sports leagues where he acquired a love for intramural activities. Alfred attended Sacramento High School and worked at the Sacramento Saw Works and Lyon-Darwin Hardware Company in Oak Park throughout the 1930s. In June of 1937, Alfred married Laura Shoemaker in Sacramento. Together the couple would have three daughters. Alfred’s career in recreational sports began on a part-time basis in 1937 when he became manager of the Clunie Swimming Pool in McKinley Park. The City recreational department also utilized Alfred to officiate baseball, basketball, soccer, and volleyball leagues sponsored by the city (Ancestry 2023a, 2023b, 2023c).

The involvement of the United States in WWII forced many young men to put their lives on hold to fight against the Axis powers in Europe and the Pacific. A heart condition kept Alfred from wartime service. However, his brother Reginald who served as Superintendent of Sports for the City was drafted, and Harry took over the position temporarily. Upon Reginald’s return in 1946, Harry became a recreational supervisor for the City and, in 1951, became the Sports Superintendent. Alfred’s duties expanded in 1962 to take on adult activities such as golf and different senior programs. Outside work, Alfred was involved with various Masonic organizations, including the Washington Lodge No. 20, Scottish Rite bodies, and the Ben Ali Shrine. Alfred continued as superintendent until his death on December 7, 1966. Alfred collapsed during a meeting with his boss and brother Reginald. Coworkers attempted mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Alfred was pronounced dead at the Sacramento Hospital. Because of Alfred’s lengthy service to the Recreation Department, the City dedicated a baseball park in his name at Del Paso Park in 1968 (*The Sacramento Bee* 1966a, 1966b).

**Associated Individuals | Salvador H. Gomez**

Salvador “Sal” Hurtado Gomez was a noteworthy restauranteur, businessman, and promoter of professional and junior sports in the Sacramento area during the second half of the twentieth century (Figure 29). Sal Gomez was born in Hayden, Arizona in 1915 to parents Niacario and Maria Gomez, both of whom were from Jalisco, Mexico and immigrated to the United States ca. 1912. Gomez’ father worked as a laborer in a smelting plant before the family ultimately resettled in Los Angeles, California ca.1927 (Ancestry 2023d). While Gomez’s father worked in street construction, Sal took a job working in the wholesale food industry. By 1940 Sal was working as a foreman and salesman for the West Coast Banana Distributors in Los Angeles (Ancestry 2023e). By 1941, he was enlisted into the U.S. Army and served in the 339th Engineers unit during WWII. Gomez met his wife in Corona, where she was working in a war time defense supplies factory, and they were married in 1942. Upon returning from the war, Sal Gomez found that his prior position was no longer available, and he ultimately began working for an uncle who

---

*Figure 29. 1970 portrait of Sal Gomez for the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. Source: Center for Sacramento History, Catalog No.2001/059/0220.*

In 1947 Sal and Lucy Gomez moved to Sacramento, where they opened their own tortilla factory located at 1406 5th Street. The La Fiesta Tortilleria grew steadily over the following decades as Sal and Lucy Gomez continued to produce and market their product around the Sacramento area to both restaurants and grocery stores. They ultimately outgrew their original location and constructed a new purpose-built facility located at 9th and X Streets, near Stockton Boulevard (Figure 30). The new facility allowed them to meet impressive demands, including being distributed by Safeway grocery stores all Northern and Central California (Castro 1992). In addition to mass producing tortillas, Sal and Lucy Gomez opened their own restaurants known as the “La Fiesta Mexicatessen.” The restaurant would experience notable success with several locations throughout the Sacramento area, including the former west end of downtown Sacramento, Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael (Figure 31).

In addition to Sal Gomez’s success in business, he was a notable promoter of professional and recreational sports throughout Sacramento. He began playing golf for the networking opportunities and to advance his business interests, and was often involved in many golf tournaments throughout Sacramento. Gomez was also a charter member of the Northridge Country Club and the Mexican American Golf Association. Gomez was also involved in boxing promotion and was a notable promoter for baseball in the Sacramento region, sponsoring a variety of amateur and recreational teams, and leading the drive to finance the lighting at Renfree Field (Gibson 1996).

Gomez’s involvement in civics extended beyond sport and recreation and included serving in a variety of organizations and committees, including the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, the West
End Citizens Committee for Redevelopment, and the Lions Club (*The Sacramento Bee* 1954). In 1970 Gomez ran for election in the 8th California Assembly District as a Republican, but ultimately lost to Democratic incumbent and former Mayor of North Sacramento Walter W. Powers (*The Sacramento Bee* 1970). While Gomez does not appear to have sought out elected office again, he continued to be a notable civic figure in Sacramento until his passing in 1996.

**CRHR Evaluation**

*Criteria A/1*

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 1. Constructed in 1968 as a municipal baseball field catering to amateur recreation, Renfree Field has no significant associations with the development of Sacramento, nor the surrounding neighborhoods in North Sacramento, all of which predate the property’s construction. Similarly, Renfree Field has no significant associations with the development of parks and recreation in the Sacramento area. Parks were an essential part of Sacramento’s initial development, and the construction of Renfree Field within that context is reflective of the general emphasis on sport as recreation in the postwar period, during which dozens of baseball diamonds were constructed throughout the city, region, and elsewhere in California and the broader United States. Although Renfree Field is notable for its use for local baseball in the amateur and recreational level during the period after its construction, particularly in relation to the development of many professional baseball players hailing from Sacramento, this is reflective of general patterns of use and is typical of many recreational facilities. As such, the association with the development of future professional athletes does not appear to rise to a level of significance under this criterion.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Renfree Field’s history is its status as the first recreational and publicly accessible baseball facility in Sacramento that had field lighting, allowing for night games and extended play. While this development is noteworthy, it does not appear to rise to a level of significance under this criterion. The use of lighting provided extended playing time, which was notable for the facility’s use, but does not reflect a broader shift in the patterns of development of recreational baseball or sport. The installation of the lighting is simply a facility improvement that prolonged an existing recreational use beyond typical daytime hours, and is reflective of the general development of recreation through improved amenities and facilities. As such, the use of lighting at Renfree Field as an amenity does not individually rise to a level of significance related to recreation in Sacramento.

Lastly, Renfree Field is not associated with any one specific event that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1.

*Criteria B/2*

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 2. Although the baseball facilities are named after Harry Renfree, who was an important promoter of sport and recreation in Sacramento during the postwar period, the naming of the field is purely commemorative in nature. Renfree, who was a superintendent of the City’s parks and recreational facilities during the 1960s,
had passed away suddenly in 1966, 2 years prior to the construction of the subject baseball field. Although he was involved in the early planning and promotion of the facility, this is true of all recreational facilities in Sacramento during this period. Furthermore, there is no direct association between Harry Renfree and Renfree Field that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

More inherently involved with the development of Renfree Field was Sal H. Gomez. Gomez was a noteworthy businessman, promoter of local sports, and civically involved individual in Sacramento during the second half of the twentieth century. Most associated with founding of the “La Fiesta” brand of tortillas, which were manufactured in Sacramento and distributed throughout Northern California, Gomez was a celebrated entrepreneur and leader within the Sacramento business community. Gomez was also heavily involved in the promotion of sports, particularly golf and baseball. While Gomez was involved as a leading personality in the funding drive for constructing Renfree Field, particularly the support facilities at the field, this association is representative of just one of his multiple efforts and initiatives within Sacramento. Although there is the potential for Gomez to be considered a locally significant individual, the contributions made by Gomez to history appear to be better reflected in other properties. Renfree Field, and specifically Gomez’s involvement in the funding drive to facilitate its construction, with a particular focus on the restrooms and other support facilities, is reflective of Gomez’s general civic engagement and does not appear to rise to a level of significance within the context of his contributions to Sacramento.

Lastly, the subject property does not appear to be significantly associated with any specific professional baseball player. While many future major and minor league baseball players from Sacramento in the 1970s onwards would use these facilities, this is a function typical of all baseball fields, of which there are dozens throughout the Sacramento area. Additionally, the status of these players as professional does not equate to significance under this criterion. Any association with Renfree Field is simply its use as a sporting facility with no likely contributions that would qualify as significant under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 2.

Criteria C/3

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to be historically significant under Criterion 3. Constructed in 1968 as a typical, municipal baseball field, the property is generally characterized by its vernacular qualities that are consistent with similar facilities located throughout Sacramento, California, and the broader United States. It does not retain any design elements or features related to a particular style or method of construction that would rise to a level of significance under this criterion. Similarly, Renfree Field appears to be a typical example of the baseball field property type. While it was noted at the time of construction for featuring lighting to allow for night games, this is a typical aspect of many baseball fields, which coincides with the other elements of Renfree Field that generally reflect established forms, features, and elements found in community-focused baseball facilities throughout all localities in the United States. The addition of lighting, while a noteworthy amenity to the field’s overall function and capacity as a sporting facility, does not rise to a level of significance under this criterion as an example of the pervasive baseball
field property type. There is also no specific architect associated with Renfree Field, and it does not appear to reflect the work of a master designer.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3.

Criteria D/4

The recreational property at Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as historically significant under this criterion. The “potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of California” typically relates to archaeological resources; however, built environment resources can be considered historically significant if they are a source of information related to evolution and understanding of construction or similar historical themes. The subject recreational property is a typical, twentieth century municipal baseball field, the construction of which is well studied and documented.

Therefore, Renfree Field is not eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 4.

Sacramento Register Evaluation

Criteria i

As stated previously, Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s and is reflective of the established postwar trend of increased sport as a predominant form of recreation. While baseball diamonds were found in Sacramento park facilities decades prior to WWII, the rise of the neighborhood park and regional recreation center led to the construction of numerous baseball fields throughout the city in the postwar period, of which there were dozens by the time Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s. Although Renfree Field is noted as the first lighted baseball diamond in the Sacramento area, this does not appear to rise to a level of historical significance under this criterion. Rather, the use of lighting is a noteworthy amenity that contributed to the facility’s initial success by accommodating additional league play beyond typical hours. While this marked an expanded service capability, this does not appear to qualify as significant. Rather, it perpetuated an existing and well established recreational use and primarily provided scheduling flexibility, particularly during the winter months where daylight was at its shortest.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion i.

Criteria ii

As described in the CRHR evaluation under Criterion 2, Renfree Field does not appear to have associations with individuals in a way that would qualify as significant under these criteria. Named after Harry Renfree, the director of the City’s parks in the postwar period who died prior to the subject property’s construction, the facility at Renfree Field is primarily commemorative in nature. While Renfree was involved in the initial plans for the facility, the same can be said of all recreational facilities throughout the city during his employment at the City. Furthermore, Renfree Field was not entirely an effort by the City, but was rather facilitated by a number of people in the private sector, as well as the general public. Of those, Sal H. Gomez was the most notable. A prominent businessman, civic leader, and promoter of sport and recreation, Gomez
was part of the initial funding drive for the development of Renfree Field. Specifically, Gomez spearheaded the effort to raise funds for specific facilities at Renfree Field, including the bleachers and restroom building, both of which are no longer extant. While Gomez was an important part in boosting the viability of Renfree Field, he was involved in multiple civic efforts throughout the city, in addition to his longstanding contributions to Sacramento’s business community and the broader development of sports and recreation. As such, Renfree Field does not appear to rise to a level of significance for its associations with Sal H. Gomez under this criterion.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion ii.

Criteria iii

Overall, Renfree Field is a typical baseball field and recreational facility from the second half of the twentieth century. Although baseball diamonds have been a fixture of parks and recreational facilities in Sacramento since the late nineteenth century, they came to particular prominence during the first half of the twentieth century and the first decade of the postwar period. By the time Renfree Field was constructed in the late 1960s, the baseball field was a ubiquitous recreational property type found at nearly all parks throughout the city. While Renfree Field originally demonstrated elevated amenities and features, including restrooms, concession stand, clubhouse with locker rooms, and a press box, this too was characteristic of baseball fields and does not specifically embody the distinctive characteristics of the property type in a significant fashion. This is exacerbated further by the loss of these facilities, all of which are no longer extant. Perhaps the most notable amenity at Renfree Field was the addition of field lighting, which allowed for extended hours of play. While this is noted as the first use of lighting at a recreational field in Sacramento, these features do not significantly embody a property type, but rather reflect an additional amenity to a pre-existing property type.

Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion iii.

Criteria iv

Renfree Field is not associated with a creative individual or master architect, designer, or builder. It is a typical recreational baseball field that reflects generic and common construction practices. Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion iv.

Criteria v

As noted above, Renfree Field is a typical municipal baseball field and recreational facility. It lacks any design features or other inherently artistic qualities that would rise to a level of significance under this criterion. Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion v.
Criteria vi

Renfree Field is a typical municipal baseball facility. Constructed in the late 1960s and reflective of the established trends of increased sport as recreation during the postwar period, the documentation and understanding regarding the construction of similar facilities is well documented and understood. Therefore, Renfree Field does not appear to qualify as eligible for designation as a Sacramento Landmark and listing in the Sacramento Register under Criterion vi.

Evaluation Summary

Renfree Field does not individually exhibit any historical significance under any of the criteria for eligibility for listing in the CRHR or Sacramento Register. Therefore, Renfree Field does not individually qualify as a historical resource for the purposes of environmental review under CEQA.
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