

Appendix D. Cultural Resources Technical Report

This page intentionally left blank.

Cultural Resources Technical Report for the
East Valley Specific Plan
City of Escondido, San Diego County, California

Prepared For:

Harris and Associates
600 B Street, Suite 2000
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 236-1778

On behalf of:

City of Escondido
San Diego County, California

Prepared by:

Brian Williams, MMA, RPA
Shannon Davis, MA, RPA,
Amy J. Jordan, PhD, RPA,
Deanna Keegan, MA, RPA
Laura Taylor Kung, MA

ASM Affiliates
2034 Corte del Nogal
Carlsbad, California 92011
Telephone: (760) 804-5757

USGS topographic quadrangle(s): Escondido, Rancho Santa Fe, Rodriguez Mountain, San Marcos,
San Pasqual, Valley Center, CA
Approximate area: 43,570 acres (68 square miles)

ASM Project Number 36760
December 2021



Cultural Resources Technical Report
for the
East Valley Specific Plan
City of Escondido
San Diego County, California

ASM Affiliates
2034 Corte del Nogal
Carlsbad, California 92011
Telephone: (760) 804-5757
Project Number 36760

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1.0 | Introduction..... | 5 |
| 1.1 | Study Location..... | 6 |
| 2.0 | Regulatory Framework..... | 9 |
| 2.1 | Federal..... | 9 |
| 2.1.1 | National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 | 9 |
| 2.1.2 | National Register of Historic Places | 9 |
| 2.1.3 | Federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act | 9 |
| 2.2 | State | 10 |
| 2.2.1 | California Register of Historical Resources | 10 |
| 2.2.2 | California Environmental Quality Act Statutes [PRC Section 21083.2(g) and (h)].. | 11 |
| 2.2.3 | Assembly Bill No. 52..... | 12 |
| 2.2.4 | Senate Bill No. 18..... | 12 |
| 2.2.5 | California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5..... | 13 |
| 2.2.6 | California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9 | 13 |
| 2.2.7 | California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act..... | 13 |
| 2.3 | Local | 13 |
| 2.3.1 | City of Escondido | 13 |
| 2.3.2 | Escondido General Plan | 15 |
| 2.3.3 | Escondido Downtown Specific Plan..... | 16 |
| 2.3.4 | East Valley Specific Plan..... | 20 |
| 3.0 | Background Context | 21 |
| 3.1 | Environmental Background..... | 21 |
| 3.1.1 | Geography..... | 21 |
| 3.1.2 | Geology | 21 |
| 3.1.3 | Biology | 21 |
| 3.2 | Cultural Background | 21 |
| 3.2.1 | Prehistoric..... | 21 |
| 3.2.2 | Ethnography | 24 |
| 3.2.3 | Historic Context..... | 27 |
| 3.2.4 | Residential Architecture in Escondido: 1884-1940..... | 31 |
| 4.0 | Background Research | 34 |
| 4.1 | CHRIS Records Search..... | 34 |

Table of Contents

4.1.1 Previous Cultural Resource Studies 34

4.1.2 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources 34

4.1.3 Potential Historic Districts 35

4.2 Native American Outreach 36

4.3 Cultural Resource Sensitivity within the East Valley Specific Plan Area..... 36

5.0 Programmatic Recommendations..... 39

5.1 Standards of Significance 39

5.1.1 Historical Resources..... 39

5.1.2 Archaeological Resources..... 39

5.1.3 Tribal Cultural Resources..... 40

5.1.4 Human Remains 40

5.2 Resource Identification Framework..... 41

5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... 41

5.3.1 Substantial Adverse Change to Historical Resources 41

5.3.2 Substantial Adverse Change to Built Environment Resources 42

5.3.3 Substantial Adverse Change to Archaeological Resources 43

5.3.4 Substantial Adverse Change to Human Remains..... 47

5.3.5 Substantial Adverse Change to Tribal Resources 48

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations..... 50

6.1 Summary of EVSP Analysis and Results 50

References 51

Appendices

Appendix A: Tables

Appendix B: Confidential Maps and Records Search Results

Appendix C: Native American Outreach

List of Figures

Figure 1. Project vicinity map. 7

Figure 2. East Valley Specific Plan project area. 8

Figure 3. Sensitivity map for built environment cultural resources within EVSP. 38

List of Tables

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 1. | Built Environment Resources within the EVSP. | 34 |
| Table 2. | Previous Cultural Resource Inventory Projects Conducted within the Project Area..... | A-1 |
| Table 3. | Built Environment Resources within the East Valley Specific Plan Area. | A-3 |

1.0 Introduction

The City of Escondido (City) is preparing a new East Valley Specific Plan (EVSP) that would focus growth and increase density in the new EVSP area, located in central Escondido. The goal of the proposed EVSP is to encourage new housing opportunities, improve economic vibrancy, and allow for flexibility in use and implementation as the EVSP area changes over time. The EVSP would rezone the existing EVSP area to cluster uses to create a more cohesive pattern and design with a goal of revitalizing the physical character and economic health of the community. The EVSP presents goals, policies, design standards, and implementation strategies for topics such as land use, mobility, and parks. The EVSP is intended to provide guidance for private development and public investment over the next 20 years. The EVSP includes a Density Transfer Program (EVSP Density Transfer Program) to enable the City to transfer densities from undeveloped or underutilized properties in the EVSP area to other properties in the EVSP area, to enable a developing property to increase its density beyond what current zoning would permit.

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) conducted a cultural resources study for the EVSP. The City of Escondido is an approximately 43,570-acre (68-square-mile) area located approximately 30 miles north of San Diego, 15 miles east of the Pacific Coast, and 20 miles south of the San Diego-Orange County border. On behalf of the City, Harris and Associates retained ASM to prepare a Cultural Resources Technical Report (CRTR) for the EVSP area.

This CRTR covers historic buildings, archaeological resources, and tribal cultural resources (TCRs) within the City, as well as applicable cultural resource regulations, the potential for impacting historic buildings, archaeological, and/or TCRs, and mitigation measures covering historic buildings, archaeological, and TCRs.

The goals of this CRTR are to:

- Provide a regulatory framework that dictates the City's treatment and protection of cultural resources (Chapter 2);
- Provide background for the City, including environmental, prehistoric chronology, ethnographic research, and historic context (Chapter 3);
- Provide a background records search and literature review to determine if any known cultural resources are present in the Project Area, including a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search, a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and buried archaeological site sensitivity analysis (Chapter 4);
- Create an outline of potential impacts to cultural resources and list of proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a level of insignificance (Chapter 5).

ASM conducted this study, undertaking documentary research in February 2021. ASM Director Brian Williams, MA, RPA, served as Principal Investigator and is the primary author of this report. Mr. Williams meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology. ASM Director Shannon Davis, MA, RPH; ASM Senior Archaeologist Amy Jordan, PhD, RPA; and ASM Architectural Historian Laura Kung, MA, assisted Mr. Williams with sections of this report.

1.1 Study Location

The City of Escondido is located approximately 30 miles north of San Diego, 15 miles east of the Pacific Coast, and 20 miles south of the San Diego-Orange County border (Figure 1). The City is located on portions of the USGS Escondido, Rancho Santa Fe, Rodriguez Mountain, San Marcos, San Pasqual, and Valley Center 7.5-minute quadrangles (Appendix B). The EVSP area is an approximately 195-acre (0.30-square-mile) subsection of the City, defined on the north by E Washington Ave and Escondido Creek, on the east by Harding St, on the west by N and S Hickory St, and on the south by E 2nd Ave (Figure 2).



Figure 1. Project vicinity map.




Figure 2. East Valley Specific Plan project area.

2.0 Regulatory Framework

2.1 Federal

2.1.1 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The act also established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and a review process for protecting cultural resources. The regulations within the NHPA provide a legal framework for other State and local cultural preservation laws. The NRHP provides a listing of the nation's cultural resources that are deemed significant to the nation's history and worthy of preservation. Listing in the NRHP assists in preservation of historic properties through the following actions: recognition that a property is of significance to the nation, the state, or the community; consideration in planning for federal or federally assisted projects; eligibility for federal tax benefits; consideration in the decision to issue a federal permit; and qualification for federal assistance for historic preservation grants, when funds are available.

2.1.2 National Register of Historic Places

Criteria has been established to evaluate whether a property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity and meet one of four established criteria:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
2. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
3. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A property is eligible for the NRHP if it meets one of the above criteria and retains sufficient integrity. Integrity in this context means the ability of a property to convey its significance. The evaluation of integrity must be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features, and how they relate to the concept of integrity. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a property requires knowing why, where, and when a property is significant. To retain historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, aspects of integrity. The seven aspects of integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

2.1.3 Federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), established in 1990, provides a cooperative process for museums and federal agencies to return to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, certain Native American cultural items including human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural

patrimony. NAGPRA also includes requirements for unclaimed and culturally unidentifiable Native American cultural items, intentional and inadvertent discovery of Native American cultural items on federal and tribal lands, and penalties for noncompliance and illegal trafficking of these items. Implementation of the proposed project would be conducted in compliance with NAGPRA. On March 15, 2010, the Department of the Interior issued a final rule on 43 CFR Part 10 of the NAGPRA Regulations – Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains. The final rule implements NAGPRA by adding procedures for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable Native American human remains in the possession or control of museums of federal agencies. The rule also amends sections related to purpose and applicability of the regulations, definitions, inventories of human remains and related funerary objects, civil penalties, and limitations and remedies. The rule became effective on May 14, 2010.

2.2 State

2.2.1 California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), established in 1992 through amendments to the Public Resources Code (PRC), serves as an authoritative guide 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 from substantial adverse change under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Historical resources are legally defined as cultural resources that are eligible for CRHR listing. The CRHR includes resources that are formally determined eligible for or listed in the NRHP, State Historical Landmarks numbered 770 or higher, Points of Historical Interest recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC), resources nominated for listing and determined eligible in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the SHRC, and resources and districts designated as city or county landmarks when the designation criteria are consistent with CRHR criteria.

A resource is eligible for listing on the CRHR if it meets any of the following criteria:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Archaeological resources are primarily evaluated under criterion 4, whereas TCRs may be considered under criterion 1. The CRHR may also include properties listed in local registers of historic properties. Section 5020.1(k) broadly defines a “local register of historic resources” as “a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution.” Local registers of historic properties come in two forms: 1) surveys of historic resources conducted by a local agency in accordance with California Office of

Historic Preservation (OHP) procedures and standards, adopted by the local agency and maintained as current; and 2) landmarks designated under local ordinances or resolutions (PRC Sections 5024.1, 21804.1, 15064.5). The minimum age criterion for the CRHR is 45 years. A property less than 45 years old may be eligible for listing on the CRHR, if “it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance” [Chapter 11, Title 14, Section 4842(d)(2)].

2.2.2 California Environmental Quality Act Statutes [PRC Section 21083.2(g) and (h)]

CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources requires that all private and public activities not specifically exempted be evaluated for potential environmental impacts, including impacts to historical resources. CEQA Section 21084.1 states that significant impacts may occur if a project “may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.” CEQA defines historical resources as “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.”

Lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate a project’s impacts to historical resources and to determine whether those impacts are significant. Mitigation of significant impacts is required if the proposed Project will cause substantial adverse change to a historical resource. Substantial adverse change includes “demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired.” While demolition and destruction are fairly obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance (i.e., its character-defining features) can be considered to materially impair the resource’s significance.

For purposes of CEQA, a “historical resource” is a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR. The CRHR includes resources listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts), or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory, may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be historical resources for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise.

Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be a “historical resource” if it:

1. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible by, the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CRHR (PRC Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
2. Is included in a local register of historical resources, or is identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC.
3. Is a building or structure determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Generally, a resource is considered “historically significant” if it meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR.

CEQA statutes [PRC Section 21083.2(g)] define 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. It contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
2. It has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
3. It is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

PRC Section 21083.2(h) defines a “non-unique archaeological resource” as an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the criteria in subdivision (g) above. A non-unique archaeological resource need be given no further consideration, other than the simple recording of its existence by the lead agency, if the agency so elects.

2.2.3 Assembly Bill No. 52

Assembly Bill No. 52 (AB 52) amends CEQA and, in general, replaces Senate Bill No. 18 (defined below) by creating a new category of cultural resources and new requirements for consultation with Native American Tribes. Governor Brown signed AB 52 on Sept 25, 2014, and the bill became effective July 1, 2015. Lead agencies are required to offer Native American tribes with an interest in TCRs located within its jurisdiction the opportunity to consult on CEQA documents. The new procedures under AB 52 offer the tribes an opportunity to take an active role in the CEQA process in order to protect TCRs. AB 52 requires a lead agency to begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project if the tribe requests to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area; and also, if the tribe requests consultation, prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. If the tribe requests consultation within 30 days upon receipt of the notice, the lead agency must consult with the tribe. AB 52 specifies examples of mitigation measures that may be considered to avoid or minimize impacts on TCRs.

2.2.4 Senate Bill No. 18

Adopted in 2004, Senate Bill No. 18 provides guidelines and advice, developed in consultation with the NAHC, for consulting with California Native American tribes for the preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects. The bill requires those guidelines to address procedures for identifying the appropriate California Native American tribes, for continuing to protect the confidentiality of information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of those places, features, and objects, and for facilitating voluntary landowner participation to preserve and protect the specific identity, location, character, and use of those places, features, and objects. The bill defines a California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC as a “person” for purposes of provisions relating to public notice of hearings relating to local planning issues. This bill requires the planning agency to refer the proposed action to California Native American tribes, as specified, and also provides opportunities for involvement of California Native American tribes. The bill requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a city or county’s general plan, the city or county conduct consultations with California Native American tribes for the purpose of preserving specified places, features, and

objects that are located within the city or county’s jurisdiction. The bill defines the term “consultation” for purposes of those provisions.

2.2.5 California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 7050.5, Disturbance of Human Remains, establishes intentional disturbance, mutilation, or removal of interred human remains as a misdemeanor and specifies protocol for the inadvertent discovery of human remains.

2.2.6 California Public Resources Code Section 5097.9

California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.9 prohibits interference with Native American religion or damage to cemeteries or places of worship and requires the NAHC to immediately notify the most likely descendants when it receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains pursuant to HSC Section 7050.5 (described above).

2.2.7 California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The California NAGPRA, enacted in 2001, requires State agencies and museums that receive State funding and that possess or control collections of human remains or cultural items, as defined, to complete an inventory and summary of these remains and items with certain exceptions. California NAGPRA also provides a process to identify and repatriate these items to the appropriate Native American tribes.

2.3 Local

2.3.1 City of Escondido

The Escondido Historic Preservation Commission develops and implements the City Historic Preservation Program under the direction of the City Council and advises the Council on the responsibilities of being a Certified Local Government and other matters relating to Historic Preservation. According to the Escondido Municipal Code, Article 40, Historical Resources, Sec. 33-794, the procedure and criteria for local register listing or local landmark designation are as follows:

Prior to granting a resource local register or historical landmark status, the city council shall consider the definitions for historical resources and historical districts and shall find that the resource conforms to one (1) or more of the criteria listed in this section. A structural resource proposed for the local register shall be evaluated against criteria number one (1) through seven (7) and must meet at least two (2) of the criteria. Signs proposed for the local register shall meet at least one (1) of the criteria numbered eight (8) through ten (10). Landscape features proposed for the local register shall meet criterion number eleven (11). Archaeological resources shall meet criterion number twelve (12). Local register resources proposed for local landmark designation shall be evaluated against criterion number thirteen (13).

The criteria are as follows:

- (1) Escondido historical resources that are strongly identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture, history, prehistory, or development of the City of Escondido, region, state or nation;
- (2) Escondido building or buildings that embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type, specimen, or are representative of a recognized architect's work and are not substantially altered;
- (3) Escondido historical resources that are connected with a business or use that was once common but is now rare;
- (4) Escondido historical resources that are the sites of significant historic events;
- (5) Escondido historical resources that are fifty (50) years old or have achieved historical significance within the past fifty (50) years;
- (6) Escondido historical resources that are an important key focal point in the visual quality or character of a neighborhood, street, area or district;
- (7) Escondido historical building that is one of the few remaining examples in the city possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type;
- (8) Sign that is exemplary of technology, craftsmanship or design of the period when it was constructed, uses historical sign materials and is not significantly altered;
- (9) Sign that is integrated into the architecture of the building, such as the sign pylons on buildings constructed in the Modern style and later styles;
- (10) Sign that demonstrates extraordinary aesthetic quality, creativity, or innovation;
- (11) Escondido landscape feature that is associated with an event or person of historical significance to the community or warrants special recognition due to size, condition, uniqueness or aesthetic qualities;
- (12) Escondido archaeological site that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory;
- (13) Escondido significant historical resource that has an outstanding rating of the criteria used to evaluate local register requests. (Ord. No. 2000-23, § 4, 9-13-00; Ord. No. 2008-16, § 4, 7-16-08; Ord. No. 2016-15, § 4, 10-26-16).

The sections of the Escondido Municipal Code that pertain to historic districts include:

Sec. 33-796 *Historical districts* (a) states that their purpose is to provide recognition to an area or site that has several individual structures or improvements that contribute to a special aesthetic, cultural, architectural or engineering interest or value of a historical or archaeological nature.

Sec. 33-797 *Procedure and findings for designating an historical district* (b) which specifies that appropriate neighborhood meetings will be held and research conducted for proposed historic districts, including:

- (i) map of the proposed district's boundaries and all structures within them, contributing or noncontributing
- (ii) an explanation of the significance of the proposed district and description of the historical resources within the proposed boundaries
- (iii) statements showing how the proposed historical district meets these findings.

2.3.2 Escondido General Plan

The City of Escondido's (2012a:VII-12) General Plan notes:

Conserving archaeological, cultural, and agricultural resources helps foster an appreciation of Escondido's past and provides an important perspective and economic opportunity for future planning efforts. Increased awareness of the economic benefits of preservation has also been recognized in the visitor and tourism industry. Interest in statewide heritage tourism and Escondido's ordinances offering economic incentives for preservation have benefited owners of historical, archeological and architecturally significant properties.

The following policies in the City of Escondido General Plan describe the specific actions the City requires of new development with regards to cultural resources.

- Cultural Resources Policy 5.1 Maintain and update the Escondido Historic Site Survey to include significant resources that meet local, state, or federal criteria.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.2 Preserve significant cultural and paleontological resources listed on the national, State, or local registers through: maintenance or development of appropriate ordinances that protect, enhance, and perpetuate resources; incentive programs; and/or the development review process.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.3 Consult with appropriate organizations and individuals (e.g., South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the CHRIS, NAHC, Native American groups and individuals, and San Diego Natural History Museum) early in the development process to minimize potential impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.

- Cultural Resources Policy 5.4 Recognize the sensitivity of locally significant cultural resources and the need for more detailed assessments through the environmental review process.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.5 Preserve historic buildings, landscapes, and districts with special and recognized historic or architectural value in their original locations through preservation, rehabilitation (including adaptive reuse), and restoration where the use is compatible with the surrounding area
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.6 Review proposed new development and/or remodels for compatibility with the surrounding historic context.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.7 Comply with appropriate local, State, or federal regulations governing historical resources.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.8 Consider providing financial incentives, and educational information on existing incentives provided by the federal government to private owners and development in order to maintain, rehabilitate, and preserve historic resources.
- Cultural Resources Policy 5.9 Educate the public on the City’s important historic resources in increase awareness for protection.

2.3.3 Escondido Downtown Specific Plan

The Escondido General Plan’s Land Use and Community Form element identified 13 Specific Plan Areas (SPA), including a 475-acre Downtown SPA (#9) (City of Escondido 2012b). The *Downtown Specific Plan* adopted in 2013 was divided into seven Downtown Specific Plan Districts, including the Historic Downtown district—a three-block-wide corridor centered on Grand Avenue between Centre City Parkway and Hickory Street, as well as the Palomar Hospital site.

The *Downtown Specific Plan’s* Vision Statement & Goals include “Preserve historically significant sites and structures that enhance the character of Downtown” (2013:I-2). The *Specific Plan’s* Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines (Section IV) direct that the overriding principle of design for historic buildings is to be consistent with the significant architectural style of the building, in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards) and “Guidelines for Historic Preservation” (NPS 2009:IV-1). This Section of the *Specific Plan* includes “Design Guidelines for Historic Buildings” for commercial structures and the adaptive reuse of residential structures for commercial uses in the Downtown SPA.

A. Purpose Statement

1. Design Guidelines for Historic Buildings

- a. Historic Local Register commercial buildings should be researched before designs for alterations, additions, or rehabilitation are prepared so that changes to the building can be based on a clear understanding of the importance of the building and the feasibility of retaining or restoring its significant architectural features.

- b. Buildings should be recognized as products of their own time and should not incorporate alterations which create a historic appearance unrelated to the significant design of the building.
- c. Buildings that have attained historical importance with altered facades made over 50 years ago represent a natural evolution and are evidence of the area's history. Recreation of the original façade is not recommended.
- d. Distinctive stylistic features which exemplify the style should be retained, uncovered, and restored. Where necessary, due to damage or deterioration, original elements of design which define style should be recreated.
- e. Damaged architectural features should be repaired, rather than replaced, whenever possible.
- f. If alterations to a historically significant building are necessary to ensure its continued use, these changes should not alter, obscure, or destroy historically significant features, materials, forms, or finishes.
- g. Additions to historic buildings should be complementary (not identical) as well as removable.
- h. The cleaning of historic facades should always be approached by employing the gentlest method possible first, and then increasing the severity of treatment as necessary. Brick masonry, wood, and terra cotta should NEVER be sandblasted to clean or remove paint to avoid permanent damage.
- i. The proportion, size, and location of existing window openings should be respected and maintained. The rhythm of solid-to-void of the existing historic building should be retained and the total percentage of facade glazing in proportion to solid-wall mass should not be significantly altered. Glazing should NOT incorporate mirror reflective glass or dark tinted glass.
- j. Proportion, scale, and rhythm are important features of historic storefronts and should be retained. Original materials should be repaired or, when necessary, replaced with like materials. The location of the entrance to the building and recess of the entry should be maintained to keep the balance and emphasis of the overall facade.
- k. Awning design should be compatible with the overall facade on which it is to be placed in terms of size, scale, color, and style. The use of retractable awnings is recommended, but not mandatory. Historic buildings traditionally had sloping shed-style awnings of one or two colors which complemented the overall color scheme of the entire building.

- l. New awning materials on historic buildings should maintain the appearance of canvas or fabric. Aluminum, vinyl, or back-lit awnings are not suitable for historic buildings.
- m. Historic buildings should be painted in colors appropriate to the architectural style of the building and complementary to the colors used on any building within the immediate area.

2. Rear Facades

- a. The design of rear facades should be consistent with the building's architectural style and design of the primary facade, but should not be overimproved.
- b. Abandoned pipes, conduits, wires, and signs should be removed and exterior anchors patched to match adjacent surfaces.
- c. Brick masonry should be cleaned or repainted by noncorrosive techniques.
- d. The use of awnings is encouraged to identify entrances and to add visual interest at windows above the first level.
- e. The use of existing window openings as display windows is encouraged. Additional openings created for displays may be permitted where they are suited to the rhythm and scale of the building.
- f. Any seismic structural upgrading should be conducted within the interior of the building unless the structural elements blend into the architecture of the exposed rear facade.
- g. Direct entrances to shops through the rear facade should be provided to encourage pedestrian activity and to separate walkway areas from vehicular traffic.
- h. Use appropriately scaled identifying signs at rear entrances and/or rear facades to encourage the use of rear entrances.
- i. Landscape design should include special planting treatments at rear facades and along pedestrian pass-throughs.
- j. Outdoor lighting should be added to rear facades and pedestrian pass-through areas to create a pleasant and safe nighttime environment. Outdoor lighting shall comply with the City's Outdoor Lighting Ordinance, Article 35 of the Escondido Zoning Code.

B. Party-Wall Construction

The majority of historic commercial buildings in the Downtown SPA are party-wall construction, which means that these buildings share common side walls with their neighbors. Many of these

buildings also are commercial vernacular in style and have fairly simple stylistic elements. The most important principle in dealing with these modest buildings is, as noted before, to respect the original design. Misguided efforts to "restore" these simple structures by adding quasi-historical elements that were not present in the original design can negate their simple charm. Compatibility in design is particularly important since these small structures are physically close to their neighbors. These buildings can often be effectively integrated into a unified design by the use of similar awnings and signs.

C. Adaptive Reuse / Residential Conversions

There are several residential structures that remain in the SPA, although many of these have been converted to nonresidential uses. Conversion of these buildings to office or retail uses (termed adaptive reuse) presents a number of challenges because the needs of the new use (such as increased parking, air conditioning, increased number of exits, improved handicapped access, added floor area, etc.) are often substantially different from the old use and yet must be accommodated within the same building.

As with rehabilitation, or renovation, of historic commercial buildings, the overriding principle of design for adaptive reuse is to be consistent with the significant historical design of the building whenever that design can be determined. Where historic records are not available, the building design should follow the design and architectural style typical of that era; particularly any buildings in the immediate area that were built in the same era and style. The following guidelines also apply to all adaptive reuse of historical buildings within the Downtown area.

- a. The primary facade or facades (those sides of the building facing or clearly visible to a public street) should not be modified unless no other design solution is possible.
- b. Preserve the significant historic features of the building by designing changes which can be reversed if the building were restored in the future.
- c. Any new additions or changes to the original structure should preserve the historic character of the original by retaining the overall shape, materials, colors, setting, craftsmanship, and window arrangement.
- d. While new additions or alterations should be compatible in design, they should not replicate the historic design in order to give the impression the historic property is a distinct unit.
- e. Consider incentive programs offered by the City or use of the Historic Building Code to provide rehab options to make a difficult project feasible.
- f. Landscape design in residential areas should include landscape improvements and street furniture conducive in scale to the residential architecture

2.3.4 East Valley Specific Plan

The 2012 City of Escondido General Plan Update (City of Escondido 2012b) identified 11 “Target Areas” that provided opportunities for achieving the General Plan vision and that involved a reevaluation of land use patterns and policies. The EVSP area is included within the limits of the General Plan’s East Valley Target Area. In 2020, the City was awarded grant funding to develop an East Valley Specific Plan (City of Escondido 2012). The City crafted the EVSP as a comprehensive planning and zoning document for the western portion of the General Plan East Valley Target Area. The EVSP was made available for public review on March 17, 2021 (City of Escondido 2012).

The EVSP’s Vision Statement and Goals do not specifically include protections for historically significant sites or structures.

3.0 Background Context

Below is a general environmental and cultural background for the region surrounding the Project Area in order to generate a set of expectations regarding the nature of cultural resources that might be encountered within the EVSP and to establish a context within which to assess the significance of any such resources.

3.1 Environmental Background

3.1.1 Geography

The EVSP area is located in the Peninsular Ranges of Southern California. Elevations within the Project area range from mountain peaks to valley floors. Major watersheds within the Study area include the San Dieguito River and Escondido Creek.

Landforms within the Study area include rolling hills and valleys, extending eastward to the Peninsular Ranges. Sediments accumulated through ocean, stream, wind, and gravitational activities characterize recent geologic deposits. The region is characterized by a Mediterranean semiarid steppe climate, moderated by coastal proximity (Bowman 1973; Hines and Rivers 1991:4). Precipitation averages 270 mm (10.6 inches) per year and falls primarily in the winter (from December to April).

3.1.2 Geology

The EVSP area lies within the Southern California Batholith and the Peninsular Ranges. Mesozoic (245-65 million years ago [MYA]) granitic and gabbroic rock and Quaternary (1.6 MYA to present) sedimentary deposits are also present within the Study area (Rogers 1965; Wagner and Maldonado 2000). The granitic and gabbroic rocks were formed in the Cretaceous period during the latter part of the Mesozoic era. They are part of the western zone of the Peninsular Ranges Batholith.

3.1.3 Biology

The Study area passes through several urbanized areas containing no native vegetation. However, within the undeveloped portions of the EVSP area, a series of major plant communities is present, including coastal sage scrub, riparian, grasslands, oaks, and chaparral (Munz 1974). A wide range of small mammals, birds, and reptiles were indigenous faunal resources of the vicinity of the Study area. Some of the mammals that occur in the area include several species of mice and bats, desert cottontail, California ground squirrel, desert woodrat, bobcat, coyote, and mule deer, among others. Geese, ducks, and other waterfowl are also found in the region. In prehistoric times, the area would have also supported a wide range of terrestrial resources, such as pronghorn, and perhaps even black bears.

3.2 Cultural Background

3.2.1 Prehistoric

Archaeological investigations in Southern California have documented a diverse range of human adaptations extending from the late Pleistocene up to the time of European contact (e.g.,

Erlandson and Colten 1991; Erlandson and Glassow 1997; Erlandson and Jones 2002; Jones and Klar 2007; Moratto 1984). To describe and discuss this diversity, local investigators have proposed a variety of different chronologies and conceptual categories (periods, horizons, stages, phases, traditions, cultures, peoples, industries, complexes, and patterns), often with confusingly overlapping or vague terminology.

The prehistory of San Diego County is most frequently divided chronologically into three or four major periods. An Early Man stage, perhaps dating back tens of thousands of years, has been proposed. More generally accepted divisions include a Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene period (ca. 12,000-6000 B.C.) (Paleo-Indian stage; Clovis and San Dieguito patterns), a Middle/Late Holocene period (ca. 6000 B.C.-A.D. 800) (Archaic stage; La Jolla, Millingstone, Encinitas, and Pauma patterns), and a Late Prehistoric period (ca. A.D. 800-1769) (Late Prehistoric; San Luis Rey, Palomar, Peninsular, Yuman, Cuyamaca, Patayan, or Hakataya pattern patterns).

Hypothetical Early Man (pre-ca. 12,000 B.C.)

The antiquity of human occupation in the New World has been the subject of considerable interest and debate for more than a century. At present, the most widely accepted model is that humans first entered portions of the western hemisphere lying to the south of Alaska between about 15,000 and 12,000 B.C., either along the Pacific coastline or through an ice-free corridor between the retreating Cordilleran and Laurentide segments of the continental glacier in Canada, or along both routes. While there is no generally accepted evidence of human occupation in coastal Southern California prior to about 11,000 B.C., ages estimated at 48,000 years and even earlier sometimes have been reported (e.g., Bada et al. 1974; Carter 1980). However, despite intense interest and the long history of research, no widely accepted evidence of human occupation of North America dating prior to about 12,000 B.C. has emerged.

Local claims for Early Man discoveries have generally been based either on the apparent crudeness of the lithic assemblages that were encountered or on the finds' apparent Pleistocene geological contexts (Carter 1957, 1980; Minshall 1976, 1989; Reeves et al. 1986). The amino acid racemization technique was used in the 1970s and early 1980s to assign Pleistocene ages to coastal Southern California sites (Bada et al. 1974), but the technique's findings have been discredited by more recent accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) radiocarbon dating (Taylor et al. 1985).

Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene Period (ca. 12,000-6000 B.C.)

The earliest chronologically distinctive archaeological pattern recognized in most of North America is the Clovis pattern. Dated to around 11,500 B.C., Clovis assemblages are distinguished by fluted projectile points and other large bifaces, as well as extinct large mammal remains. At least three isolated fluted points have been reported within San Diego County, but their occurrence is very sparse and their dating and contexts are uncertain (Davis and Shutler 1969; Kline and Kline 2007; Rondeau et al. 2007).

The most widely recognized archaeological pattern within this period is termed San Dieguito and has been dated from at least as early as 8500 B.C. to perhaps around 6000 B.C. (Rogers 1966; True and Bouey 1990; Warren 1966; Warren et al. 2008). The San Dieguito pattern was originally defined near the central coast of San Diego County, and its presence has been reported through

extensive areas to the east, but few traces are recognized on or near the northern coast of San Diego County. Proposed characteristics to distinguish San Dieguito flaked lithic assemblages include large projectile points (Lake Mojave, Silver Lake, and other, less diagnostic forms), bifaces, crescents, scraper planes, scrapers, hammers, and choppers. The San Dieguito technology involved well-controlled percussion flaking and some pressure flaking.

Malcolm Rogers (1966) suggested that three successive phases of the San Dieguito pattern (San Dieguito I, II, and III) could be distinguished in Southern California, based on evolving aspects of lithic technology. However, subsequent investigators have generally not been able to confirm such changes, and the phases are not now generally accepted.

A key issue has concerned ground stone, which was originally suggested as having been absent from San Dieguito components but has subsequently been recognized as occurring infrequently within them. It was initially suggested that San Dieguito components, like other Paleo-Indian manifestations, represented the products of highly mobile groups that were organized as small bands and focused on the hunting of large game. However, in the absence of supporting faunal evidence, this interpretation has increasingly been called into question, and it has been suggested that the San Dieguito pattern represented a more generalized, Archaic-stage lifeway, rather than a true Paleo-Indian adaptation.

A vigorous debate has continued for several decades concerning the relationship between the San Dieguito pattern and the La Jolla pattern that succeeded it and that may have also been contemporaneous with or even antecedent to it (e.g., Gallegos 1987; Warren et al. 2008). The initial view was that San Dieguito and La Jolla represented the products of distinct ethnic groups and/or cultural traditions (e.g., Rogers 1945; Warren 1967, 1968). However, as early Holocene radiocarbon dates have been obtained for site components with apparent La Jolla characteristics (shell middens, milling tools, and simple cobble-based flaked lithic technology), an alternative interpretation has gained some favor: that the San Dieguito pattern represented a functional pose related in particular to the production of bifaces, and that it represents activities by the same people who were responsible for the La Jolla pattern (e.g., Bull 1987; Hanna 1983).

Middle/Late Holocene Period (ca. 6000 B.C. – A.D. 800)

Archaeological evidence from this period in the San Diego region has been characterized as belonging to the Archaic stage, Millingstone horizon, Encinitas tradition, or La Jolla and Pauma patterns (Moratto 1984; Rogers 1945; Sutton and Gardner 2010; True 1958, 1980; True and Beemer 1982; True and Pankey 1985; Wallace 1955; Warren 1968; Warren et al. 1961).

Adaptations during this period apparently emphasized gathering, in particular the harvesting of hard plant seeds, as well as small-game hunting. Distinctive characteristics of the La Jolla pattern include extensive shell middens, portable ground stone metates and manos, crudely flaked cobble tools, occasional large expanding-stemmed projectile points (Pinto and Elko forms), and flexed human burials. The inland Pauma pattern has variously been interpreted as a separate culture that was broadly similar to the contemporaneous La Jolla pattern on the coast or as a different functional pose of the same culture.

Investigators have called attention to the apparent stability and conservatism of the La Jolla pattern throughout this long period, as contrasted with less conservative patterns observed elsewhere in coastal Southern California (Hale 2009; Sutton 2010; Sutton and Gardner 2010; Warren 1968). However, distinct chronological phases within the pattern have also been

suggested, based on changes in the flaked lithic and ground stone technologies, the shellfish species targeted, and burial practices (Harding 1951; Moriarty 1966; Rogers 1945; Shumway et al. 1961; Sutton and Gardner 2010; Warren 1964; Warren et al. 2008).

Late Prehistoric Period (ca. A.D. 800-1769)

A Late Prehistoric period in San Diego County has been distinguished, primarily on the basis of three major innovations: the use of small projectile points (Desert Side-notched, Cottonwood triangular, and Dos Cabezas forms), associated with the adoption of the bow and arrow in place of the atlatl as a primary hunting tool and weapon; brownware pottery, presumably supplementing the continued use of basketry and other containers; and the practice of human cremation in place of inhumation. Uncertainty remains concerning the exact timing of these innovations, and whether they appeared simultaneously or sequentially (e.g., Griset 1996; Yohe 1992).

Labels applied to the archaeological manifestations of this period include San Luis Rey, Palomar, and Peninsular in northern San Diego County and Yuman, Cuyamaca, Patayan, and Hakataya in southern San Diego County (Meighan 1954; Sutton 2011, 2015; True 1970; True et al. 1974, 1991; Waugh 1986; Rogers 1945; True 1970; Schroeder 1978; Waters 1982).

Within northern San Diego County these remains have generally been associated with the ethnohistorically known Luiseño, Cupeño, and Cahuilla and have been seen as perhaps marking the initial local appearance of those groups in a migration from the north. Traits characterizing the Late Prehistoric period include greater reliance on acorns as an abundant but labor-expensive food resource, a greater emphasis on hunting of both large and small game (particularly deer and rabbits), a greater amount of interregional exchange (seen notably in more use of obsidian), more elaboration of nonutilitarian culture (manifested in more frequent use of shell beads, decorated pottery, and rock art), and possibly denser regional populations. Settlement may have become more sedentary during this period, as compared with the preceding period.

Within southern San Diego County these remains have generally been associated with the ethnohistorically known Kumeyaay (Diegueño, Tipai, Ipai) and have been seen as perhaps marking the initial local appearance of that group in a migration from the lower Colorado River region. Traits characterizing the Late Prehistoric period include a shift toward greater use of inland rather than coastal settlement locations, greater reliance on acorns as an abundant but labor-expensive food resource, a greater emphasis on hunting of both large and small game (particularly deer and rabbits), a greater amount of interregional exchange (seen notably in more use of obsidian), more elaboration of nonutilitarian culture (manifested in more frequent use of shell beads, decorated pottery and the distinctive Rancho Bernardo and La Rumorosa rock art styles), and possibly denser regional populations (Christenson 1990; McDonald and Eighmey 2008). Whether settlement became more or less sedentary during this period, as compared with the preceding period, is uncertain.

3.2.2 Ethnography

In ethnohistoric times, northern San Diego County was occupied by speakers of the closely related Luiseño, Cupeño, and Cahuilla languages. Meanwhile, central and southern San Diego

County was occupied by speakers of a Yuman language or languages, variously referred to as Kumeyaay, Diegueño, Tipai, and Ipai.

Northern San Diego County

Luiseno territory extended from Agua Hedionda Lagoon, Escondido, and Lake Henshaw northward into southern Orange and Riverside counties. The Cupeño occupied a relatively small territory in the vicinity of Warner's Ranch. The extensive Cahuilla lands extended east from Luiseno territory into the Colorado Desert and north as far as San Geronimo Pass. To the south lay the territory of the unrelated Kumeyaay (Diegueño, Ipai) (Heizer 1978; Kroeber 1925).

Linguistic evidence links Luiseno, Cupeño, and Cahuilla with the Uto-Aztecan family of languages (e.g., Golla 2007; Laylander 2010). A hierarchy of relationships within that family likely mirrors a sequence of separations reflecting territorial expansions or migrations, leading the linguistic ancestors of the Luiseno, Cupeño, and Cahuilla from a still-debated Uto-Aztecan homeland to a northern Uto-Aztecan base somewhere in western North America and ultimately south to their ethnohistoric homes. Splits within the ancestral family included the differentiation of Takic (also termed Southern California Shoshonean) (ca. 1000 B.C.?), the separation of Luiseno from Cahuilla-Cupeño (ca. A.D. 1?), and the separation of Cahuilla and Cupeño (ca. A.D. 1000?).

While Luiseno, Cupeño, and Cahuilla cultural patterns, as recorded subsequent to European contact, cannot necessarily be equated with Late Prehistoric patterns, at a minimum they provide indispensable clues to cultural elements that would be difficult or impossible to extract unaided from the archaeological record alone. A few important ethnohistoric accounts are available from Franciscan missionaries and others (Geiger and Meighan 1976; Harrington 1933, 1934; Henshaw 1972; Laylander 2000). Many accounts by ethnographers, primarily recorded during the early and middle twentieth century, are available (Bean 1972, 1978; Bean and Shipek 1978; Bean and Smith 1978; Drucker 1937; Gifford 1918; Hicks 1963; Hooper 1920; Kroeber 1908, 1925; Laylander 2004; Sparkman 1908; Strong 1929; White 1953, 1957, 1963).

The Luiseno, Cupeño, and Cahuilla inhabited a diverse environment that included littoral, valley, foothill, mountain, and desert resource zones. Because of the early incorporation of coastal Luiseno into the mission system, most of the available twentieth-century ethnographic information relates to inland groups that lived in the Peninsular Range and the Colorado Desert. Acorns were a key resource for inland groups, but a wide range of other mineral, plant, and animal resources were exploited (Bean and Saubel 1972; Sparkman 1908). Some degree of residential mobility seems to have been practiced; one classic fission/fusion pattern involved annual seasonal shifts between consolidated winter and spring settlements in the upper San Luis Rey River valley and smaller, dispersed groups living on Palomar Mountain in the summer and fall (Oxendine 1983). The fundamental Luiseno social units above the family were patrilineal, patrilocal clans, the latter ideally coinciding with the winter-spring village communities. The Cahuilla and Cupeño also had patrilineal Coyote and Wildcat moieties, serving primarily to impose exogamous marriage and to conduct ceremonies. Hereditary leaders performed ceremonial, advisory, and diplomatic functions, rather than judicial, redistributive, or military ones. There seems to have been no national level of political unity among the Luiseno or Cahuilla, and perhaps little sense of commonality within the language group.

Luiseno, Cahuilla, and Cupeño material culture was effective, but it was not highly elaborated. Structures included houses with excavated floors, ramadas, sweathouses, ceremonial enclosures,

and acorn granaries. Hunting equipment included bows and arrows, curved throwing sticks, nets, and snares. Processing and storage equipment included a variety of flaked stone tools, milling implements, ceramic vessels, and baskets.

Nonutilitarian culture was not neglected. A range of community ceremonies were performed, with particular emphases placed on making individuals' coming of age and on death and mourning. Oral literature included, in particular, an elaborate creation myth that was shared with the Takic-speaking Serrano as well as with Yuman speakers (Kroeber 1925; Laylander 2001; Waterman 1909).

Central and Southern San Diego County

Kumeyaay territory extended from south of Agua Hedionda Lagoon, Escondido, and Lake Henshaw to some distance south of Ensenada in northern Baja California, and east nearly as far as the lower Colorado River. Linguistic evidence (e.g., Golla 2007; Laylander 2010) suggests that the Yuman-Cochimí families of languages may have been affiliated with a widespread Hokan phylum, represented by scattered languages and families around the periphery of California and extending south into Mexico, and probably dating back at least as far as the early Holocene. Subsequent separations within the Yuman-Cochimí group may represent territorial expansions or migrations: the separation of Yuman and central Baja California's Cochimí (ca. 2000 B.C.?); the differentiation of Core Yuman from Kiliwa (ca. 1000 B.C.?); of Core Yuman into Delta-California, River, and Pai branches (ca. A.D. 1?); of Delta-California Yuman into Diegueño and Cocopa (ca. A.D. 500?); and of Diegueño into Kumeyaay proper, Ipai, Tipai, and Ku'ahl languages or dialects (ca. post-A.D. 1000?). The boundary between Ipai and Kumeyaay proper (or Tipai) languages or dialects on the San Diego coast has generally been put just south of the San Diego River (Luomala 1978).

While Kumeyaay cultural patterns, as recorded subsequent to European contact, cannot necessarily be equated with Late Prehistoric patterns, at a minimum they provide indispensable clues to cultural elements that would be difficult or impossible to extract unaided from the archaeological record alone. A few important ethnohistoric accounts are available from Hispanic-period explorers and travelers, Spanish administrators, and Franciscan missionaries, primarily in coastal areas (Fages 1937; Geiger and Meighan 1976; Laylander 2000). Many accounts by ethnographers, primarily recorded during the early twentieth century, are available (Almstedt 1982; Drucker 1937, 1941; Gifford 1918, 1931; Hicks 1963; Hohenthal 2001; Kroeber 1925; Laylander 2004; Luomala 1978; Shipek 1982, 1991; Spier 1923; Waterman 1910).

The Kumeyaay inhabited a diverse environment that included littoral, valley, foothill, mountain, and desert resource zones. Because of the early incorporation of coastal Kumeyaay into the mission system, most of the available ethnographic information relates to inland groups that lived in the Peninsular Range or the Colorado Desert. There may have been considerable variability among the Kumeyaay in settlement and subsistence strategies and in social organization (Laylander 1991, 1997; Luomala 1978; Spier 1923; but cf. Shipek 1982). Acorns were a key resource, but a wide range of other mineral, plant, and animal resources were exploited (Hedges 1986; Shipek 1991; Wilken 2012). Pre-contact practices of land management and agriculture west of the Colorado Desert have been suggested but not confirmed (Shipek 1993; cf. Laylander 1995). Some degree of residential mobility seems to have been practiced, although its extent and nature (e.g., within patterns of community fission and fusion) may have varied

considerably among different communities and settings. The fundamental Kumeyaay social unit above the family was the *šimul* (patrilineage) and the residential community or band, to the extent that those two units were not identical. Leaders performed ceremonial, advisory, and diplomatic functions, rather than judicial, redistributive, or military ones. There seems to have been no national level of political unity and perhaps little sense of commonality within the language group (but cf. Shipek 1982).

Kumeyaay material culture was effective, but it was not highly elaborated. Structures included houses with excavated floors, ramadas, sweathouses, ceremonial enclosures, and acorn granaries. Hunting equipment included bows and arrows, curved throwing sticks, nets, and snares. Processing and storage equipment included a variety of flaked stone tools, milling implements, ceramic vessels, and baskets.

Nonutilitarian culture was not neglected. A range of community ceremonies were performed, with particular emphases placed on making individuals' coming of age and on death and mourning. Oral literature included, in particular, an elaborate creation myth that was shared with other Yuman groups as well as with Takic speakers (Luiseño, Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Serrano) to the north (Kroeber 1925; Laylander 2001; Waterman 1909).

3.2.3 Historic Context

Spanish and Mexican Periods

European exploration of the San Diego area began in 1542 with the arrival of a maritime expedition under Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, followed by a similar reconnaissance in 1602 by Sebastián Vizcaíno (Pourade 1960). It is possible that additional brief, unrecorded contacts with the crews of the Manila galleons may have occurred during the following century and a half, and that other influences, such as an awareness of alien technologies or the introduction of diseases, may have reached the region overland from earlier outposts of the Spanish empire in Baja California or Sonora.

The historic period proper did not begin until 1769, when multiple seaborne and overland expeditions under the leadership of the soldier Gaspar de Portolá and the Franciscan missionary Junípero Serra reached the region from Baja California and passed northward along the coastal plain to seek Monterey. In that year, a royal presidio and the Misión San Diego de Alcalá were founded, and the incorporation of local Kumeyaay into the mission system was begun. Shortly after the mission had been moved a short distance to the east from the presidio, a Kumeyaay uprising in 1775 resulted in the burning of the mission and the killing of one of its Franciscan missionaries (Carrico 1997). However, the uprising was soon suppressed. Additional missions were founded among the Luiseño/Juaneño at San Juan Capistrano in 1776 and San Luis Rey de Francia in 1798.

As Spanish attention was consumed by the Napoleonic wars in Europe, California and its government and missions were increasingly left to their own devices. In 1821, Mexico consummated its independence from Spain, and the region became more open to outside visitors and influences (Pourade 1961). The loyalty to Mexico of the European Franciscans was considered to be in doubt, and private secular interests clamored for a greater share of the region's resources. The missions were secularized by act of the Mexican Congress in 1833. Native Americans released from the San Diego mission returned to their native villages, moved

east to areas lying beyond Mexican control, or sought work on ranchos or in the towns of San Diego and Los Angeles. The ranchería of the San Pasqual Band of Indians was located four miles to the east-southeast of the subject property, in the valley of the Santa Ysabel Creek in the 1830s and 1840s; this tribe is one of 13 that comprise the Kumeyaay Nation in Southern California and that lived for centuries in this valley (San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians 2017a). At the time of the secularization of the missions, San Pasqual was one of three pueblos established by territorial governor Jose Figueroa to resettle the displaced Indians who had lived at the Missions San Diego and San Luis Rey. Indians with construction skills were brought from the Mission San Diego, and the agricultural village was self-governed under Mexican law. The San Pasqual ranchería prospered and had a population of more than 100 by 1845, residing in tule huts around a plaza (Fox 2017; McGrew 1998:11; San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians 2017b).

Also in this period, numerous large land grants were issued to private owners, including El Rincon de Diablo, Agua Hedionda, Los Vallecitos de San Marcos, Buena Vista, and Santa Margarita y Las Flores in northern coastal San Diego County (Pourade 1963). The Study area was part of the 12,653-acre El Rincon del Diablo land grant made in 1843 by the Mexican government to San Diego native Juan Bautista Alvarado. As a leading member of the legislature of the Mexican Alta California territory, in 1836 Alvarado led a revolt against a harsh governor and subsequently himself served as governor of the reorganized Department of California until 1842 (Faragher 2016:97-104; Find A Grave 2021).

The San Pasqual Valley floor to the south of the ranchería was the site of the Mexican-American War's bloodiest battle in California on December 6, 1846. Upon confirmation in July 1846 of battles in Texas and the entry of the United States (U.S.) into war with Mexico, U.S. naval forces invaded Monterey, San Pedro, and San Diego. But when the U.S. military units relocated to Monterey in September, an insurrection took place and drove out the U.S. soldiers holding Los Angeles. Brigadier General Stephen Watts Kearny and two companies of Army dragoons had marched from Santa Fe, New Mexico, for the conquest of California. Upon their arrival at Warner's Ranch, Kearny received information that a Californio force may be preparing to engage them on the road to the Navy's base in San Diego. A patrol led by Andres Pico, the Californio commander of Los Angeles' military district, was camped with a unit of lanceros in the San Pasqual ranchería, approximately 20 miles to the west, and they also received word of Kearny's approach (Faragher 2016:133-140). Kearny's unit initiated a pre-dawn attack from the south side of the San Pasqual Valley. The San Pasqual Indians evacuated to the north side of the valley and watched the running battle between Kearny's and Pico's troops throughout the day (Buskirk 2017; San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians 2017b). The members of Pico's force were expert horsemen; many worked as ranchers and were proficient with lances and reatas, with which they inflicted numerous casualties on Kearny's weary and poorly mounted troops. At the end of the day the combatants were approximately one mile to the west, and the San Pasqual tribe's leaders interceded with the Mexican troops for their withdrawal and allowing the Americans to treat their wounded and reclaim their dead soldiers. (San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians 2017b). The San Pasqual headman José Panto also accompanied two U.S. dragoons and assisted them in slipping through the Mexican patrols and getting a request for assistance to San Diego (Faragher 2016:151). The remnant of Kearny's men skirmished with Pico's unit as they continued toward San Diego, passing Rancho San Bernardo late on December 7 and taking some cattle and chickens from the rancho (Ames 1943:47).

American Period

The conquest and annexation of California by the U.S. in the Mexican-American War between 1846 and 1848 ushered in many more changes (Pourade 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1977; Pryde 2004). Faced with debts and difficulties in confirming land grants, many Californio families lost their lands to outsiders. Cultural patterns that were brought by immigrants from the eastern U.S. gradually supplanted old Californio customs. Native American reservations were established at Mesa Grande, Santa Ysabel, Inaja, Cosmit, Barona, Capitan Grande, Viejas, Cuyapaipe, Sycuan, Manzanita, La Posta, and Campo (Shipek 1978).

The region experienced cycles of economic and demographic booms and busts, with notable periods of growth in the mid-1880s, during World Wars I and II, and on a more sustained basis throughout the postwar decades. Aspects of development included the creation of transportation networks based on port facilities, railroads, highways, and airports; more elaborate systems of water supply and flood control; grazing livestock and growing a changing array of crops; supporting military facilities; limited amounts of manufacturing; and accommodating visitors and retirees. After false starts, San Diego converted itself to a substantial city, and then into a metropolis. Escondido was incorporated as a city in 1888, and unincorporated north county communities include Fallbrook, Bonsall, Valley Center, Pala, and Pauma Valley (Pryde 2004). Other cities were incorporated in the inland southern and central region of San Diego County, including El Cajon (1912), La Mesa (1912), Lemon Grove (1977), Santee (1980), and Poway (1980). Notable unincorporated communities include Spring Valley, Lakeside, Alpine, and Ramona (Pryde 2004).

Escondido: Settlement and Growth

The confirmation of rancho boundaries in the late 1860s and early 1870s across the county drew additional settlers as land became officially conveyable. Thereafter, small farming communities were established. After Juan Bautista Alvarado's death in 1850, the El Rinco Del Diablo rancho was purchased from Alvarado's heirs by Oliver S. Witherby, who arrived in California with the U.S. Boundary Commission following the Mexican-American War (McGrew 1998:12). In 1868 Witherby sold the rancho to a partnership comprised of Edward McGear, Matthew Wolfskill and his sons John and Josiah Wolfskill; Matthew was the brother of William Wolfskill, a trapper who arrived in Los Angeles in 1831 and is reputed to have planted the first orange grove there (McGrew 1998:13). The partnership changed the rancho's operation to a sheep ranch, and planted a large vineyard of Muscat grapes. When its first post office opened in 1881, the community was known as Apex (meaning the central point) (McGrew 1998:18). The Wolfskill and McGear partnership sold the property in 1883 to the Escondido Company, the forerunner of the Escondido Land & Town Company (EL&TCO).

When established in 1886, the EL&TCO subdivided the land, planted additional vineyards and citrus groves, and drilled wells for irrigation (McGrew 1998:14-16). By that time, horticulture had already begun around the county, with many of the earliest plantings in fruit trees and grapes. The California Southern rail line between San Diego and San Bernardino was built in the early 1880s, and its connection to the transcontinental Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe line was completed in 1885. The opening of the rail line fueled a boom in the San Diego region between 1885 and 1890. During this period, the EL&TCO invested in the San Diego Central Railroad line that was built between Escondido and Escondido junction near Oceanside; its 1887 Escondido

station was relocated to Grape Day Park in 1985 and rehabilitated as a museum (Price 1988). By 1890, the city population had grown to 541, and by 1891 there were at least 12 oil-fueled lights in the downtown section of Grand Avenue (Escondido History Center n.d.; U.S. Census Bureau, 1900:439).

Ranching and farming had been important livelihoods in San Diego County, and agriculture increasingly became an important economy. Water projects developed across the county in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that made this possible. In Escondido, completion of the Escondido Reservoir (now Lake Wohlford) by the Escondido Mutual Water Company supplied water to the valley and opened up more opportunities for citrus (oranges and lemons) plantings (Fox 2016; Heilbron 1936). Escondido developed during that boom time as a new citrus-growing community that also developed grapes, hay, and grain, and is credited with planting the first avocado tree in the county (Heilbron 1936:207).

Initially, individual growers processed their own fruit by washing and drying them before taking them to the Escondido depot to ship to consumers in the east. In the early 1900s, growing cooperatives developed in Escondido that were known as the Escondido Citrus Union and the Escondido Fruit Growers Association. By 1916, the number of acres planted with citrus had risen to 600. Just 12 years later, nearly 2,800 acres were devoted to growing citrus. The industry had grown so large that the two cooperatives dissolved and new organizations were formed: the Escondido Lemon Association and the Escondido Orange Association. They were local divisions of the San Diego County Exchange and the California Exchange. Lemon production grew from 64,470 boxes in 1911 to more than one million boxes in 1941. Orange production had grown from 12,225 boxes in 1918 to 1.4 million boxes in 1943. At the 1929 dedication of a new Sunkist packing house of the Escondido Lemon Association, it was noted to be “the largest and certainly most modern of all lemon houses.” A new orange packing house was completed in 1935. The town’s emphasis on citrus and produce ranching, as well as produce processing and shipping, made it a service and commercial center for the surrounding region (Alter 2011). In the 1920s and 1930s, the citrus industry was the local economic engine, and many people were employed by it or benefitted from it as merchants, and neighborhoods grew up around the groves and packing plants, housing workers associated with the industry (Alter 2011; Fox 2016; San Diego Directory Company 1938). The strength of the citrus industry resulted in tremendous growth in Escondido and its financial stability during the Great Depression, with Escondido becoming the citrus center of California (Kolva 1989).

Escondido transitioned from a rural town of 755 people in 1900 to a growing agriculture-based city of 3,421 in 1930, a significant increase of 353 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 1900:439, 1930: 137). Some of the new arrivals came as groups, including a community of Mennonite Brethren—some of Russian descent—who moved to Escondido from the Midwest in 1907; some members of this group moved away when their minister returned to Kansas in 1917 (Fox 2017).

The avocado industry developed after the citrus industry, with the first cooperative established as the California Avocado Association (later Society) in 1915 (Shepherd and Bender 2001). In San Diego County, the oldest seedling was planted in 1892, just two miles north of Escondido. However, the earliest orchards were planted in Vista in 1915 and 1916 (Popenoe 1927). In 1920, “Haas” avocados were developed as an alternative to the “Fuerte” avocado that had short seasons and erratic production. The California Avocado Exchange (later Calavo Growers of California) was established in 1924 in an effort to standardize the industry and market the

products. In 1926, the first carload of avocados was shipped to Chicago (Shepherd and Bender 2001). In San Diego County, Vista had planted some of the earliest and largest plantings in the county, but the Escondido plantings were still young in 1927 (Popenoe 1927). The industry struggled during the 1930s due to root rot, fungus, long-standing low temperatures, and overproduction for a smaller market. Demand for avocados increased in the 1940s and thereafter due to larger marketing efforts. Growing avocados increasingly became a lucrative business (Shepherd and Bender 2001).

In 1935, the primary county exports were citrus, poultry, and dairy, with Escondido supplying almost half of the county's exports. By 1936, Escondido led the county in citrus production and was the foremost producer of avocados and citrus for the state. An assured water supply for irrigation and domestic use was pivotal to the area's success (Heilbron 1936). Through the 1950s citrus continued to be the prime crop in Escondido while avocados held strong. San Diego County contained more than half of the avocado acreage in California, having grown from approximately 7,900 acres in 1936 to 15,000 in 1958. Avocados were second to tomatoes in plant crops and fourth, following eggs, tomatoes, and milk (Gustafson 1959).

However, the post-World War II housing shortage made housing development more profitable than ranching, and other industries offered new employment opportunities in Escondido and around San Diego County (AEGIS 1991:13). The 1950 construction of Highway 395 linked Escondido to San Diego, reducing commuting time (Fark n.d.). By 1960, more than one million people lived in the county, and between 1950 and 1970, bedroom communities such as El Cajon, Escondido, Chula Vista, and Oceanside experienced a tremendous growth rate (between 214 and 833 percent) (Engstrand 2005:166; U.S. Census Bureau 1960). By then, market conditions prompted the dissolution of the two citrus organizations (Fox 2016). Yet, avocado production remains an important crop for San Diego County.

3.2.4 Residential Architecture in Escondido: 1884-1940¹

Architecture

Southern California experienced the biggest land boom in its history during the late 1880s. Even though Escondido had been founded before this time, the rate war between the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific railroads, which caused the boom, had a profound influence on the future of Escondido. Many houses were built during this period. The Santa Fe Depot (now relocated in Grape Day Heritage Park) was also built to accommodate the growth of the railroad. The Escondido area, unlike many areas, prospered and grew during this period. The collapse of the boom in 1888 left Escondido well established and incorporated as a town.

During the boom and for several years later, houses sprang up quickly. Many were Victorian cottages which had Queen Anne and Colonial Revival phases. These smaller Victorians were often decorated almost as elaborately as their larger sisters, but some were plain hip-roof boxes. There are many of these cottages left in Old Escondido. Some of the oldest examples of Escondido architecture are: 208 E. Fifth Avenue (1887); 637 South Juniper (1888); and 1887 South Broadway (1887).

¹ Excerpted from Escondido Context Statement

<https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/pdfs/Planning/EscondidoContextStatement.pdf>

Street Names

The 1886 townsite streets, east to west, were names of trees in alphabetical listing. Originally, Escondido's Avenues, north to south, were named after states except one. The main commercial street was called Grand Avenue. As Escondido grew, some streets were added, and in 1930, to ease mail delivery, the avenues named after states were numbered second, third, fourth, etc. The downtown main street is still Grand Avenue and reminders of the state avenues are still evident in imprints on some of the curbs.

Architectural Styles

Escondido has a variety of architectural styles. The period 1887-1913 provided Escondido with more variety in its residential architecture than at any period in the city's history. There are several existing structures which exhibit the architecture of this period: Victorian, Classical Revival, Colonial Revival, Mission (Moorish) Revival, and Craftsman. The Victorian idiom is well established in Escondido. Books and tours feature the Victorian "stars." The Victorians vary from the board and batten Cottage to the elaborate Queen Anne, and in Escondido include Italian and Second Empire. Examples include: the Queen Anne Bandy Conley House, 638 South Juniper (1891); the Second Empire House, 103 W. Eighth Avenue (1893); and the shingled Culp House (1890), 209 West Eighth Avenue.

Other styles, such as the American Foursquare or Classic Box, Craftsman, and Prairie are well represented in Escondido. The Craftsman-style house expressed progressive ideas during the first part of the twentieth century. It was a large step away from the rigid proportion of classicism and the ostentatious Victorian theme and was designed to have a close relationship with the outdoors. Most Craftsman houses are Bungalows, although not all Bungalows are Craftsman. Craftsman architecture was part of the Arts and Crafts Movement which took place in this country and England from 1876 until about 1916. The movement was a response to a call for the return to simple, natural, and honest lifestyles and products. It addressed social, industrial, and political issues and included the fine arts, literature, bookbinding, printing, furniture and textile design, as well as architecture.

Gustav Stickley, often called the father of the American Arts and Crafts Movement, published *Craftsman Homes* in 1909. It contains patterns for different styles of Craftsman structures as well as patterns for building Mission furniture and ideas for interior design. The common Craftsman thread in the book is simplicity. The movement rejected the ornamentation of the Victorian era for a simple "democratic" house for the common man. Examples include: The Stoff-Flintom House at 239 East Fourth Avenue (1918), the Wohlford Ting House, 209 East Fourth Avenue (1910), and the Charlotta Hotel, 637 South Upas Street (1915).

The 1920s were a time of economic growth for the county and for Escondido. The city almost doubled in population, which contributed to the growth of the commercial area, since many downtown businesses were built during this period. Revival styles became very popular during this time. Colonial Revival, Mediterranean (Spanish and Italian) Revival, and the Tudor Revival are some of the examples. The 1920s were also boom times in Southern California, only this time oil (and perhaps citrus in Escondido) took the place of land and railroads. Theatres, shopping centers, and residences were designed to conjure up romantic times and faraway places. The longing for a foreign atmosphere was so great that entire tracts were sometimes developed in a

revival style. Red-tiled roofs of low pitch, arches, plastered exterior and interior walls, carved or cast ornamentation, arcades, balconies with railings of wrought iron or wood, window grilles, pergolas, and bracket capitals are some of the characteristics that might be parts of houses built during this era. Spanish Colonial Revival, Monterey Revival, and Pueblo Revival are some of the styles found in Escondido. Examples include: Plymouth Hall located at 290 South Maple Street (1925), 633 East Fourth (1922), 619 East Fifth (1910), and 649 East Fifth (1924). Escondido also has examples of the California Bungalow. They are smaller and simpler than their Craftsman forebearers. Having low pitched roofs, usually one story with one or two gables, the California Bungalow took on its own style with unique vents at the tip of the gable, and a variety of porch and window styles. Examples are: 148 East Fifth Avenue (1920) and 230 East Sixth Avenue (1920).

California Ranch-style homes were popular just before and after World War II. Most of these were built after the city adopted zoning regulations and are sited farther back on the lot than the Bungalow or Cottage. This gives the impression of more land as befits this all-American style. But there are remnants from earlier styles in these post-World War II structures. The roof overhang is usually supported on two-by-fours to create a recessed front porch similar to early California houses. Window shutters often suggest Colonial architecture, while diagonal brackets on the porch posts may suggest Victorian, and stickwork may suggest Craftsman.

4.0 Background Research

4.1 CHRIS Records Search

On February 24, 2021, ASM GIS Manager Nick Doose conducted a CHRIS records search at the SCIC for EVSP. Summarized records search results provided below are sourced from the SCIC and correspondence is provided in Appendix B.

ASM conducted additional archival research, including the review of historic maps and queries to the OHP Historic Property Directory (HPD) and NRHP for archaeological resources. There are no archaeological sites or historic buildings within the EVSP which are listed in the NRHP, CRHR, or the OHP HPD.

4.1.1 Previous Cultural Resource Studies

The SCIC report shows a total of 18 previously completed projects within the EVSP Project Area. Appendix A, Table 5 summarizes previous cultural resources studies that have been conducted within the EVSP.

4.1.2 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

One previously recorded archaeological resource has been identified within the EVSP Project Area. This resource is a buried historic mid-twentieth century refuse deposit and was identified in a disturbed context in-fill. This resource is not considered a historical resource under CEQA.

ASM reviewed the SCIC records search, the Built Environment Resource Directory, and the list of historical resources maintained by the City of Escondido. A total of 448 built environment resources are located within the EVSP area; of these, 28 are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR (some of which have been previously recommended for reevaluation) and two are listed on the local register (Table 1). Additionally, two potential Historic Districts have been proposed by the City of Escondido that overlap with the EVSP area. The east end of the Commercial Core Historic District is located on the west end of the EVSP area on the streets west of Fig Street. The northwest corner of the proposed Los Arboles Historic District extension also overlaps with the EVSP area. Both Districts have been previously recommended eligible for listing under the City's criteria and the Historic Preservation Commission Policy, Procedure for establishing Historic Districts, Article 40, Section 33-797 (C)(c). See Table 3, Appendix A for the entire list of built environment resources within the EVSP.

Table 1. Built Environment Resources within the EVSP.

| <i>Address</i> | <i>Zip</i> | <i>Year Built</i> | <i>Eligibility Status</i> |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| 512 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-3356 | 1890 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 520 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-3356 | 1900 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 526 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-3356 | 1915 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 536 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-3356 | 1925 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |

4.0 Background Research

| <i>Address</i> | <i>Zip</i> | <i>Year Built</i> | <i>Eligibility Status</i> |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|--|
| 620 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-4413 | 1895 | Appears eligible for NRHP as a contributor to a NRHP-eligible district |
| 624 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-4413 | 1900 | Locally listed |
| 627 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-4412 | 1935 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 637 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-4412 | 1935 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 643 E 2 nd Ave | 92025-4412 | 1940 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 115 S Elm St | 92025-4534 | 1915 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 613 E Grand Ave | 92025-4402 | 1910 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 718 E Grand Ave | 92025-4405 | 1930 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 726 E Grand Ave | 92025-4446 | 1930 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 810 E Grand Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 818 E Grand Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 842 E Grand Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 942 E Grand Ave | 92025-3404 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 958 E Grand Ave | 92025-3404 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 1002 E Grand Ave | 92025-4605 | 1938 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 1127 E Grand Ave | 92025-3219 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 125 S Grape St | 92025-4406 | 1930 | Locally listed |
| 145 S Grape St | 92025-4406 | 1928 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 829 E Ohio Ave | 92025-3420 | 1890 | Appears eligible for NR as a contributor to a NR eligible district |
| 848 E Ohio Ave | 92025-3421 | 1933 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 1143 E Ohio Ave | 92025-3206 | 1930 | Recommended Eligible for listing |
| 719 E Pennsylvania Ave | 92025-3004 | 1920 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 1035 E Pennsylvania Ave | 92025-4616 | 1925 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 1101 E Pennsylvania Ave | 92025-3208 | 1915 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 1110 E Pennsylvania Ave | 92025-3209 | 1915 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |
| 1004 E Valley Pkwy | 92025-4619 | 1935 | Appears Eligible for CRHR/NRHP but needs to be re-evaluated |

4.1.3 Potential Historic Districts

Commercial Core Historic District.

The Commercial Core of Escondido is exemplified by Grand Avenue and its tributary streets, which have been at the center of City business, government, and social life since 1886 and comprise

“Downtown Escondido.” Even through economically weak periods, Grand Avenue and the surrounding streets have remained at the center of the City, representing one of the few cities in the county with a traditional downtown. Though the area has been impacted by the introduction of shopping malls in the 1950s and the 1980s, built environment representatives from each historic-era development surge remain. The proposed boundaries for the district are primarily within the Downtown SPA and include Centre City Parkway on the west; the alley between Grand Avenue and 2nd Avenue and the alley between Grand Avenue and Valley Parkway to Maple Street; from Maple Street along the north side of 2nd Avenue to North Fig Street; north along North Fig Street to westerly along the Flood Control Channel; south on North Grape Street to East Valley Parkway. From East Valley Parkway, the boundary extends to the west on the south side of East Valley Parkway, and continues to the east on the south side of East Valley Parkway to Maple Street.

Los Arboles Historic District

The proposed Los Arboles Historic District encompasses a significant concentration of buildings representing various period-styles of workers’ housing from board-and-batten to 1950s contemporary. Primarily composed of one-story homes, the area represents the City of Escondido’s residential history. The district derives its name from the City designation of the Los Arboles Neighborhood. The majority of the proposed district is defined by the City as bordered by Ash Street to the east; 5th Avenue to the north; Date Street to the west; and the alley along the north side of 2nd Avenue. A Los Arboles Extension is additionally proposed to include the properties within Date Street, the alley between 4th and 5th Avenues, west to Hickory Street, and to the alley along the north side of 2nd Avenue.

4.2 Native American Outreach

An SLF records search request was submitted by ASM to the NAHC on February 23, 2021. The NAHC responded on March 9, 2021, with a positive result for the SLF search of the Project Area. Additionally, the NAHC provided a list of Native American tribal contacts who have knowledge of the Project Area. The City of Escondido has sent information requests and AB 52 consultation letters to the tribal contacts provided by the NAHC; ASM also sent information request letters to the tribal contracts. Appendix C includes requests to the NAHC, their response and results, a list of contacts for information about the Project Area, and associated letters from ASM. The City is consulting with the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians to develop mitigation measures regarding TCRs.

4.3 Cultural Resource Sensitivity within the East Valley Specific Plan Area

For the purposes of this report, “sensitivity” is defined as the likelihood for the discovery of buried archaeological deposits or eligible built environment resources in an area.

One archaeological resource has been previously recorded within the EVSP. This resource was a historic refuse deposit identified in secondary deposition. Therefore, there are no archaeological historic resources within the EVSP. Due to the location of the EVSP within a highly urbanized area, the likelihood of buried prehistoric or historic archaeological resources is low.

As indicated on the map (Figure 3), the EVSP area contains a variety of levels of historic sensitivity. The red parcels indicate resources which have been recommended eligible or listed on the local register. These include residential resources such as the Craftsman Bungalow at 1110 Pennsylvania

Avenue (1915) and the Greek Revival-style house converted to apartments at 829 East Ohio Avenue (1890). There are also some commercial resources such as the former Christo's Café at 1004 East Valley Parkway (1935) which have been altered since they were designated and may no longer be eligible but require further evaluation. Projects with the potential to impact historical resources should be avoided in these areas. When projects cannot be avoided or redesigned, a Historic Resources Assessment Report (HRAR) completed by an SOI-qualified architectural historian should be completed to confirm current eligibility and consider mitigation measures.

The orange areas on the ESVP map indicate potential historic districts that have been identified. The east end of the Commercial Core Historic District is located on the west end of the map on the streets west of Fig Street. It also overlaps with the northwest corner of the proposed Los Arboles Historic District extension. This area contains small workers' homes primarily from the 1950s. Although these areas have not been designated, projects in these areas should be avoided when possible. When the project cannot be avoided or redesigned, an HRAR that includes an evaluation of the resource both individually and as a contributor to the proposed historic district should be completed. If the resource is determined to be a noncontributor and/or not individually eligible, the report should also assess the potential for adverse impacts to the proposed district. If adverse impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce the impact to less than significant should be identified. If the impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared.

There are concentrations of yellow in some portions of the map, particularly on Ohio and Pennsylvania Avenues, indicating neighborhoods that are more than 45 years old. Projects in these areas would require an HRAR evaluating the building and any potential historic district to which it may contribute. If no historical resources are identified, then no further action shall be required beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms. If a historical resource is identified, the HRAR should assess the potential impacts from the proposed project following the Secretary of Interior Standards and CEQA guidelines. If adverse impacts are identified, mitigation measures to reduce the impact to less than significant should be identified. If the impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant, than an EIR must be prepared.

Green areas of the map are located primarily east of Ash Street and along portions of East Valley Parkway. No historic resources were identified in these areas.




Figure 3. Sensitivity map for built environment cultural resources within EVSP.

5.0 Programmatic Recommendations

5.1 Standards of Significance

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (§15064.5), an implementation of a project would be considered to have a significant impact on historical, cultural, or TCRs if it may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. CEQA (§15064.5b,1) defines a substantial adverse change as:

... change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

5.1.1 Historical Resources

CEQA (§15064.5b,2) further provides context that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

- A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in or eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR; or
- B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

5.1.2 Archaeological Resources

Section 15064.5(c) of CEQA applies to effects on archaeological sites and contains the following provisions regarding archaeological sites:

1. When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 (a).
2. If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the PRC, and this section, Section 15126.4 of the Guidelines, and the limits contained in Section 21083.2 of the PRC do not apply.
3. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria defined in Section 15064.5 (a), but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21083.2 of the PRC, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of section 21083.2. The time and cost limitations described in PRC Section 21083.2 (c-f) do

- not apply to surveys and site evaluation activities intended to determine whether the project location contains unique archaeological resources.
4. If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the Initial Study or EIR, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

5.1.3 Tribal Cultural Resources

Appendix G, XVIII of CEQA provides a framework on the determination of effect on TCRs.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

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

5.1.4 Human Remains

Section 15064.5 (d) & (e) contain additional provisions regarding human remains. Regarding Native American human remains, paragraph (d) provides:

When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from: the general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5); and the requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

5.2 Resource Identification Framework

5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The City of Escondido's General Plan is intended to be a "self-mitigating" document, in that the policies are designed to mitigate or avoid impacts and preserve historical resources, cultural resources, or TCRs resulting from implementation of the EVSP.

ASM proposes the following policies that provide mitigation for historical resources pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines for each significant impact in this section. Each impact discussion offers a determination as to whether the impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level or would remain significant and unavoidable after the Specific Plan policies are implemented.

5.3.1 Substantial Adverse Change to Historical Resources

Could the implementation of the EVSP cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines?

According to CEQA (§15064.5b), a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

The demolition or substantial alteration of a resource listed in, or formally determined eligible for, the NRHP or the CRHR, including contributors to NRHP or CRHR historic districts, or that meet the CEQA criteria for historical resources, would represent a significant direct impact to historical resources. Additionally, grading, excavation and other ground-disturbing activities associated with development projects that affect significant archaeological sites or traditional cultural properties would represent a significant direct impact to historical resources.

Impact Analysis

Within the EVSP, there are no archaeological sites and two built environment structures that are listed in the local register; there are currently 28 additional built environment resources that have been recommended eligible for CRHR and/or NRHP listing within the EVSP area.

Significance of Impact

Historical resources, both buried archaeological sites and the built environment, are present within the City. While the EVSP does not specifically propose demolition, or substantial alteration of a historical resource, or ground-disturbing activities such as grading or excavation, it can be assumed that future development consistent with the goals and policies of the EVSP have the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to historical resources. Therefore, there is potential for a significant impact to historical resources if development is proposed in Levels 1-3 and the additional potential for a significant impact to archaeological resources if development is proposed in Level 4.

5.3.2 Substantial Adverse Change to Built Environment Resources

Could the implementation of the EVSP cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a built environment resource pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines?

Impact Analysis

There are 449 cultural resources located within the EVSP area. There are no NRHP or CRHR-listed properties within the EVSP area; however, there are 28 resources which have been recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR within the EVSP. If development is proposed in one of the areas highlighted as Levels 1-3 for historical resource sensitivity, there is potential for a significant impact to built environment resources.

Significance of Impact

While the EVSP does not specifically propose demolition, or substantial alteration of a historical resource, it can be assumed that future development consistent with the goals and policies of the EVSP has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to built environment resources. Following the below mitigation measures should result in no significant impacts to historical resources.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1: Historical Evaluation.

In areas identified as having a Level 1 (red) sensitivity on the Sensitivity Map for Built Environment Cultural Resources in the East Valley Specific Plan Area (Figure 3), projects with the potential to impact historical resources should be avoided or designed to ensure that the project would not result in a significant impact. A Historical Resources Assessment Report shall be completed for properties to assess impacts to individual resources and the district. This Historical Resources Assessment Report shall be completed by an architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History, and shall consider mitigation measures that take all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm. Significance evaluations shall not be required if the historical resource has been evaluated for California Environmental Quality Act significance or for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility within the last 5 years and if there has been no change in the conditions that contributed to the determination of significance or eligibility. A historical resource shall be re-evaluated if its condition or setting has either improved or deteriorated, if new information is available, or if the resource is becoming increasingly rare due to the loss of other similar resources. The Historical Resources Assessment Report shall include an evaluation of whether the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. New construction in a historic district shall also be reviewed to ensure that it meets the standards so that it shall not have an adverse impact (including visual impacts or impacts to setting).

Projects in Level 2 (orange) areas where potential historical resources have been identified shall also be avoided or redesigned when possible. Areas in Level 2 (orange) indicate the presence of a

potential historic district, but specific contributors have not been identified. A Historical Resources Assessment Report that includes an evaluation of the resource both individually and as a contributor to the proposed historic district shall be completed. If the resource is determined to be a non-contributor or not individually eligible, the Historical Resources Assessment Report shall also assess the potential for adverse impacts (including visual impacts or impacts to setting) to the proposed district in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

Projects in the Level 3 (yellow) area of sensitivity have the potential to impact a historical resource because the level includes all buildings more than 45 years old. A Historical Resources Assessment Report evaluating the building and any potential historic district to which the historical resource may contribute shall be prepared. If no historical resources are identified, then no further action shall be required beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site forms. If a historical resource is identified, the Historical Resources Assessment Report shall assess the potential impacts from the project following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

5.3.3 Substantial Adverse Change to Archaeological Resources

Could the implementation of the EVSP cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines?

Section 15064.5(c) of CEQA applies to effects on archaeological sites and contains the following additional provisions regarding archaeological sites:

When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency will first determine whether the site is an historical resource, as defined above.

If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it will refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the PRC, and this section, Section 15126.4 of the Guidelines, and the limits contained in Section 21083.2 of the PRC do not apply.

If important archaeological sites occur on property that is proposed for development, construction activities, such as grading and excavation, could result in significant impacts.

Impact Analysis

Impacts on archaeological resources typically occur during construction activities, which could potentially damage or destroy known or unknown archaeological resources. Archaeological resources may be difficult to detect prior to construction activities, as they are generally located below the ground surface. Therefore, the potential to affect important archaeological sites exists if a development activity requires even minimal grading and/or excavation. Previously excavated areas are generally considered to have a low potential for archaeological resources, since the soil containing the archaeological resources has been removed. However, under certain circumstances, further evaluation is necessary when previously excavated and/or graded project sites are located within areas of known archaeological sensitivity (e.g., recorded sites, designated sites, etc.), or are

identified as traditional cultural properties. In addition, building demolition and surface clearance could result in impacts to archaeological resources if present.

Significance of Impact

While the EVSP does not specifically propose demolition or substantial alteration of a resource, or ground-disturbing activities such as grading or excavation, it can be assumed that future development consistent with the goals and policies of the EVSP have the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to archaeological resources. Therefore, this is a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-2: Archaeological Evaluation Program.

Before the issuance of a grading permit, future discretionary projects in the East Valley Specific Plan Area shall be reviewed by the City of Escondido Planning Department to determine if a Cultural Resources Study is required. Site-specific archaeological surveys shall be conducted for the following types of projects: (1) projects in areas that have not been previously developed, or (2) projects that may impact built environment resources that meet the age threshold for eligibility.

For projects requiring a Cultural Resources Study, the work shall be conducted by a City-approved qualified archaeologist to determine the likelihood of the project site to contain archaeological resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historical information and conducting a site visit. A Native American monitor shall be on site during site-specific archaeological surveys. Before field reconnaissance, background research, including a records search at the South Coastal Information Center, shall be required. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission shall also be conducted. If potential archaeological resources are identified through background research and field surveys, those resources must be avoided or the City of Escondido must proceed to Step 2.

If avoidance of resources is not possible, significance evaluations shall be required for the potential archaeological resources identified in Step 1. Potential resources include new resources identified as a result of a survey, previously recorded resources that have not been evaluated and are relocated during a survey, and previously recorded sites not relocated during the survey if there is a likelihood that the resources still exist. Significance evaluations shall not be required if the resources have been evaluated for California Environmental Quality Act significance within the last 5 years and if there has been no change in the conditions that contributed to the determination of significance or eligibility.

An archaeological testing program shall be required for archaeological sites in need of resource significance evaluation. Archaeological testing programs include evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence and absence of subsurface features, and research potential. Tribal representatives and/or Native American monitors shall be involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of prehistoric archaeological sites during this phase of the process. The testing program may require re-evaluation of the project, which could result in a combination of project redesign to preserve significant resources and mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Tribal representatives and/or Native American monitors).

If significant archaeological resources are identified within the project footprint, the site may be eligible for designation on one or more registers. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action shall be required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment shall require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicate that there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring shall be required.

Avoiding and preserving the resources through project redesign would be the preferred mitigation for archaeological resources. If avoidance is not possible, the City of Escondido shall consult with all applicable parties, including Native American Tribes if prehistoric, in an effort to determine measures to mitigate any potential impacts to the resource in accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2, and the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15126.4. A project archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology shall employ measures that include documentation of the resource.

For archaeological resources for which preservation is not an option, a research design for a data recovery program would be prepared. The data recovery program would be based on a written research design and would be subject to the provisions as outlined in California Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2.

CUL-3: Qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitoring.

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall provide written verification to the City that a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor associated with a Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project location have been retained to implement a monitoring program for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever an archaeological site or a Native American Traditional Cultural Property within the project footprint would be impacted. The archaeologist shall be responsible for coordinating with the Native American monitor. This verification shall be presented to the City of Escondido in a letter from the project archaeologist that confirms the selected Native American monitor is associated with a traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe. The City of Escondido, prior to any pre-construction meeting, shall approve all people involved in the monitoring program.

CUL-4: Attend Pre-Grading Meeting.

The qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor shall attend a pre-grading meeting with the grading contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. During the initial grubbing, site grading, excavation, or disturbance of the ground surface, the qualified archaeologist and the Native American monitor shall be on site full time. The frequency of inspections shall depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and any discoveries of Tribal Cultural Resources as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21074. Archaeological and Native American monitoring shall be discontinued when the depth of grading and soil conditions no longer retain the potential to contain cultural deposits. The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American monitor, shall be responsible for determining the duration and frequency of monitoring.

CUL-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance Operation.

In the event that previously unidentified archaeological and/or Tribal Cultural Resources are discovered, the qualified archaeologist and the Native American monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field and collected so the monitored grading can proceed.

CUL-6: Notify the City of Archaeological and/or Tribal Cultural Resource Discovery.

If a potentially significant archaeological and/or Tribal Cultural Resource is discovered, the archaeologist shall notify the City of Escondido of said discovery. The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the City of Escondido, the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe, and the Native American monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resource. A recommendation for the Tribal Cultural Resource's treatment and disposition shall be made by the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe and the Native American monitor, and be submitted to the City of Escondido for review and approval.

CUL-7: Avoidance and/or Preservation of Discovery.

The avoidance and/or preservation of the significant Tribal Cultural Resource and/or unique archaeological resource must first be considered and evaluated as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Where any significant Tribal Cultural Resources and/or unique archaeological resources have been discovered and avoidance and/or preservation measures are deemed to be infeasible by the City of Escondido, a research design and data recovery program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist (using professional archaeological methods), in consultation with the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe and the Native American monitor, and shall be subject to approval by the City of Escondido. The archaeological monitor, in consultation with the Native American monitor, shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the research design and data recovery program activities must be concluded to the satisfaction of the City of Escondido.

CUL-8: Collection and Treatment of Resources.

If the qualified archaeologist elects to collect any Tribal Cultural Resources, the Native American monitor must be present during any testing or cataloging of those resources. Moreover, if the qualified archaeologist does not collect the cultural resources that are unearthed during the ground-disturbing activities, the Native American monitor may, at their discretion, collect said resources and provide them to the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe for respectful and dignified treatment in accordance with the Tribe's cultural and spiritual traditions. Any Tribal Cultural Resources collected by the qualified archaeologist shall be repatriated to the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe. Should the traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe or other traditionally and culturally affiliated Tribe decline the collection, the collection shall be curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center. All other resources determined by the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American monitor, to not be Tribal Cultural Resources shall be curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center.

CUL-9: Monitoring and/or Evaluation Report.

Prior to the release of the grading bond, a monitoring report and/or evaluation report, if appropriate, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusion of the archaeological monitoring program and any data recovery program on the project site, shall be submitted by the qualified archaeologist to the City of Escondido. The Native American monitor shall be responsible for providing any notes or comments to the qualified archaeologist in a timely manner to be submitted with the report. The report will include California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site Forms for any newly discovered resources.

5.3.4 Substantial Adverse Change to Human Remains

Could the implementation of the EVSP disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Section 15064.5 (d) & (e) contains additional provisions regarding human remains. Regarding Native American human remains, paragraph (d) provides:

When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement shall be exempt from: the general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5); and the requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

Impact Analysis

There are known areas within the City where prehistoric human remains have been uncovered and historic cemeteries and burials are known to exist. The potential for encountering prehistoric human remains during construction development activities is low, but the potential for encountering human remains in general is possible, and EVSP implementation may result in impacts to human remains.

Significance of Impact

While the EVSP does not specifically propose demolition or substantial alteration of a resource or ground-disturbing activities such as grading or excavation, it is possible that future development consistent with the goals and policies of the EVSP have the potential to disturb human remains. Therefore, this is a significant impact.

CUL-10: Identification and Treatment of Human Remains.

If Native American human remains are discovered within a project footprint, the City shall work with the most likely descendants identified by the NAHC as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any items of cultural patrimony associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from the general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps shall be taken:

- All construction activity shall cease within 100 feet of the discovery until the San Diego County Medical Examiner is contacted and has completed their study.
- The San Diego County Medical Examiner shall be contacted to determine whether an investigation of the cause of death is required.
- If the medical examiner determines that the remains are Native American, the medical examiner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours.
- The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant from the deceased Native American.
- The landowner shall discuss and confer with the Most Likely Descendant regarding all reasonable options for treatment of human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

As part of the objectives, criteria, and procedures required by PRC Section 21082, a lead agency shall make provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction. These provisions shall include an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the archaeologist determines the find to be a significant historical or archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be necessary. Work may continue on other parts of the project site while resource mitigation takes place.

5.3.5 Substantial Adverse Change to Tribal Resources

Could the implementation of the EVSP cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21081.3.1?

Assembly Bill 52 requires lead agencies to provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a project if they have requested to be notified of projects subject to AB 52. Consultation as defined under AB 52 includes, but is not limited to, discussing the type of environmental review necessary, the significance of TCRs, the significance of the project impacts on the TCRs, and alternatives and mitigation measures recommended by the tribe.

Impact Analysis

Records searches completed by ASM for the City from the NAHC and SCIC report no known TCRs within the EVSP. The City has sent information request letters to contacts provided by the NAHC. Though there are no reported TCRs, Native American tribes were distributed across the region, and there is a possibility that unknown TCRs exist within the area.

Significance of Impact

While the EVSP does not specifically propose demolition or substantial alteration of a resource or ground-disturbing activities such as grading or excavation, it can be assumed that future development consistent with the goals and policies of the EVSP have the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to TCRs. Therefore, this is a significant impact.

CUL-11: Tribal Cultural Resources Evaluation.

For any project with potential to result in adverse impacts to TCRs, the City shall avoid and/or minimize impacts by facilitating the identification of TCRs through field studies. Coordination and collaboration regarding the resource shall be completed with agencies, tribes, and institutions, such as the South Coastal Information Center, the NAHC, and local tribal governments, including consultation as outlined in Senate Bill 18 and Assembly Bill 52. The resource shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (A) Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource;
- (B) Protecting the traditional use of the resource; and
- (C) Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

If possible, the City shall avoid and preserve the resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.

Greenspace, parks, or other open space shall use appropriate planning to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property shall be created with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This report serves as a preliminary assessment of the potential for impacts to historical resources within the City of Escondido's East Valley Specific Plan Project Area based on a review of previously conducted cultural inventories, a records search of previously recorded resources within the Project Area, and a search of information at the NAHC. The study does not include sites that have yet to be identified or programmatic recommendations for yet to be identified architectural historic resources. This analysis identified 449 previously recorded cultural resources within the EVSP. One resource is a historic archaeological site which is not considered a historical resource under CEQA. The remaining 448 previously recorded resources are built environment resources; of these, 28 are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. Projects proposed for sensitivity areas Levels 1-3 (red, orange, and yellow) on Figure 2 are the most likely to contain historical resources. Buried archaeological sensitivity analysis suggests a low sensitivity for buried prehistoric and historic archaeology in the entire EVSP, as the soil is Pleistocene in age. However, areas underlain with minor geomorphic alluvial and fluvial deposits in perennial stream areas have a high sensitivity for buried prehistoric archaeology. This report also provides the programmatic recommendations for future projects conducted under the EVSP in order to identify and assess potential impacts to historical resources of future projects and mitigation measures to reduce the potential for substantial adverse changes to historical resources.

6.1 Summary of EVSP Analysis and Results

This analysis identified 449 previously recorded cultural resources within the EVSP Project Area; one resource was archaeological and 448 were built environment resources. The EVSP Project area contains Levels 1-3 (red, orange, and yellow) of historical resource sensitivity, indicating that the area is likely to contain historical resources. Buried archaeological sensitivity analysis suggests a low sensitivity for buried prehistoric and historic archaeology within the EVSP. As such, Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 would be appropriate to reduce the potential for substantial adverse changes to historical resources.

References

AEGIS

- 1991 *Escondido Context Statement*. AEGIS Consulting, Claremont, California.

Almstedt, Ruth

- 1982 Kumeyaay and Ipay. In *APS/SDG&E Interconnection Native American Cultural Resources*, edited by Clyde Woods, pp. 6-20. Wirth Associates, San Diego.

Alter, Ruth C.

- 2011 *Cultural Resources Report for the Historical and Architectural Evaluation Study of 309 E. Grand Avenue, Escondido, California, 92025*. Archaeos, San Diego, California.

Ames, George

- 1943 *A Doctor Comes to California: The Diary of John S. Griffin, Assistant Surgeon with Kearny's Dragoons, 1846-47*. San Francisco, California Historical Society, 1943.

Bada, Jeffrey, Roy Schroeder, and George Carter

- 1974 New Evidence for the Antiquity of Man in North America Deduced from Aspartic Acid Racemization. *Science* 184:791-793.

Bean, Lowell John

- 1972 *Mukat's People: The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 1978 Cahuilla. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 575-587. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell John, and Katherine Siva Saubel

- 1972 *Temalpakh: Cahuilla Indian Knowledge and Usage of Plants*. Malki Museum Press, Banning, California.

Bean, Lowell John, and Florence C. Shipek

- 1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell John, and Charles B. Smith

- 1978 Cupeño. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 588-591. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bowman, Roy H.

- 1973 *Soil Survey, San Diego Area, California*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Bull, Charles S.

- 1987 A New Proposal: Some Suggestions for San Diego Prehistory. In *San Dieguito – La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by Dennis R. Gallegos, pp. 35-42. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Buskirk, Shirley

- 2017 San Pasqual Battlefield Volunteer Association docent. Personal interview, May 24.

Carrico, Richard L.

- 1997 Sociopolitical Aspects of the 1775 Revolt at Mission San Diego de Alcalá: An Ethnohistorical Approach. *Journal of San Diego History* 43:143-157.

Carter, George F.

- 1957 *Pleistocene Man at San Diego*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
1980 *Earlier Than You Think: A Personal View of Man in the Americas*. Texas A&M University, College Station.

Christenson, Lynne Elizabeth

- 1990 The Late Prehistoric Yuman People of San Diego County, California: Their Settlement and Subsistence System. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tempe.

City of Escondido

- 2012a Escondido General Plan Update, Downtown Specific Plan Update, and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report. SCH#2010071064. Prepared by Atkins. April 23.
2012b Land Use and Community Form, published online, <https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/GPUpdate/GeneralPlanChapterII.pdf>, accessed March 2021.
2013 *Escondido Downtown Specific Plan*. Published online by the City of Escondido, <https://www.escondido.org/Data/Sites/1/media/PDFs/Planning/DowntownSpecificPlan.pdf>, accessed March 2021.

Davis, Emma Lou, and Richard Shutler, Jr.

- 1969 Recent Discoveries of Fluted Points in California and Nevada. *Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers* 14:154-169. Carson City.

Drucker, Philip

- 1937 Culture Element Distributions: V, Southern California. *Anthropological Records* 1:1-52. University of California, Berkeley.
1941 Culture Element Distributions: XVII, Yuman-Piman. *Anthropological Records* 6:91-230. University of California, Berkeley.

Engstrand, Iris

- 2005 *San Diego: California's Cornerstone*. Sunbelt, San Diego.

References

- Erlandson, Jon M., and Roger H. Colten (editors)
1991 *Hunter Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California*. Perspectives in California Archaeology No. 1. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Erlandson, Jon M., and Michael Glassow (editors)
1997 *Archaeology of the California Coast during the Middle Holocene*. Perspectives in California Archaeology No. 4. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Erlandson, Jon M., and Terry L. Jones
2002 *Catalysts to Complexity: Late Holocene Societies on the California Coast*. Perspectives in California Archaeology No. 6. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Escondido History Center
n.d. "Escondido Timeline." <http://pdf.escondidohistory.org/escondido%20timeline.pdf>, accessed June 14, 2018.
- Fages, Pedro
1937 *A Historical, Political, and Natural Description of California (1775)*. Translated by Herbert Ingram Priestly. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Faragher, John Mack.
2016 *Eternity Street: Violence and Justice in Frontier Los Angeles*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, New York.
- Fark, Bill
n.d. "A Brief History of Escondido." Published online by the Escondido History Center, <http://escondidohistory.com/>, accessed March 2021.
- Find A Grave
2021 "Juan Bautista Alvarado." Published online by Find A Grave, <https://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=40768039>, accessed March 2021.
- Fox, Robin
2016 Brief History of the Citrus Industry in Escondido. On file at the Escondido History Center.
2017 Escondido History Center. Personal interview, May 24, 2017.
- Gallegos, Dennis R.
1987 (editor) *San Dieguito – La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

References

Geiger, Maynard, and Clement W. Meighan (editors)

- 1976 *As the Padres Saw Them: California Indian Life and Customs As Reported by the Franciscan Missionaries, 1813-1815*. Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library, Santa Barbara, California.

Gifford, Edward W.

- 1918 Clans and Moieties in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 14:155-219. Berkeley.
- 1931 *The Kamia of Imperial Valley*. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 97. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Golla, Victor

- 2007 California Archaeology and Prehistory after Moratto: Linguistic Prehistory. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 71-82. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Griset, Suzanne

- 1996 Southern California Brown Ware. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Gustafson, C. D.

- 1959 San Diego County Avocado Industry. *California Avocado Society Yearbook* 43:37-39.

Hale, Micah Jeremiah

- 2009 Santa Barbara and San Diego: Contrasting Adaptive Strategies on the Southern California Coast. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Hanna, David C.

- 1983 A Major Challenge to "San Dieguito" and "La Jolla." *Cultural Resource Management Casual Papers* 1(3):76-102. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Harding, Mabel

- 1951 La Jollan Culture. *El Museo* 1(1):10-11, 31-38.

Harrington, John Peabody (editor)

- 1933 *Chinigchinich: A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Gerónimo Boscana's Historic Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagancies of the Indians of this Mission of San Juan Capistrano Called the Acagchemem Tribe*. Fine Arts Press, Santa Ana, California.
- 1934 *A New Original Version of Boscana's Historical Account of the San Juan Capistrano Indians of Southern California*. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 92(4). Washington, D.C.

Hedges, Ken

- 1986 *Santa Ysabel Ethnobotany*. San Diego Museum of Man Ethnic Technology Notes No. 20.

References

Heilbron, Carl H.

- 1936 *History of San Diego County*, San Diego Press Club, San Diego.

Heizer, Robert F. (editor)

- 1978 *California*. Handbook of the North American Indians, Vol. 8, edited by William C. Sturtevant. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Henshaw, Henry W.

- 1972 The Luiseño Creation Myth. *The Masterkey* 46:93-100.

Hicks, Frederic Noble

- 1963 Ecological Aspects of Aboriginal Culture in the Western Yuman Area. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hines, Phillip, and Betty Rivers

- 1991 A Re-evaluation of the Prehistoric Archaeological Sites within the Pendleton Coast District. In: *The Cultural Resources of the Pendleton Coast District*, pp. 1-25.

Hohenthal, William D., Jr.

- 2001 *Tipai Ethnographic Notes: A Baja California Indian Community at Mid-Century*. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 48. Novato, California.

Hooper, Lucille

- 1920 The Cahuilla Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 16:315-380. Berkeley.

Jones, Terry L., and Kathryn A. Klar (editors)

- 2007 *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Kline, George E., and Victoria L. Kline

- 2007 Fluted Point Recovered from San Diego County Excavation. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology* 20:55-59.

Kolva, H. J.

- 1989 *Escondido Orange Association Packing House (Calfame Packing Plant)*, "Photographs, Written Historical and Descriptive Data." Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, 1989. Published online at <https://cdn.loc.gov/master/pnp/habshaer/ca/ca1500/ca1547/data/ca1547data.pdf>, accessed March 2021.

Kroeber, A. L.

- 1908 Ethnography of the Cahuilla Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8:29-68. Berkeley.
- 1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 78. Washington, D.C.

Laylander, Don

- 1991 Organización comunitaria de los yumanos occidentales: Una revisión etnográfica y prospecto arqueológico. *Estudios Fronterizos* 24/25:31-60.
- 1995 The Question of Prehistoric Agriculture among the Western Yumans. *Estudios Fronterizos* 35/36:187-203.
- 1997 Inferring Settlement Systems for the Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherers of San Diego County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 19:179-196.
- 2000 *Early Ethnography of the Californias, 1533-1825*. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 47. Salinas, California.
- 2001 The Creation and Flute Lure Myths: Regional Patterns in Southern California Traditions. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 23:155-178.
- 2004 *Listening to the Raven: The Southern California Ethnography of Constance Goddard DuBois*. Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory No. 51. Salinas, California.
- 2010 Linguistic Prehistory and the Archaic-Late Transition in the Colorado Desert. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 30:141-155.

Luomala, Katherine

- 1978 Tipai and Ipai. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 592-609. Handbook of the North American Indians, Vol. 8, edited by William C. Sturtevant. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

McDonald, Meg, and James D. Eighmey

- 2008 Late Period Prehistory in San Diego. In *Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology of Metropolitan San Diego: A Historic Properties Background Study*, pp. 109-169. ASM Affiliates, Carlsbad, California.

McGrew, Allen B.

- 1998 *Hidden Valley Heritage: Escondido's First 100 Years*. Blue-Ribbon Centennial History Committee, Escondido, California.

Meighan, Clement W.

- 1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10:215-227.

Minshall, Herbert L.

- 1976 *The Broken Stones*. Copley Books, San Diego.
- 1989 *Buchanan Canyon: Ancient Human Presence in the Americas*. Slawson Communications, San Marcos, California.

Moratto, Michael J.

- 1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.

Moriarty, James R., III

- 1966 Cultural Phase Divisions Suggested by Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon Dating at San Diego. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 4:20-30.

Munz, Philip A.

- 1974 *A Flora of Southern California*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

NPS (National Park Service)

- 2009 Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines [As Amended and Annotated]. Accessed March 19, 2009. http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_0.htm.

Oxendine, Joan

- 1983 The Luiseño Village during the Late Prehistoric Era. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

Popenoe, F. O.

- 1927 San Diego County Avocado History. *California Avocado Association Yearbook* 12:41-48.

Pourade, Richard F.

- 1960 *The Explorers*. The History of San Diego Vol. 1. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1961 *Time of the Bells*. The History of San Diego Vol. 2. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1963 *The Silver Dons*. The History of San Diego Vol. 3. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1964 *The Glory Years*. The History of San Diego Vol. 4. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1965 *Gold in the Sun*. The History of San Diego Vol. 5. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1967 *The Rising Tide*. The History of San Diego Vol. 6. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.
1977 *City of the Dream*. The History of San Diego Vol. 7. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego.

Price, James N.

- 1988 "The Railroad Stations of San Diego County." Published online by San Diego History Center, <https://www.sandiegohistory.org/journal/1988/april/railroad-6/>, accessed March 2021.

Pryde, Philip R.

- 2004 *San Diego: An Introduction to the Region*. Sunbelt Publications, San Diego.

Reeves, Brian, John M. D. Pohl, and Jason W. Smith

- 1986 The Mission Ridge Site and the Texas Street Question. In *New Evidence for the Pleistocene Peopling of the Americas*, edited by Alan Lyle Bryan, pp. 65-80. Center for the Study of Early Man, University of Maine, Orono.

Rogers, Malcolm J.

- 1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1:167-198.
1966 *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*. Union-Tribune, San Diego.

Rogers, Thomas H.

- 1965 *Santa Ana Sheet*. Geologic Map of California. California Division of Mines and Geology, Sacramento.

Rondeau, Michael F., Jim Cassidy, and Terry L. Jones

- 2007 Colonization Technologies: Fluted Proposed Projectile Points and the San Clemente Island Woodworking/Microblade Complex. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 63-70. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

San Diego Directory Company

- 1938 *San Diego City Directory*. Frye and Smith, San Diego.

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians

- 2017a "Culture." Published online at <http://www.sanpasqualbandofmissionindians.org/culture>, accessed March 2021.
- 2017b "History." Published online at <http://www.sanpasqualbandofmissionindians.org/history>, accessed March 2021.

Schroeder, Albert H.

- 1978 Prehistory: Hakataya. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 100-107. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 9, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Shephard, John S., and Gary S. Bender

- 2001 History of the Avocado Industry in California. *California Avocado Society Yearbook* 85:29-50.

Shipek, Florence

- 1978 History of Southern California Mission Indians. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 610-618. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- 1982 Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4:296-303
- 1991 *Delfina Cuero: Her Autobiography, an Account of Her Last Years, and Her Ethnobotanic Contributions*. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, California.
- 1993 Kumeyaay Plant Husbandry: Fire Water, and Erosion Management Systems. In *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*, edited by Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson, pp. 378-388. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, California.

Shumway, George, Carl L. Hubbs, and James R. Moriarty

- 1961 Scripps Estates Site, San Diego, California: A La Jolla Site Dated 5460 to 7370 Years before the Present. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 93:37-132.

Sparkman, Philip S.

- 1908 The Culture of the Luiseño Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8:187-234. Berkeley.

Spier, Leslie

- 1923 Southern Diegueno Customs. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20:295-358. Berkeley.

Strong, William D.

- 1929 Aboriginal Society in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 26:1-358. Berkeley.

Sutton, Mark Q.

- 2010 The Del Rey Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(2):1-54.
- 2011 The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1-74.
- 2015 Revisions to the Palomar Tradition Model in Southern California Prehistory. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 51(1):1-18.

Sutton, Mark Q., and Jill K. Gardner

- 2010 Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 42(4):1-64.

Taylor, R., L. Payen, C. Prior, P. Slota, R. Gillespie, J. Gowlett, R. Hedges, A. Hull, T. Zabel, D. Donahue, and R. Berger

- 1985 Major Revisions in the Pleistocene Age Assignments for North American Human Skeletons by C14 Accelerator Mass Spectrometry: None Older Than 11,000 C14 Years B.P. *American Antiquity* 50:136-140.

True, Delbert L.

- 1958 An Early Complex in San Diego County, California. *American Antiquity* 23:255-263.
- 1970 *Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California*. Archaeological Survey Monographs No. 1. University of California, Los Angeles.
- 1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County: 1978. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 3(4):1-39.

True, Delbert L., and Eleanor Beemer

- 1982 Two Milling Stone Inventories from Northern San Diego County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4:233-261.

True, Delbert L., and Paul D. Bouey

- 1990 Gladishill: A Probable San Dieguito Camp near Valley Center, California. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 7(4):1-28.

References

- True, Delbert L., Clement W. Meighan, and Harvey Crew
1974 *Archaeological Investigations at Molpa, San Diego, California*. University of California Publications in Anthropology No. 11. Berkeley.
- True, Delbert L., and Rosemary Pankey
1985 Radiocarbon Dates for the Pauma Complex Component at the Pankey Site, Northern San Diego County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7:240-244.
- True, Delbert L., Rosemary Pankey, and Claude N. Warren
1991 *Tom-Kav, a Late Village Site in Northern San Diego County, California, and Its Place in the San Luis Rey Complex*. Anthropological Records No. 30. University of California, Berkeley.
- U. S. Census Bureau
1900 *The Twelfth Census of the United States, San Diego County*. U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
1930 *The Fifteenth Census of the United States, San Diego County*. U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
1960 *The Nineteenth Census of the United States, San Diego County*. U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Microfilm, San Diego Historical Society Archives.
- Wagner, David L. and Dinah D. Maldonado
2000 Generalized Geologic Map of California. California Geologic Survey, Sacramento. Electronic document, www.conservation.ca.gov, accessed February 13, 2008.
- Wallace, William J.
1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.
- Warren, Claude N.
1964 Cultural Change and Continuity on the San Diego Coast. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.
1966 (editor) *The San Dieguito Type Site: M. J. Rogers' 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River*. San Diego Museum of Man Papers No. 5.
1967 The San Dieguito Complex: Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.
1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by Cynthia Irwin-Williams, pp. 1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology No. 1(3). Portales.
- Warren, Claude N., Gretchen Siegler, and Frank Dittmer
2008 Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic Periods. In *Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology of Metropolitan San Diego: A Historic Properties Background Study*, pp. 13-107. ASM Affiliates, Carlsbad, California.

References

Warren, Claude N., Delbert L. True, and Ardith A. Eudey

- 1961 Early Gathering Complexes of Western San Diego County: Results and Interpretations of an Archaeological Survey. *University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1960-1961*:1-106.

Waterman, Thomas T.

- 1909 Analysis of the Mission Indian Creation Story. *American Anthropologist* 11:41-55.
1910 The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8:271-358. Berkeley.

Waters, Michael R.

- 1982 The Lowland Patayan Ceramic Tradition. In *Hohokam and Patayan: Prehistory of Southwestern Arizona*, edited by Randall H. McGuire and Michael B. Schiffer, pp. 275-297. Academic Press, New York.

Waugh, M. Georgie

- 1986 Intensification and Land-Use: Archaeological Indications of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

White, Raymond C.

- 1953 Two Surviving Luiseño Indian Ceremonies. *American Anthropologist* 55:569-578.
1957 The Luiseño Theory of "Knowledge." *American Anthropologist* 59:1-19.
1963 Luiseño Social Organization. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 48:91-194. Berkeley.

Wilken, Michael Alan

- 2012 An Ethnobotany of Baja California's Kumeyaay Indians. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Yohe, Robert M., II

- 1992 A Reevaluation of Western Great Basin Cultural Chronology and Evidence for the Timing of the Introduction of the Bow and Arrow to Eastern California Based on New Excavations at the Rose Spring Site (CA-INY-372). Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

Appendices

Appendix A

Tables

Table 2. Previous Cultural Resource Inventory Projects
Conducted within the Project Area

| Report Number | Report Title | Authors | Year |
|---------------|--|--|------|
| SD-00429 | An Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Lincoln Ash interim Facility, in the City of Escondido, California | Paul G. Chace | 1977 |
| SD-00478 | An Archaeological Survey Report for a Proposed Interstate 15 Crossing Rancho Bernardo (11-SD-15 M22.8/M27.2) 11208-105671 | Joyce M. Corum | 1978 |
| SD-01017 | Cultural Resource Survey of the Osborne OV6 Trunk Sewer Line, Vista, California | Dennis Gallegos and Andrew Pigniolo | 1987 |
| SD-02219 | Historical/Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Grand Ave, Second Ave, and Valley Blvd Specific Plan, Escondido, California | Dennis Gallegos | 1992 |
| SD-02236 | Archaeological Survey Report Route 11-SD-76 | Martin D. Rosen | 1991 |
| SD-02326 | Historical/Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Grand Avenue, Second Avenue, and Valley Boulevard Specific Plan - Escondido, CA | Carolyn Kyle, Kathleen Crawford, and Dennis Gallegos | 1992 |
| SD-08588 | Draft Environmental Impact Report for Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facility | City of Escondido | 1980 |
| SD-08596 | Appendices-Reclaimed Water Distribution System Project: Draft Environmental Impact Report | Keller Environmental Associates, Inc. | 1992 |
| SD-09763 | Historic Building Survey of the Escondido Mutual Water District Shop/ Warehouse, 1201 East Washington Avenue, Escondido, California | Price, Harry J. | 2004 |
| SD-13261 | An Archaeological Survey of the Ash Street Bicycle Undercrossing Project, City of Escondido, California | Andrew R. Pigniolo and John Dietler | 2011 |
| SD-14394 | Survey Report on Historic/ Cultural Resources City of Escondido | Donald A. Cotton Associates | 1983 |
| SD-14692 | Interior Renovations Escondido Medical Family Office, 255 North Ash St., Escondido, San Diego County, CA | Hedy Levine | 2012 |
| SD-15113 | Direct APE Historic Architectural Assessment for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SD06590A (SD590 Light & Life Church) 110 North Ash Street, Escondido, San Diego County, California | Wayne H. Bonner and Kathleen A. Crawford | 2014 |
| SD-15628 | Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate SD06590A (SD590 Light & Life Church) 110 North Ash Street, Escondido, San Diego County, California | Wayne H. Bonner, Sarah A. Williams, and Kathleen A. Crawford | 2013 |
| SD-16557 | Historic Resources Technical Report for the North Inland Residential Crisis Center, Escondido, San Diego County, California | Jennifer Gorman | 2014 |
| SD-17339 | Recycled Water Easterly Main and Tanks Project and Brine Line, Broadway to Hale Avenue Resource Recovery Facility (HARRF) Project - Cultural Resources Study | Mary Robbins-Wade and Nicole Falvey | 2015 |
| SD-17484 | City of Escondido Phase I Agricultural Reuse and Salt Reduction Project Extended Phase I Archaeological Investigation | Michael Vader | 2018 |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Report Number | Report Title | Authors | Year |
|----------------------|---|--|-------------|
| SD-18415 | Historic Structure Assessment for the Palomar Health Downtown Campus and Medical Offices, Escondido, California (APNs 229-442-01 TO -04 and -18, 229-450-05 and -06, 230-163-01 TO -05, and 760-169-27) | Brian F. Smith and Jennifer R. K. Stopes | 2020 |

Table 3. Built Environment Resources within the East Valley Specific Plan Area.

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|----------------|---|-----|-----|------------|-------------------|---|
| 512 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-3356 | 1890 | Recommended Eligible |
| 520 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-3356 | 1900 | Recommended Eligible |
| 526 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-3356 | 1915 | Recommended Eligible |
| 536 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-3356 | 1925 | Recommended Eligible |
| 620 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4413 | 1895 | Recommended Eligible |
| 624 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4413 | 1900 | Locally Listed |
| 627 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4412 | 1935 | Recommended Eligible |
| 637 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4412 | 1935 | Recommended Eligible |
| 643 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4412 | 1940 | Recommended Eligible |
| 651 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4412 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 701 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | 1946 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 710 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4415 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 711 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | No Date | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 719 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 720 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4415 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 726 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4415 | 1953 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 727 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | 1947 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 735 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4462 | 1949 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 736 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4415 | 1900 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 743 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | 1949 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 751 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4414 | 1949 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 760 | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025-4415 | 1954 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| no data | E | 2nd | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 110 | N | Ash | St | 92027 | No Date | -- |
| 200 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3024 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 203 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3014 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 250 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3026 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3068 | After 1976 | -- |
| 303 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3015 | After 1976 | -- |
| 305 | N | Ash | St | 92027-3015 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 415 | N | Ash | St | 92027-2301 | After 1976 | -- |
| 425 | N | Ash | St | 92027-2301 | After 1976 | -- |
| 433 | N | Ash | St | 92027-2301 | After 1976 | -- |
| 620 | N | Ash | St | 92027-1902 | After 1976 | -- |
| 623 | N | Ash | St | 92027-1901 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 648 | N | Ash | St | 92027-1902 | Before 1976 | -- |
| no data | N | Ash | St | 92025 | No Date | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|----------------|---|-------------|---------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| no data | N | Ash | St | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 131 | N | Beech | St | 92025-3215 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 303 | N | Beech | St | 92025-3202 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 304 | N | Beech | St | 92025-3203 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 333 | N | Beech | St | 92025-3202 | After 1976 | -- |
| 427 | N | Beech | St | 92025-3283 | 1935 | -- |
| 525 | N | Beech | St, #21 | 92025-3281 | After 1976 | -- |
| 525 | N | Beech | St, #22 | 92025-3281 | After 1976 | -- |
| 525 | N | Beech | St, #23 | 92025-3281 | After 1976 | -- |
| 525 | N | Beech | St, #24 | 92025-3281 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #13 | 92025-3282 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #15 | 92025-3282 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #16 | 92025-3282 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #17 | 92025-3282 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #18 | 92025-3282 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #19 | 92025-3284 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Beech | St, #20 | 92025-3284 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | N | Beech | St | 92025-3201 | No Date | -- |
| 609 | | Beechwood | St | 92025-2201 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 612 | | Beechwood | St | 92025-2202 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 129 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4602 | After 1976 | -- |
| 216 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4609 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 250 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4651 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 251 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4608 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 314 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4611 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 333 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4610 | 1940 | -- |
| 417 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4612 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 419 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4612 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 421 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4612 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 430 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-4650 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 543 | N | Cedar | St | 92025-3123 | Before 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Cedar | St | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Cedar | St | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1001 | | Cedar Brook | | 92025-3125 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1007 | | Cedar Brook | | 92025-3125 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1015 | | Cedar Brook | | 92025-3125 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1019 | | Cedar Brook | | 92025-3125 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 150 | N | Date | St | 92025-3406 | After 1976 | -- |
| 160 | N | Date | St | 92025-3406 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 161 | N | Date | St | 92025-3405 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 209 | N | Date | St | 92025-3407 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 425 | N | Date | St | 92025-3413 | After 1976 | -- |
| 426 | N | Date | St | 92025-3409 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 551 | N | Date | St | 92025-3138 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Date | St | 92025 | No Date | -- |
| 115 | S | Elm | St | 92025-4534 | 1915 | Recommended Eligible |
| 117 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3410 | Before 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|-------|--------|------------|-------------|---|
| 120 | S | Elm | St | 92025-4535 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 120 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3411 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 123 | S | Elm | St | 92025-4534 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 160 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3411 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 255 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3431 | After 1976 | -- |
| 453 | N | Elm | St | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 457 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3001 | After 1976 | -- |
| 457 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3001 | After 1976 | -- |
| 462 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3002 | After 1976 | -- |
| 520 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3049 | After 1976 | -- |
| 533 | N | Elm | St | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Elm | St, #1 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 535 | N | Elm | St, #2 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 537 | N | Elm | St, #1 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 537 | N | Elm | St, #2 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 539 | N | Elm | St, #1 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 539 | N | Elm | St, #2 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 541 | N | Elm | St, #1 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 541 | N | Elm | St, #2 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 543 | N | Elm | St, #1 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| 543 | N | Elm | St, #2 | 92025-3011 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Elm | St | | No Date | -- |
| 130 | S | Fig | St | 92025-4401 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 145 | S | Fig | St | 92025-4453 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 206 | N | Fig | St | 92025-3417 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 221 | S | Fig | St | 92025-4424 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 428 | N | Fig | St | 92025-3015 | After 1976 | -- |
| 454 | N | Fig | St | 92025-3025 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 502 | N | Fig | St | 92025-3017 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 465 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3303 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 511 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3323 | 1906 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 613 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4402 | 1910 | Recommended Eligible |
| 619 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4402 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|----------------|---|-------|-----|------------|-------------------|---|
| 625 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4402 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 647 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4402 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 661 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4402 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 701 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4466 | After 1976 | -- |
| 704 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4405 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 711 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4404 | After 1976 | -- |
| 718 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4405 | 1930 | Recommended Eligible |
| 719 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4404 | No Date | -- |
| 726 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4446 | 1930 | Recommended Eligible |
| 727 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4404 | After 1976 | -- |
| 736 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4405 | After 1976 | -- |
| 737 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4404 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 750 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4460 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 751 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4404 | 1900 | -- |
| 802 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3402 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 803 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3401 | After 1976 | -- |
| 809 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3401 | After 1976 | -- |
| 810 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 817 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3401 | After 1976 | -- |
| 818 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 840 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3402 | After 1976 | -- |
| 842 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3402 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 850 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3435 | After 1976 | -- |
| 851 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3401 | After 1976 | -- |
| 899 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3442 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 910 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3430 | After 1976 | -- |
| 911 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | After 1976 | -- |
| 919 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | After 1976 | -- |
| 925 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 933 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 936 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3404 | 1940 | -- |
| 942 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3404 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 943 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 951 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 952 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3404 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 958 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3404 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 959 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3403 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1001 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4604 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1002 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4605 | 1938 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1017 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4604 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1026 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4605 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1027 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4604 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1034 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4605 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4601 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1043 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4604 | After 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|-----------|--------------|------------|-------------|---|
| 1050 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4605 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1051 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4604 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1060 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-4605 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1061 | E | Grand | Ave, # A & B | 92025-4604 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1102 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1103 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1107 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1110 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1118 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1119 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1127 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1128 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1132 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1135 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1142 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1147 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1152 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1155 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3219 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1160 | E | Grand | Ave | 92025-3220 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1314 | E | Grand | Ave | 92027-3019 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1316 | E | Grand | Ave | 92027-3019 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1330 | E | Grand | Ave | 92027-3019 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Grand | Ave | 92025 | 1925 | -- |
| no data | E | Grand | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Grand | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Grand | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Grand | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 106 | S | Grape | St | 92025-4407 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 125 | S | Grape | St | 92025-4406 | 1930 | Locally Listed |
| 126 | S | Grape | St | 92025-4407 | 1954 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 142 | S | Grape | St | 92025-4468 | 1952 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 145 | S | Grape | St | 92025-4406 | 1928 | Recommended Eligible |
| 475 | N | Grape | St | 92025-3000 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 490 | N | Grape | St | 92025-3079 | 1953 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 500 | N | Grape | St | 92025-3035 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 503 | N | Grape | St | 92025-3071 | After 1976 | -- |
| 140 | S | Hickory | St | 92025-3354 | 1955 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 406 | N | Hickory | St | 92025-2940 | Before 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Hickory | St | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1207 | E | Jefferson | Ave | 92027-1921 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1215 | E | Jefferson | Ave | 92027-1921 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1223 | E | Jefferson | Ave | 92027-1921 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1231 | E | Jefferson | Ave | 92027-1921 | Before 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|-----------|-----|------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 1239 | E | Jefferson | Ave | 92027-1921 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 702 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3419 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 705 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3418 | After 1976 | -- |
| 706 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3419 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 727 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3418 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3437 | After 1976 | -- |
| 800 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3421 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 809 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3420 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 817 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3420 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 829 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3420 | 1890 | Recommended Eligible |
| 830 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3421 | After 1976 | -- |
| 835 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3420 | After 1976 | -- |
| 838 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3421 | After 1976 | -- |
| 847 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3420 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 848 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3421 | 1933 | Recommended Eligible |
| 852 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3421 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 901 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3422 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 910 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3438 | After 1976 | -- |
| 927 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3422 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 931 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3422 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 942 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3423 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 943 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3422 | After 1976 | -- |
| 950 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3423 | After 1976 | -- |
| 957 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3422 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1004 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1010 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1015 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4660 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1018 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1026 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1027 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4614 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1034 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4614 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1037 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4614 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1044 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1050 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1051 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4614 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1060 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-4615 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1102 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1103 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1108 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1111 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1119 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | Before 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 1120 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1125 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1126 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1133 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1134 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1142 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3207 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1143 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | 1930 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1149 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1161 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92025-3206 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1259 | E | Ohio | Ave, # A- T | 92027-3047 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1260 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92027-3054 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1268 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92027-3073 | 1888 | -- |
| 1269 | E | Ohio | Ave | 92027-3091 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Ohio | Ave | 92027 | After 1976 | -- |
| 701 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 709 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 719 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | 1920 | Recommended Eligible |
| 727 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 731 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | After 1976 | -- |
| 739 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3004 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 815 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3424 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 843 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3424 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 861 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3424 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 869 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3424 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 925 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3432 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 935 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3425 | After 1976 | -- |
| 943 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3425 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 950 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3436 | After 1976 | -- |
| 951 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3425 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1011 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4616 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1012 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | 1935 | -- |
| 1017 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4616 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1020 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | 1935 | -- |
| 1025 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1030 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4616 | 1925 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1038 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1040 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1045 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4616 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1048 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-4617 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1101 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3208 | 1915 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1110 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3209 | 1915 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1115 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3208 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1116 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3209 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1121 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3208 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1126 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3209 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1127 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3208 | After 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|--------------|------|------------|-------------|---|
| 1130 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3209 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1138 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025-3209 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1225 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92027-3020 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1299 | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92027-3027 | Before 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92027 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | E | Pennsylvania | Ave | 92027 | After 1976 | -- |
| 500 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3054 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 560 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3006 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 600 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3008 | 1953 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 601 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | 1955 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 611 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | Before 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 620 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3008 | No Date | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 621 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 629 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 635 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 645 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 651 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 675 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3007 | After 1976 | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| 703 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 711 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 714 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3010 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 719 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 725 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | After 1976 | -- |
| 728 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3052 | After 1976 | -- |
| 728 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3052 | After 1976 | -- |
| 735 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 743 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 750 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3010 | After 1976 | -- |
| 755 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3009 | After 1976 | -- |
| 760 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3010 | After 1976 | -- |
| 802 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3427 | After 1976 | -- |
| 805 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3426 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 815 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3426 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 840 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3427 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 845 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3426 | After 1976 | -- |
| 851 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3426 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 903 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |
| 903 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |
| 903 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|----------------|---|--------|------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 903 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |
| 903 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |
| 910 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3429 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 915 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | After 1976 | -- |
| 922 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3429 | After 1976 | -- |
| 936 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 941 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3433 | After 1976 | -- |
| 942 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3429 | After 1976 | -- |
| 951 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3428 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 970 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1004 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4619 | 1935 | Recommended Eligible |
| 1005 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1009 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1012 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4619 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1025 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1026 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4619 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1040 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4606 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1045 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1048 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4637 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1051 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-4618 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1109 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1110 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3211 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1129 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3210 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1146 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3211 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1146 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3211 | No Date | -- |
| 1157 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3210 | 1930 | -- |
| 1161 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92025-3210 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1201 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1201 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1202 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2310 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1205 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | No Date | -- |
| 1205 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | No Date | -- |
| 1215 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1215 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1226 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2310 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1275 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2309 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1300 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2320 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1300 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2320 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1301 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2328 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1310 | E | Valley | Pkwy | | After 1976 | -- |
| 1315 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2311 | No Date | -- |
| 1315 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2311 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1319 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2311 | No Date | -- |
| 1330 | E | Valley | Pkwy | | After 1976 | -- |
| 1333 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2311 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1340 | E | Valley | Pkwy | | After 1976 | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | | | | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|---------|---|------------|----------|------------|-------------|---|
| 1350 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2312 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1401 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2313 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1475 | E | Valley | Pkwy | 92027-2313 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | 1920 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | W | Valley | Pkwy | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 917 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-3128 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 947 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-3128 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 955 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-3128 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-3213 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Washington | Ave, #14 | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Washington | Ave, #6 | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1035 | E | Washington | Ave, #7 | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1037 | E | Washington | Ave, #2 | 92025-3216 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1037 | E | Washington | Ave, #3 | 92025-3216 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1037 | E | Washington | Ave, #4 | 92025-3216 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #10 | 92025-3217 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #11 | 92025-3217 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #12 | 92025-3217 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #5 | 92025-3205 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #8 | 92025-3217 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1039 | E | Washington | Ave, #9 | 92025-3217 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1111 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-2226 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1120 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1150 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-2215 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1158 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-2215 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1160 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-2215 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1162 | E | Washington | Ave | 92025-2215 | Before 1976 | -- |
| 1236 | E | Washington | Ave | 92027-1928 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1256 | E | Washington | Ave | 92027-1951 | After 1976 | -- |
| 1261 | E | Washington | Ave | 92027-1950 | 1930 | -- |
| no data | E | Washington | Ave | 92025 | After 1976 | -- |
| no data | | Washington | St | 92027 | After 1976 | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | After 1976 | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | No Date | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | No Date | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | After 1976 | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | No Date | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | After 1976 | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | No Date | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| | | no data | | no data | After 1976 | -- |
| | | no data | | no data | No Date | -- |

APPENDIX A: TABLES

| Address | ZIP | Year Built | Status |
|----------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| no data | no data | No Date | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| no data | no data | No Date | -- |
| no data | no data | No Date | -- |
| no data | no data | No Date | Unevaluated, within potential historic district |
| no data | no data | No Date | -- |

Appendix B

Confidential Maps and Records Search Results

Appendix C

Native American Outreach

Local Government Tribal Consultation List Request

Native American Heritage Commission

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
916-373-3710
916-373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Type of List Requested

CEQA Tribal Consultation List (AB 52) – Per Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subs. (b), (d), (e) and 21080.3.2

General Plan (SB 18) - Per Government Code § 65352.3.

Local Action Type:

___ General Plan General Plan Element
___ General Plan Amendment Specific Plan
___ Specific Plan Amendment ___ Pre-planning Outreach Activity

Required Information

Project Title: Cultural Resources Technical Report for the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study

Local Government/Lead Agency: City of Escondido

Contact Person: Amy Jordan

Street Address: 8555 Aero Dr, Suite 206

City: San Diego **Zip:** 92123

Phone: 619-740-1318

Fax:

Email: ajordan@asmaffiliates.com

Specific Area Subject to Proposed Action

County: San Diego

City/Community: Escondido

Project Description:

The City of Escondido (City) is proposing a Housing and Community Investment Study (Housing Study or project) that would identify the City's housing needs and establish clear goals and objectives to inform future housing decisions. The Housing Study would cover the City and its Sphere of Influence, located in northern San Diego County (County). The Housing Study would consist of the following three components: East Valley Specific Plan (EVSP), Housing Element Update, and Sector Feasibility Study.

The City is preparing a new EVSP that would focus growth and increase density in the new EVSP area, located in central Escondido. The goal of the proposed EVSP is to encourage new housing opportunities, improve economic vibrancy, and allow for flexibility in use and implementation as the EVSP area changes over time. The EVSP would rezone the existing EVSP area to cluster uses to create a more cohesive pattern and design with a goal of revitalizing the physical character and economic health of the community. The EVSP is intended to provide guidance for private development and public investment over the next 20 years. The EVSP includes a Density Transfer Program (EVSP Density Transfer Program) to enable the City to transfer densities from undeveloped or underutilized properties in the EVSP area to other properties in the EVSP area to enable a developing property to increase its density beyond what current zoning would permit.

The Housing Element is one element of the City of Escondido General Plan. The City is required to ensure the availability of residential sites at adequate densities and appropriate development standards to accommodate its fair share of the regional housing need, also known as the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. The San Diego Association of Governments is responsible for oversight of the RHNA process in the San Diego region. The City's RHNA allocation for the 2021–2029 planning period is approximately 9,600 housing units, which is broken down by income category to accommodate the estimated growth need at various income levels. Upon adoption of the RHNA plan, cities and the County are required to update their General Plans, Housing Elements, and Zoning Codes to accommodate the housing unit allocation. The Housing Element Update would allow the City to assess current conditions; plan for future conditions; and advance a set of programs to develop, conserve, and maintain fair housing choices for current and future residents. The Housing Element Update would also include an Adequate Sites Inventory that would demonstrate that there are enough sites within the City boundaries to accommodate the RHNA allocation.

A Sector Feasibility Study is a residential sector housing market study that offers a general framework for defining realistic goals for the preferred housing market outcomes. The Sector Feasibility Study would identify information and assess if, and to what degree, housing development is financially and economically feasible under rising construction, land, and regulatory costs. The analysis of different development types and densities would enable the City to consider its various regulatory and non-regulatory approaches to accommodating the marketplace and how to treat programmed Housing Element Update implementation.

No ground disturbing is planned for this project. The cultural resources technical study will inform the City regarding areas which may be culturally sensitive for prehistoric or historic archaeological resources and historic built environment resources.

Additional Request



Sacred Lands File Search - *Required Information:*

USGS Quadrangle Name(s): Escondido, Rancho Santa Fe, Rodriguez Mountain, San Marcos, San Pasqual, Valley Center

Township: 11S **Range:** 1W **Section(s):** 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35

Township: 11S **Range:** 2W **Section(s):** 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36

Township: 11S **Range:** 3W **Section(s):** 36

Township: 12S **Range:** 1W **Section(s):** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31

Township: 12S **Range:** 2W **Section(s):** 1-36 (all sections)

Township: 12S **Range:** 3W **Section(s):** 1, 24

Township: 13S **Range:** 2W **Section(s):** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12

Township: 13S **Range:** 3W **Section(s):** 1

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

March 9, 2021

Amy Jordan
City of Escondido

Via Email to: ajordan@smaffiliates.com

Re: Native American Consultation, Pursuant to Senate Bill 18, Government Code §65352.3 and §65352.4, Cultural Resources Technical Report for the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Project, San Diego County

Dear Ms. Jordan:

Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties.

Government Code §65352.3 and §65352.4 require local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose of avoiding, protecting, and/or mitigating impacts to cultural places when creating or amending General Plans, Specific Plans and Community Plans.

The law does not preclude initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated within your jurisdiction. The NAHC believes that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.

The NAHC also believes that agencies should also include with their notification letters, information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the area of potential effect (APE), such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
 - A listing of any and all known cultural resources that have already been recorded or are adjacent to the APE, such as known archaeological sites;
 - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
 - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the APE; and
 - If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
 - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measures.



CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Merri Lopez-Keifer
Luiseño

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Russell Attebery
Karuk

COMMISSIONER
William Mungary
Paiute/White Mountain
Apache

COMMISSIONER
Julie Tumamait-Stenslie
Chumash

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Christina Snider
Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code §6254.10.

3. The result of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) check conducted through the Native American Heritage Commission was positive. Please contact the Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians, the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, the San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, and the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians on the attached list for more information.
4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the APE; and
5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS are not exhaustive. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the event, that they do, having the information beforehand will help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we are able to assure that our consultation list remains current.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

**Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
San Diego County
3/9/2021**

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande

Edwin Romero, Chairperson
1095 Barona Road Diegueno
Lakeside, CA, 92040
Phone: (619) 443 - 6612
Fax: (619) 443-0681
cloyd@barona-nsn.gov

Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians

Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1 Diegueno
Campo, CA, 91906
Phone: (619) 478 - 9046
Fax: (619) 478-5818
rgoff@campo-nsn.gov

Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians

Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 6315
Fax: (619) 445-9126
michaelg@leaningrock.net

Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians

Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 6315
Fax: (619) 445-9126
wmicklin@leaningrock.net

lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel

Virgil Perez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 130 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 765 - 0845
Fax: (760) 765-0320

Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians

Rebecca Osuna, Chairperson
2005 S. Escondido Blvd. Diegueno
Escondido, CA, 92025
Phone: (760) 737 - 7628
Fax: (760) 747-8568

Jamul Indian Village

Erica Pinto, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817
epinto@jiv-nsn.gov

Jamul Indian Village

Lisa Cumper, Tribal Historic
Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4855
lcumper@jiv-nsn.gov

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians

Carmen Lucas,
P.O. Box 775 Diegueno
Pine Valley, CA, 91962
Phone: (619) 709 - 4207
Kwaaymii

La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians

Norma Contreras, Chairperson
22000 Highway 76 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA, 92061
Phone: (760) 742 - 3771

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians

Javaughn Miller, Tribal
Administrator
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
jmiller@LPtribe.net

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians

Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
8 Crestwood Road Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
LP13boots@aol.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 Resources Code and Section 6097.98 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4 et seq for the proposed Cultural Resources Technical Report for the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Project, San Diego County.

**Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
San Diego County
3/9/2021**

**Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay
Nation**

Angela Elliott Santos, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302 Diegueno
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 766 - 4930
Fax: (619) 766-4957

**Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno
Mission Indians**

Michael Linton, Chairperson
P.O. Box 270 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA, 92070
Phone: (760) 782 - 3818
Fax: (760) 782-9092
mesagrandeband@msn.com

Pala Band of Mission Indians

Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic
Preservation Officer
PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Cupeno
Rd. Luiseno
Pala, CA, 92059
Phone: (760) 891 - 3515
Fax: (760) 742-3189
sgaughen@palatribe.com

Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians

Temet Aguilar, Chairperson
P.O. Box 369 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA, 92061
Phone: (760) 742 - 1289
Fax: (760) 742-3422
bennaecalac@aol.com

**Pechanga Band of Luiseno
Indians**

Mark Macarro, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1477 Luiseno
Temecula, CA, 92593
Phone: (951) 770 - 6000
Fax: (951) 695-1778
epreston@pechanga-nsn.gov

Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians

Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson
One Government Center Lane Luiseno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 1051
Fax: (760) 749-5144
bomazzetti@aol.com

Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians

Cheryl Madrigal, Tribal Historic
Preservation Officer
One Government Center Lane Luiseno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 297 - 2635
crd@rincon-nsn.gov

**San Luis Rey Band of Mission
Indians**

San Luis Rey, Tribal Council
1889 Sunset Drive Luiseno
Vista, CA, 92081
Phone: (760) 724 - 8505
Fax: (760) 724-2172
cjmojado@slrmissionindians.org

**San Pasqual Band of Diegueno
Mission Indians**

Allen Lawson, Chairperson
P.O. Box 365 Diegueno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
allenl@sanpasqualtribe.org

**Soboba Band of Luiseno
Indians**

Isaiah Vivanco, Chairperson
P. O. Box 487 Cahuilla
San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Luiseno
Phone: (951) 654 - 5544
Fax: (951) 654-4198
ivivanco@soboba-nsn.gov

**Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay
Nation**

Cody Martinez, Chairperson
1 Kwaaypaay Court Kumeyaay
El Cajon, CA, 92019
Phone: (619) 445 - 2613
Fax: (619) 445-1927
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov

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 Resources Code and Section 6097.98 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4 et seq for the proposed Cultural Resources Technical Report for the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Project, San Diego County.

**Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
San Diego County
3/9/2021**

***Viejas Band of Kumeyaay
Indians***

John Christman, Chairperson
1 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 3810
Fax: (619) 445-5337

Diegueno

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 Resources Code and Section 6097.98 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4 et seq for the proposed Cultural Resources Technical Report for the City of Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Project, San Diego County.



NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION



February 17, 2021

Darren Parker
City of Escondido
201 North Broadway
Escondido, CA 92025

Re: 2021020263, Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Project, San Diego County

Dear Mr. Parker:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Merri Lopez-Keifer
Luiseño

PARLIAMENTARIAN
Russell Attebery
Karuk

COMMISSIONER
William Mungary
Paiute/White Mountain
Apache

COMMISSIONER
Julie Tumamait-
Stenslie
Chumash

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Christina Snider
Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

- 1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project:** Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:

 - a. A brief description of the project.
 - b. The lead agency contact information.
 - c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
 - d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).
- 2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report:** A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).

 - a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).
- 3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe:** The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:

 - a. Alternatives to the project.
 - b. Recommended mitigation measures.
 - c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
- 4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation:** The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:

 - a. Type of environmental review necessary.
 - b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
 - c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
 - d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
- 5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process:** With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).
- 6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document:** If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:

 - a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
 - b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

- 7. Conclusion of Consultation:** Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
- a.** The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
 - b.** A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).
- 8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).
- 9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).
- 10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
- a.** Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
 - i.** Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
 - ii.** Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
 - b.** Treating 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:
 - i.** Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
 - ii.** Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
 - iii.** Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
 - c.** Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
 - d.** Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
 - e.** Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
 - f.** Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).
- 11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
- a.** The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
 - b.** The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
 - c.** The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf.

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).
2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.
3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).
4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
 - a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
 - b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>.

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
 - a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.

- b.** The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.
- 3.** Contact the NAHC for:
- a.** A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
 - b.** A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.
- 4.** Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
- a.** Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
 - b.** Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
 - c.** Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address:

Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse

Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians

CULTURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

One Government Center Lane | Valley Center | CA 92082
(760) 749-1051 | Fax: (760) 749-8901 | rincon-nsn.gov



March 3, 2021

Sent via email: dparker@escondido.org

City of Escondido
Planning Division
Darren Parker
201 North Broadway
Escondido, CA 92025

Re: Response to Notice of Preparation and Notice of Scoping Meeting for the Housing and Community Investment Study Program Environmental Impact Report; City Project Number: PHG 20-0028; PHG 20-0029; PHG 20-0030

Dear Mr. Parker,

This letter is written on behalf of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (“Rincon Band” or “Band”), a federally recognized Indian Tribe and sovereign government. We have received your Notice of Preparation and Notice of Scoping Meeting for the Housing and Community Investment Study Program Environmental Impact Report, and we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. The identified location is within the Traditional Use Area (TUA) of the Luiseño people and within the Band’s specific Area of Historic Interest (AHI). As such, Rincon is traditionally and culturally affiliated to the project area.

From the provided documents and previous consultation on the project, the Band kindly asks the City to reiterate that consultation with the affiliated Tribes early in the process will be critical to eliminate zone changes and potential development for areas with significant cultural resources or other tribal cultural resources. Furthermore, the Rincon Band would like to continue consultation on standardized mitigation measures that can be applied when physical construction of any project sites.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office at your convenience at (760) 297-2635 or via electronic mail at cmadrigal@rincon-nsn.gov. Thank you for the opportunity to protect and preserve our cultural assets.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Madrigal
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Cultural Resources Manager



April 2, 2021

[Tribe Name]
[Addressee, Title]
[Address]
[City, State, Zip Code]

Re: Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study, Escondido, San Diego County, California

Dear [Name],

The City of Escondido (City) is proposing a Housing and Community Investment Study (Housing Study) that would identify the City's housing needs and establish clear goals and objectives to inform future housing decisions with a particular focus on the East Valley Specific Plan (EVSP) area. The Housing Study would cover the City and its Sphere of Influence, located in northern San Diego County (County). ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) has been retained to produce a Cultural Resources Technical Report. No ground disturbing is planned for this project. The cultural resources technical study will inform the City regarding areas which may be culturally sensitive for prehistoric or historic archaeological resources and historic built environment resources.

A records search of the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File was conducted, and the results were positive.

We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the Project area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Tribal Cultural Resources, Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed Project, AB-52 consultation will be conducted by the City of Escondido. We appreciate any input you may have on the Project and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at. (760) 804-5757 or at bwilliams@asmaffiliates.com. Again, any information you provide will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian Williams', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brian Williams, M.M.A., RPA
Director
ASM Affiliates, Inc.

ATTACHMENT:

Figure 1. Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Location.




Figure 1. Escondido Housing and Community Investment Study Location.

