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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY/ABSTRACT

The following historic resources study was prepared to assess potential impacts to the existing single-family residence located at 2510 Summit Drive as part of the Summit Estates Project. This study has been prepared on behalf of 2510 Summit, LLC in conformance with the environmental review requirements of the County of San Diego and the statutory requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project proposes the demolition of the single-family residence at 2510 Summit Drive and the development of 20 single-family residential lots. The project is located southeast of the intersection of Summit Drive and Palma Vista in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area of San Diego County, California. The project is located within the former Rancho Rincon del Diablo on the 7.5-minute, United States Geological Survey (USGS) Escondido, California topographic quadrangle, Township 12 South, Range 2 West (projected) and includes Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 237-090-05.

The purpose of this study was to locate and record any historic resources present within the project and subsequently evaluate any resources as part of the County of San Diego’s environmental review process conducted in compliance with County of San Diego guidelines and CEQA. The historic investigation of the project also included the review of an archaeological records search performed at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) at San Diego State University (SDSU) in order to assess previous historic studies and identify any previously recorded historic resources within the project boundaries or in the immediate vicinity. A review of the records search provided by the SCIC indicates that 32 cultural resources and one historic address have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the project, two of which are located within the project (P-37-038444, the 2510 Summit Drive building recorded by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. [BFSA] during the current study, and SDI-22,651, a bedrock milling feature recorded by LSA Associates, Inc. [LSA] during the 2019 cultural resources survey of the subject property [Brodie 2019]).

The historic resources survey was conducted on May 28, 2019. The project was easily accessible and no constraints were encountered. During the survey, P-37-038444 was discovered and recorded. Site P-37-038444 consists of the 2510 Summit Avenue building, which was constructed in 1936 as a single-family residence with a detached garage. The building has been extensively modified since that time. Based upon the age of the building, a historic structure evaluation was conducted to determine the potential significance of the 2510 Summit Drive building. Site P-37-038444 was evaluated as having limited significance and no historic importance under County of San Diego and CEQA criteria and, as such, the site is not considered a CEQA-significant Historical Resource. Although impacts to the property will directly affect P-37-038444, they will not be adverse and mitigation of any direct impacts to P-37-038444 will not be required. The bedrock milling feature (SDI-22,651) identified on the property by LSA in 2019 (Brodie 2019) was noted within the current project boundaries; however, the prehistoric site is not associated with the 2510 Summit Drive building.
A copy of this report will be permanently filed with the SCIC at SDSU. All notes, photographs, and other materials related to this project will be curated at the BFSA archaeological laboratory in Poway, California.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Description

The historic resources study for the Summit Estates Project was conducted in order to comply with CEQA and County of San Diego environmental guidelines. The 2510 Summit Drive (APN 237-090-05) property, which is currently partially developed with one residential building, is located southeast of the intersection of Summit Drive and Palma Vista in the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area of San Diego County, California (Figure 1.1–1). The project is located within the former Rancho Rincón del Diablo Land Grant on the 7.5-minute USGS Escondido, California topographic quadrangle, Township 12 South, Range 2 West (projected) (Figure 1.1–2). The Summit Estates Project is a planned residential community on 22.89 acres that will consist of the demolition of the existing single-family residence at 2510 Summit Drive and the development of 20 single-family residential lots (Figure 1.1–3).

1.2 Existing Conditions

1.2.1 Environmental Setting

Natural Setting

The study area lies within the foothills south of San Pasqual Valley. The region surrounding the project encompasses a system of granitic formations cut by numerous drainages. The underlying bedrock recorded for this area includes metavolcanics (Jurassic/Triassic), granodiorites (Mesozoic), and alluvial soils along the major drainages. The project is situated on moderate to steep slopes with elevations that range from 784 to 855 feet above mean sea level. The project area also includes a variety of soils that include Cieneba Fallbrook coarse rocky to sandy soils (Bowman 1973).

The biological setting of the project area is characterized by native coastal sage scrub communities in the canyons and slopes on the north and east portions of the project, while the level areas on the southern portion have plant communities associated with post-agricultural uses. These communities are heavily dependent upon the amount of precipitation that the area receives. The project area was cleared of native vegetation prior to the 1940s in order to plant orchard trees.

Cultural Setting

The project setting includes the natural, physical, geological, and biological contexts of the proposed project, as well as the cultural setting of prehistoric and historic human activities in the general area. The following sections discuss both the environmental and cultural settings at the subject property, the relationship between the two, and the relevance of that relationship to the project.
Figure 1.1–1
General Location Map
The Summit Estates Project
DeLorme (1:250,000)
Figure 1.1–3
Project Development Map
The Summit Estates Project
Paleoenvironment

Because of the close relationship between prehistoric settlement and subsistence patterns and the environment, it is necessary to understand the setting in which these systems operated. At the end of the final period of glaciation, approximately 11,000 to 10,000 years before the present (YBP), the sea level was considerably lower than it is now; the coastline at that time would have been two to two and a half miles west of its present location (Smith and Moriarty 1985a, 1985b). At approximately 7,000 YBP, the sea level rose rapidly, filling in many coastal canyons that had been dry during the glacial period. The period between 7,000 and 4,000 YBP was characterized by conditions that were drier and warmer than they were previously, followed by a cooler, moister environment similar to the present-day climate (Robbins-Wade 1990). Changes in sea level and coastal topography are often manifested in archaeological sites through the types of shellfish that were utilized by prehistoric groups. Different species of shellfish prefer certain types of environments and dated sites that contain shellfish remains reflect the setting that was exploited by the prehistoric occupants.

Pollen studies have not been conducted for this area of San Diego; however, studies in other areas of southern California, such as Santa Barbara, indicate that the coastal plains supported a pine forest between approximately 12,000 and 8,000 YBP (Robbins-Wade 1990). After 8,000 YBP, this environment was replaced by more open habitats, which supported oak and non-arboreal communities. The coastal sage scrub and chaparral environments of today appear to have become dominant after 2,200 YBP (Robbins-Wade 1990).

Prehistory

In general, the prehistoric record of San Diego County has been documented in many reports and studies, several of which represent the earliest scientific works concerning the recognition and interpretation of the archaeological manifestations present in this region. Geographer Malcolm Rogers initiated the recordation of sites in the area in the 1920s and 1930s, using his field notes to construct the first cultural sequences based upon artifact assemblages and stratigraphy (Rogers 1966). Subsequent scholars expanded the information gathered by Rogers and offered more academic interpretations of the prehistoric record. Moriarty (1966, 1967, 1969), Warren (1964, 1966), and True (1958, 1966) all produced seminal works that critically defined the various prehistoric cultural phenomena present in this region (Moratto 1984). Additional studies have sought to further refine these earlier works (Cardenas 1986; Moratto 1984; Moriarty 1966, 1967; True 1970, 1980, 1986; True and Beemer 1982; True and Pankey 1985; Waugh 1986).

In sharp contrast, the current trend in San Diego prehistory has also resulted in a revisionist group that rejects the established cultural historical sequence for San Diego. This revisionist group (Warren et al. 1998) has replaced the concepts of La Jolla, San Dieguito, and all of their other manifestations with an extensive, all-encompassing, chronologically undifferentiated cultural unit that ranges from the initial occupation of southern California to around A.D. 1000 (Bull 1983, 1987; Ezell 1983, 1987; Gallegos 1987; Kyle et al. 1990; Stropes 2007). For the present study,
the prehistory of the region is divided into four major periods: Early Man, Paleo Indian, Early Archaic, and Late Prehistoric.

**Early Man Period (Prior to 8500 B.C.)**

At the present time, there has been no concrete archaeological evidence to support the occupation of San Diego County prior to 10,500 years ago. Some archaeologists, such as Carter (1957, 1980) and Minshall (1976), have been proponents of Native American occupation of the region as early as 100,000 years ago. However, their evidence for such claims is sparse at best, and they have lost much support over the years as more precise dating techniques have become available for skeletal remains thought to represent early man in San Diego. In addition, many of the “artifacts” initially identified as products of early man in the region have since been rejected as natural products of geologic activity. Some of the local proposed Early Man Period sites include Texas Street, Buchanan Canyon, Brown, Mission Valley (San Diego River Valley), Del Mar, and La Jolla (Bada et al. 1974; Carter 1957, 1980; Minshall 1976, 1989; Moriarty and Minshall 1972; Reeves 1985; Reeves et al. 1986).

**Paleo Indian Period (8500 to 6000 B.C.)**

For the region, it is generally accepted that the earliest identifiable culture in the archaeological record is represented by the material remains of the Paleo Indian Period San Dieguito Complex. The San Dieguito Complex was thought to represent the remains of a group of people who occupied sites in this region between 10,500 and 8,000 YBP, and who were related to or contemporaneous with groups in the Great Basin. As of yet, no absolute dates have been forthcoming to support the great age attributed to this cultural phenomenon. The artifacts recovered from San Dieguito Complex sites duplicate the typology attributed to the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition (Moratto 1984; Davis et al. 1969). These artifacts generally include scrapers, choppers, large bifaces, and large projectile points, with few milling tools. Tools recovered from San Dieguito Complex sites, along with the general pattern of their site locations, led early researchers to believe that the people of the San Dieguito Complex were a wandering hunter/gatherer society (Moriarty 1969; Rogers 1966).

The San Dieguito Complex is the least understood of the cultures that have inhabited the San Diego County region. This is due to an overall lack of stratigraphic information and/or datable materials recovered from sites identified as belonging to the San Dieguito Complex. Currently, controversy exists among researchers regarding the relationship of the San Dieguito Complex and the subsequent cultural manifestation in the area, the La Jolla Complex. Although, firm evidence has not been recovered to indicate whether the San Dieguito Complex “evolved” into the La Jolla Complex, the people of the La Jolla Complex moved into the area and assimilated with the people of the San Dieguito Complex, or the people of the San Dieguito Complex retreated from the area because of environmental or cultural pressures.
Early Archaic Period (6000 B.C. to A.D. 0)

Based upon evidence suggesting climatic shifts and archaeologically observable changes in subsistence strategies, a new cultural pattern is believed to have emerged in the San Diego region around 6000 B.C. Archaeologists believe that this Archaic Period pattern evolved from or replaced the San Dieguito Complex culture, resulting in a pattern referred to as the Encinitas Tradition. In San Diego, the Encinitas Tradition is believed to be represented by the coastal La Jolla Complex and its inland manifestation, the Pauma Complex. The La Jolla Complex is best recognized for its pattern of shell middens and grinding tools closely associated with marine resources and flexed burials (Shumway et al. 1961; Smith and Moriarty 1985a, 1985b). Increasing numbers of inland sites have been identified as dating to the Archaic Period, which focused upon terrestrial subsistence (Cardenas 1986; Smith 1996; Raven-Jennings and Smith 1999a, 1999b).

The tool typology of the La Jolla Complex displays a wide range of sophistication in the lithic manufacturing techniques used to create the tools found at their sites. Scrapers, the dominant flaked tool type, were created by either splitting cobbles or by finely flaking quarried material. Evidence suggests that after about 8,200 YBP, milling tools began to appear in La Jolla Complex sites. Inland sites of the Encinitas Tradition (Pauma Complex) exhibit a reduced quantity of marine-related food refuse and contain large quantities of milling tools and food bone. The lithic tool assemblage shifts slightly to encompass the procurement and processing of terrestrial resources, suggesting seasonal migration from the coast to the inland valleys (Smith 1996). At the present time, the transition from the Archaic Period to the Late Prehistoric Period is not well understood. Many questions remain concerning cultural transformation between periods, possibilities of ethnic replacement, and/or a possible hiatus from the western portion of the county.

Late Prehistoric Period (A.D. 0 to 1769)

For the following discussion regarding the Late Prehistoric Period, both the Kumeyaay and Luiseño cultures are represented, as the project area is situated in proximity to the tribal territorial boundaries of both Native American groups. For the topics of subsistence and settlement, social organization, and material culture, only the Luiseño are discussed as an example of Late Prehistoric Period Native American lifeways in the region.

The transition into the Late Prehistoric Period is primarily represented by a marked change in archaeological patterning known as the Yuman Tradition. This tradition is primarily represented by the Cuyamaca Complex, which is believed to have derived from the mountains of southern San Diego County. The people of the Cuyamaca Complex are considered ancestral to the ethnohistoric Kumeyaay (Diegueño). Although several archaeologists consider the local Native American tribes to be relatively latecomers, the traditional stories and histories passed down through oral tradition by the local Native American groups speak both presently and ethnographically to their presence here since the creation of all things.

The Kumeyaay Native Americans were a seasonal hunting and gathering people with cultural elements that were very distinct from the people of the La Jolla Complex. Noted variations
in material culture include cremation, the use of the bow and arrow, and adaptation to the use of the acorn as a main food staple (Moratto 1984). Along the coast, the Kumeyaay made use of marine resources by fishing and collecting shellfish for food. Seasonally available plant food resources (including acorns) and game were sources of nourishment for the Kumeyaay. By far, the most important food resource for these people was the acorn. The acorn represented a storable surplus, which in turn allowed for seasonal sedentism and its attendant expansion of social phenomena.

Firm evidence has not been recovered to indicate whether the people of the La Jolla Complex were present when the Kumeyaay Native Americans migrated into the coastal zone. However, stratigraphic information recovered from Site SDI-4609 in Sorrento Valley may suggest a hiatus of 650 ± 100 years between the occupation of the coastal area by the La Jolla Complex (1,730 ± 75 YBP is the youngest date for the La Jolla Complex inhabitants at SDI-4609) and Late Prehistoric cultures (Smith and Moriarty 1983). A reevaluation of two prone burials at the Spindrift Site excavated by Moriarty (1965) and radiocarbon dates of a pre-ceramic phase of Yuman occupation near Santee suggest a comingling of the latest La Jolla Complex inhabitants and the earliest Yuman inhabitants about 2,000 years ago (Kyle and Gallegos 1993).

Approximately 1,300 YBP, a Shoshonean-speaking group from the Great Basin region moved into northern San Diego County, marking the transition to the Late Prehistoric Period. This period is characterized by higher population densities and development in social, political, and technological systems. Economic systems diversified and intensified during this period, with the continued elaboration of trade networks, the use of shell-bead currency, and the appearance of more labor-intensive, yet effective, technological innovations. Technological developments during this period include the introduction of the bow and arrow between A.D. 400 and 600. Atlatl darts were replaced by smaller arrow darts, including the Cottonwood series points. Other hallmarks of the Late Prehistoric Period include cremation of the dead and extensive trade networks as far reaching as the Colorado River Basin.

The period is divided into two phases based upon the introduction of pottery: San Luis Rey I and San Luis Rey II (Meighan 1954). Radiocarbon dating and the introduction of pottery established that San Luis Rey II began at approximately A.D. 1300. San Luis Rey I is characterized by the use of portable shaped or unshaped slab metates and nonportable bedrock milling features. Manos and pestles can also be shaped or unshaped. Cremations, bone awls, and stone and shell ornaments are also prominent in the material culture. The later San Luis Rey II assemblage is augmented by pottery, which consisted of cooking and storage vessels, cremation urns, and polychrome pictographs, or rock art, which likely appeared as the result of increased population sizes and increased sedentism (True et al. 1974). Flaked stone dart points are dominated by the Cottonwood Triangular series, but Desert Side-Notched, Dos Cabezas Serrated, leaf-shaped, and stemmed styles also occurred. Subsistence is thought to have focused upon the utilization of acorns, a storable species that allowed for relative sedentism and increased population sizes.

Ethnohistoric and ethnographic evidence indicates that the Shoshonean-speaking group
that occupied the northern portion of San Diego County was the Luiseño. Along the coast, the Luiseño made use of available marine resources by fishing and collecting mollusks for food. Seasonally available terrestrial resources, including acorns and game, were also sources of nourishment for Luiseño groups. The elaborate kinship and clan systems between the Luiseño and other groups facilitated a wide-reaching trade network that included trade of Obsidian Butte obsidian, resources from the eastern desert region, and steatite from the Channel Islands.

When the Spanish began exploring the region in the sixteenth century, the Luiseño occupied a territory bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the Peninsular Ranges mountains, including Palomar Mountain to the south and Santiago Peak to the north, on the south by Agua Hedionda Lagoon, and on the north by Aliso Creek in present-day San Juan Capistrano. The Luiseño were a Takic-speaking people more closely related linguistically and ethnographically to the Cahuilla, Gabrielino, and Cupeño to the north and east rather than to the Kumeyaay, a Yuman-speaking group, who occupied territory to the south. The Luiseño differed from their neighboring Takic speakers in having an extensive proliferation of social statuses, a system of ruling families that provided ethnic cohesion within the territory, a distinct world view that stemmed from use of the hallucinogen datura, and an elaborate religion that included ritualized sand paintings of the sacred being “Chingichngish” (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976). The following is a summary of ethnographic data regarding this group (Luiseño).

**Subsistence and Settlement**

The Luiseño occupied sedentary villages that were most often located in sheltered areas in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges. Villages were located near water sources to facilitate acorn leaching, and in areas that offered thermal and defensive protection. Villages comprised areas that were both publicly and privately (family) owned. Publicly owned areas included trails, temporary campsites, hunting areas, and quarry sites. Inland groups had fishing and gathering sites along the coast that were utilized, particularly from January to March, when inland food resources were scarce. During October and November, most of the village would relocate to mountain oak groves to harvest acorns. For the remainder of the year, the Luiseño remained at village sites, where food resources were within a day’s travel (Bean and Shipek 1978).

The most important food source for the Luiseño was the acorn, six different species of which were used (*Quercus californica*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus chrysolepis*, *Quercus dumosa*, *Quercus engelmannii*, and *Quercus wislizeni*). Seeds, particularly of grasses, composites, and mints, were also heavily utilized. Seed-bearing species were encouraged through controlled burns, which were conducted at least every third year. A variety of other stems, leaves, shoots, bulbs, roots, and fruits were also utilized. Hunting also augmented this vegetal diet. Animal species used for subsistence included deer, rabbit, hare, woodrat, ground squirrel, antelope, quail, duck, freshwater fish from mountain streams, and marine mammals, fish, crustaceans, and mollusks (particularly abalone [*Haliotis* sp.] from the coast. In addition, a variety of snakes, small birds,
and rodents also provided sources of food (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

**Social Organization**

Luiseño social groups consisted of patrilineal families or clans, which were politically and economically autonomous. Several clans comprised a religious party, or nota, which was headed by a chief who organized religious ceremonies and controlled economics and warfare. The chief had assistants who specialized in particular aspects of ceremonial or environmental knowledge, and who, with the chief, were part of a cultic social group with special access to supernatural power, particularly that of Chingichngish. The positions of chief and assistants were hereditary, and the complexity and multiplicity of these specialists’ roles likely increased in larger villages, notably along the coast (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Marriages were arranged by the parents, often made to forge alliances between lineages. Useful alliances included those between groups of differing ecological niches, and those that resulted in territorial expansion. Residence was patrilocal (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976). Women were primarily responsible for plant gathering, while men were responsible for hunting; however, at times, particularly during acorn and marine mollusk harvests, there was no division of labor. Elderly women cared for children, while elderly men were active participants in rituals, ceremonies, and political affairs, as well as being responsible for manufacturing hunting and ritualistic implements. Children were taught subsistence skills at the earliest age possible (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

**Material Culture**

House structures were conical, partially subterranean, and thatched with reeds, brush, or bark. Ramadas were rectangular-shaped and generally used to protect workplaces for domestic chores, including cooking. Ceremonial sweathouses, which were important in purification rituals, were round, partially subterranean, thatched structures covered with a layer of mud. Another ceremonial structure was the wámkis, which was located in the center of the village as the place of rituals, including the sand painting associated with the Chingichngish cult (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Clothing was minimal; women wore a cedar-bark, netted-twine, double apron and men wore a waist cord. In cold weather, cloaks or robes of rabbit fur, deerskin, or sea otter fur were worn by both sexes. Footwear included sandals fashioned from yucca fibers and deerskin moccasins. Adornments included bead necklaces and pendants made from bone, clay, stones, shells, bear claws, mica sheets, deer hooves, and abalone shells. Men wore ear and nose piercings made of cane or bone, which were sometimes decorated with beads (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Hunting implements included the bow and arrow. Arrows were tipped with either a carved, fire-hardened, wood tip, or a lithic point, usually fashioned from locally available Santiago Peak metavolcanic or quartz. Throwing sticks fashioned from wood were used in hunting small game,
while deer head decoys were used during deer hunts. Coastal groups fashioned dugout canoes for nearshore fishing and harvested fish with seines, nets, traps, and hooks made of bone or abalone shell (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The Luiseño had a well-developed basket industry; baskets were used in resource gathering, food preparation, storage, and food serving. Pottery containers, which were shaped by paddle and anvil and then fired in shallow, open pits, were used for food storage, cooking, and serving. Other utensils included wood implements, steatite bowls, and ground stone manos, metates, mortars, and pestles (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976). Additional tools included knives, scrapers, choppers, awls, and drills. Shamanistic items included soapstone or clay smoking pipes and crystals made of quartz or tourmaline (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Native American Perspective

In addition to the point of view discussed above, it is acknowledged herein that other perspectives exist to explain the presence of Native Americans in the region. The Native American perspective is that they have been here from the beginning, as described by their oral histories. Similarly, they do not necessarily agree with the distinction that is made between different archaeological cultures or periods, such as “La Jolla” or “San Dieguito.” Instead, they believe that there is a continuum of ancestry, from the first people to the present Native American populations of San Diego County.

Historic Period

Exploration Period (1530 to 1769)

The historic period around San Diego Bay began with the landing of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo and his men in 1542 (Chapman 1925). Sixty years after the Cabrillo expeditions (1602 to 1603), an expedition under Sebastian Vizcaíno made an extensive and thorough exploration of the Pacific coast. Although his voyage did not extend beyond the northern limits of the Cabrillo track, Vizcaíno had the most lasting effect on the nomenclature of the coast. Many of the names Vizcaíno gave to various locations throughout the region have survived to the present time, whereas nearly every one of Cabrillo’s has faded from use. For example, Cabrillo gave the name “San Miguel” to the first port at which he stopped in what is now the United States; 60 years later, Vizcaíno changed the port name to “San Diego” (Rolle 1969).

Spanish Colonial Period (1769 to 1821)

The Spanish occupation of the claimed territory of Alta California took place during the reign of King Carlos III of Spain (Engelhardt 1920). Jose de Gálvez, a powerful representative of the king in Mexico, conceived the plan to colonize Alta California and thereby secure the area for the Spanish (Rolle 1969). The effort involved both military and religious components, where the overall intent of establishing forts and missions was to gain control of the land and the native inhabitants through conversion. Actual colonization of the San Diego area began on July 16, 1769.
when the first Spanish exploring party, commanded by Gaspar de Portolá (with Father Junípero Serra in charge of religious conversion of the native populations), arrived by the overland route to San Diego to secure California for the Spanish (Palou 1926). The natural attraction of the San Diego harbor and the establishment of a military presence in the area solidified the importance of San Diego to the Spanish colonization of the region and the growth of the civilian population.

Missions were constructed from San Diego to as far north as San Francisco. The mission locations were based upon important territorial, military, and religious considerations. Land grants were made to those who applied, but many tracts reverted back to the government due to lack of use. As an extension of territorial control by the Spanish Empire, each mission was placed so as to command as much territory and as large a population as possible. While primary access to California during the Spanish Period was by sea, the route of El Camino Real served as the land route for transportation, commercial, and military activities within the colony. This route was considered to be the most direct path between the missions (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). As increasing numbers of Spanish and Mexican peoples, as well as the later Americans during the Gold Rush, settled in the area, the Native American populations diminished as they were displaced or decimated by disease (Carrico and Taylor 1983).

**Mexican Period (1821 to 1846)**

On September 16, 1810, the priest Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla started a revolt against Spanish rule. He and his untrained Native American followers fought against the Spanish; however, the revolt was unsuccessful and Father Hidalgo was executed. After this setback, Father José Morales led the revolutionaries, but he too failed and was executed. These two men are still symbols of Mexican liberty and patriotism. After the Mexican-born Spanish and the Catholic Church joined the revolution, Spain was finally defeated in 1821. Mexican Independence Day is celebrated on September 16 each year in honor of the start of Father Hidalgo’s revolt.

The revolution had repercussions in the northern territories, and by 1834, all of the mission lands had been removed from the control of the Franciscan Order under the Acts of Secularization. Without proper maintenance, the missions quickly began to disintegrate, and after 1836, missionaries ceased to make regular visits inland to minister to the Native Americans (Engelhardt 1920). Large tracts of land continued to be granted to those who applied or who had gained favor with the Mexican government. Grants of land were also made to settle government debts and the Mexican government was called upon to reaffirm some older Spanish land grants shortly before the Mexican-American War of 1846 (Moyer 1969).

**Anglo-American Period (1846 to Present)**

California was invaded by United States troops during the Mexican-American War from 1846 to 1848. The acquisition of strategic Pacific ports and California land was one of the principal objectives of the war (Price 1967). At the time, the inhabitants of California were practically defenseless, and they quickly surrendered to the United States Navy in July 1847 (Bancroft 1886).
The cattle ranchers of the “counties” of southern California prospered during the cattle boom of the early 1850s. Cattle ranching soon declined, however, contributing to the expansion of agriculture. With the passage of the “No Fence Act,” San Diego’s economy changed from stock raising to farming (Rolle 1969). The act allowed for the expansion of unfenced farms, which was crucial in an area where fencing material was practically unavailable. Five years after its passage, most of the arable lands in San Diego County had been patented as either ranchos or homesteads, and growing grain crops replaced raising cattle in many of the county’s inland valleys (Blick 1976; Elliott 1883 [1965]). By 1870, farmers had learned to dry farm and were coping with some of the peculiarities of San Diego County’s climate (San Diego Union 1868; Van Dyke 1886). Between 1869 and 1871, the amount of cultivated acreage in the county rose from less than 5,000, to more than 20,000 acres (San Diego Union 1872). Large-scale farming in San Diego County was limited by a lack of water and the small size of arable valleys, while the small urban population and poor roads restricted commercial crop growing. Nevertheless, cattle continued to be grazed in inland San Diego County (Gordinier 1966).

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the population of San Diego County continued to grow. The population of the inland county declined during the 1890s, but between 1900 and 1910, it rose by about 70 percent. The pioneering efforts were over, the railroads had broken the relative isolation of southern California, and life in San Diego County became similar to other communities throughout the west. After World War I, the history of San Diego County was primarily determined by the growth of San Diego Bay. During this time period, the history of inland San Diego County was subsidiary to that of the city of San Diego, which became a Navy center and industrial city (Heiges 1976). In inland San Diego County, agriculture became specialized and recreational areas were established in the mountain and desert areas.

**A Brief History of the Escondido Area**

After the arrival of Spanish explorers, the area that is present-day Escondido became part of the Spanish mission system. The project area is located within the Mexican land grant known as El Rincón del Diablo Rancho, which was granted to Juan Bautista Alvarado in 1843. Alvarado was prominent in Los Angeles and San Diego, holding office as a councilman in both cities in the 1830s. When Alvarado died in 1850, the rancho was sold to Oliver S. Witherby, a judge and member of California’s first state legislature. Witherby farmed and raised cattle, and in the early 1860s, began to mine the land for gold. In 1868, the judge sold the rancho to Edward McGeary and the three Wolfskill brothers (Fark 2016), who planted vineyards and raised sheep.

In 1883, the Escondido Company, a group of Stockton speculators, purchased much of the area and subdivided the property three years later (McGrew 1988). In 1886, 13 businessmen formed the Escondido Land and Town Company (ELTC) and bought the former Rincón del Diablo, subdividing the land to plant more vineyards and citrus groves (Fark 2016). In order to move products from their agricultural endeavors, the ELTC lobbied for the construction of a railroad connection to the coast (Van Wormer and Walter 1991), which was subsequently
constructed from the coastal city of Oceanside to Escondido in 1887. The ELTC, which was also influential in getting the city of Escondido incorporated in 1888, drilled several wells to provide water for the surrounding farms and the new city. In 1887, the Escondido Irrigation District was formed to build the Lake Wohlford dam and reservoir. Later, the district was reorganized and named the Escondido Mutual Water Company (Moyer 1969).

Escondido grew steadily, primarily relying upon citrus production, which continued to expand after the arrival of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad that enabled distribution to markets across the country (Alter 2011). Escondido would become a hub for citrus and other produce farming, processing, and shipping for the outlying region. The population began to expand, and residential neighborhoods were established around the groves and packing plants, providing housing for the industry workers. A small downtown commercial area arose in the late 1800s, which helped expand the economy to support a variety of businesses beyond the produce industry (Alter 2011).

Aggressive land promotions in the latter half of the 1880s drew many people to the area, and although growth had slowed considerably during the 1890s, settlers continued to arrive in the backcountry, where small farms and ranches were established. This migration took a sharp decline with the onset of the Depression in the 1930s, as many of the rural farmers abandoned their farms and moved to urban areas. The number of people living on farms fell by 63 percent in the 1930s, while San Diego County’s overall population increased by 38 percent (Van Wormer and Walter 1991). Nevertheless, farming and ranching continued to be the major focus of Escondido’s economy until the 1960s.

1.2.2 Results of the Archaeological Records Search

An archaeological records search for a one-mile radius around the project was conducted by the SCIC at SDSU. The SCIC reported that 32 cultural resource locations have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the project (Table 1.2–1), two of which are located within the project (P-37-038444, the 2510 Summit Drive building, and SDI-22,651, a bedrock milling feature recorded by LSA during the 2019 cultural resources survey of the subject property). The remainder of the sites include: a lithic scatter, prehistoric villages, habitation sites, and campsites, bedrock milling feature sites, historic structures, historic irrigation features, a historic runway, historic refuse deposits, prehistoric isolates, and a historic mine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Site Dimensions</th>
<th>Report Reference / Recorded By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDI-568</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>150x90 meters</td>
<td>Mooney &amp; Associates (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-5340</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>625x175 feet</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Site Dimensions</td>
<td>Report Reference / Recorded By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-5426</td>
<td>Prehistoric campsite</td>
<td>250x250 feet</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp; Associates (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-6910</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>2x2 meters</td>
<td>Michele Fergoda (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-10,308</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>3x3 meters</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp; Associates (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-10,309</td>
<td>Bedrock milling features</td>
<td>1x3 meters</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp; Associates (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-10,310</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>3x4 meters</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp; Associates (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-10,311</td>
<td>Bedrock milling features</td>
<td>50x20 meters</td>
<td>Paul G. Chace &amp; Associates (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-11,047</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>4x3 meters</td>
<td>Brian F. Smith (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-11,159</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>2x1 meters</td>
<td>Caltrans (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-12,537/H</td>
<td>Lithic scatter and a possible historic house location</td>
<td>100x100 meters</td>
<td>ERCE (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-12,538</td>
<td>Prehistoric habitation site or campsite</td>
<td>30x50 meters</td>
<td>ERCE (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-12,539/H</td>
<td>Historic trash scatter with one prehistoric flake</td>
<td>80x15 meters</td>
<td>ERCE (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-12,540</td>
<td>Bedrock milling features</td>
<td>10x10 meters</td>
<td>ERCE (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-12,541</td>
<td>Possible prehistoric temporary campsite</td>
<td>30x30 meters</td>
<td>ERCE (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-14,463</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>2x3 meters</td>
<td>Mooney &amp; Associates (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-14,479</td>
<td>Bedrock milling features</td>
<td>35x25 meters</td>
<td>Mooney &amp; Associates (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-019064</td>
<td>Escondido Gravity Float Line</td>
<td>1.4 miles long</td>
<td>Tierra Environmental Services (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-15,984</td>
<td>Bedrock milling feature</td>
<td>3x1.5 meters</td>
<td>Tierra Environmental Services (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI-17,081</td>
<td>Cleveland-Pacific Mine</td>
<td>100x60 feet</td>
<td>Frank Lorey, Historical Archaeology Services (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, 73 cultural resource studies have been conducted within a one-mile radius of the project (see Table 1.2–2 in Appendix D), two of which overlap portions of the project boundaries (City of Escondido 1980; De Barros 2009). Neither the City of Escondido Draft Environmental Impact Report (City of Escondido 1980) nor the Professional Archaeological Services cultural resources survey (De Barros 2009) identified any cultural resources. Although not recorded with the SCIC, the cultural resources survey conducted by LSA in 2019 for the Summit Estates Project (Brodie 2019) identified one bedrock milling feature site (SDI -22,651) within the current project boundaries.

The SCIC search indicates that one historic address has been recorded within a one-mile radius of the project (1445 Navel Place [P-37-028195]). The 2510 Summit Drive building, which BFSA recorded as P-37-038444 with the SCIC, was constructed in 1936 and is discussed and evaluated in Section 4.0. Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms were prepared for the building and submitted to the SCIC at SDSU (Appendix B).

The following historic sources were also reviewed:

- The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Index
- The Office of Historic Preservation, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility
- The Office of Historic Preservation, Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File
- The Historic American Buildings Survey Index
- 1946, 1964, 1980, and 1989 historic aerial photographs
- 1901 (1929 Edition) and 1949 Escondido USGS topographic quadrangle maps (7.5-
1.3 Applicable Regulations

Resource importance is assigned to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess exceptional value or quality illustrating or interpreting the heritage of San Diego County in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. A number of criteria are used in demonstrating resource importance. Specifically, criteria outlined in CEQA, the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and the San Diego County Local Register provide the guidance for making such a determination. The following sections detail the criteria that a resource must meet in order to be determined important.

1.3.1 California Environmental Quality Act

According to CEQA, Section 15064.5(a), the term “historical resource” includes the following:

1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by, the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Public Resources Code [PRC] SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR. Section 4850 et seq.).

2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3) 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 may be considered a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (PRC SS5024.1, Title 14, Section 4852), including the following:

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

4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1[k] of the PRC), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1[g] of the PRC) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

According to CEQA, Section 15064.5(b), 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. CEQA defines a substantial adverse change as:

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

2) 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 a 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 a 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 a 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.

Section 15064.5(c) of CEQA applies to effects upon archaeological sites and contains the following additional provisions regarding archaeological sites:
1. When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is a historical resource, as defined in subsection (a).

2. If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is a historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the PRC, 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 subsection (a) but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21803.2 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 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 upon it are noted in the Initial Study or Environmental Impact Report, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

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

(d) When an Initial Study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood of, Native American human remains within the project, the lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), as provided in PRC SS5097.98. 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:

1) 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).

2) The requirements of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

### 1.3.2 San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register)

The County requires that resource importance be assessed not only at the state level as required by CEQA, but also at the local level. If a resource meets any one of the following criteria as outlined in the Local Register, it will be considered an important resource:
1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Diego County’s history and cultural heritage;

2) Is associated with the lives of persons important to the history of San Diego or its communities;

3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, San Diego County region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

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

### 1.3.3 County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance

The County of San Diego’s RPO protects significant cultural resources. The RPO defines “Significant Prehistoric or Historic Sites” as follows:

Location of past intense human occupation where buried cultural deposits can provide information regarding important scientific research questions about prehistoric or historic activities that have scientific, religious, or other ethnic value of local, regional, state, or federal importance. Such locations shall include, but not be limited to:

1) Any prehistoric or historic district, site, interrelated collection of features or artifacts, building, structure, or object either:

   a) Formally determined eligible or listed in the NRHP by the Keeper of the National Register; or
   b) To which the Historic Resource (‘H’ Designator) Special Area Regulations have been applied; or

2) One-of-a-kind, locally unique, or regionally unique cultural resources, which contain a significant volume and range of data and materials; and

3) Any location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances, which is either:

   a) Protected under Public Law 95-341, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, or PRC Section 5097.9, such as burial(s), pictographs, petroglyphs, solstice observatory sites, sacred shrines, religious ground figures; or
   b) Other formally designated and recognized sites, which are of ritual, ceremonial, or sacred value to any prehistoric or historic ethnic group.
The RPO does not allow non-exempt activities or uses damaging to significant prehistoric or historic lands on properties under County of San Diego jurisdiction. The only exempt activity is scientific investigation authorized by the County. All discretionary projects are required to be in conformance with applicable County of San Diego standards related to cultural resources, including the noted RPO criteria for prehistoric and historic sites. Non-compliance would result in a project that is inconsistent with the County’s standards.
2.0 GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

Pursuant to County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources (September 26, 2006; Revised December 5, 2007), any of the following will be considered a significant impact to cultural resources:

1) The project, as designed, causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
2) The project, as designed, causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
3) The project, as designed, disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
4) The project proposes non-exempt activities or uses damaging to, and fails to preserve, significant cultural resources as defined by the RPO.

Guidelines 1 and 2 are derived directly from CEQA. Sections 21083.2 and 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines require evaluating historical and archaeological resources to determine whether or not a proposed action would have a significant effect upon unique historical or archaeological resources. Guideline 3 is included because human remains must be treated with dignity and respect, and CEQA requires consultation with the “Most Likely Descendant,” as identified by the NAHC, for any project in which human remains have been identified. Guideline 4 was selected because the RPO requires that cultural resources be considered when assessing environmental impacts. Any project that would have an adverse impact (direct, indirect, or cumulative) upon significant cultural resources, as defined by Guideline 4, would be considered a significant impact. The only exemption is scientific investigation. For the purposes of this study, only Guidelines 1 and 4 apply.
3.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

The primary goal of the research design is to attempt to understand the way in which humans have used the land and resources within the project through time, as well as to aid in the determination of resource significance. For the current project, the study area under investigation is the foothills of San Diego County. The scope of work for the historic resources study conducted for the Summit Estates Project included the evaluation of the 2510 Summit Drive building, which has been recorded as Site P-37-038444 as part of the current study (Appendix B). Given the area involved and the recorded presence of a historic site, the research design for this project was focused upon realistic study options. Since the main objective of the investigation was to identify the presence of and potential impacts to historic resources, the goal was not necessarily to answer wide-reaching theories regarding the development of early southern California, but to investigate the role and importance of the identified resources. Nevertheless, the assessment of the significance of a resource must take into consideration a variety of characteristics, as well as the ability of the resource to address regional research topics and issues.

Although historic structure evaluations are limited in terms of the amount of information available, several specific research questions were developed that could be used to guide the initial investigations of any observed historic resources.

Research Questions:
- Can the building be associated with any significant individuals or events?
- Is the building representative of a specific type, style, or method of construction?
- Is the building associated with any nearby structures? Does the building, when studied with the nearby structures, qualify as a contributor to a potential historic district?
- Was the building designed or constructed by a significant architect, designer, builder, or contractor?

Data Needs

The overall goal is to understand the construction and use of the building within its associated historic context. Therefore, adequate information on site function, context, and chronology from a historic perspective is essential for the investigation. The fieldwork and archival research were undertaken with the following primary research goals in mind:

1) To identify historic resources occurring within the project;
2) To determine the type, style, and method of construction for the building;
3) To identify persons or events associated with the building and its construction; and
4) To provide recommendations for the treatment of any historic resources identified.
4.0 ANALYSIS OF PROJECT EFFECTS

The historic resources study of the project consisted of an institutional records search, a historic resources survey of the area surrounding Site P-37-038444, and the detailed recordation of the 2510 Summit Drive building. This study was conducted in conformance with County of San Diego environmental guidelines, Section 21083.2 of the California PRC, and CEQA. Statutory requirements of CEQA (Section 15064.5) were followed for the identification of historic resources, in addition to the County of San Diego RPO. Specific definitions for historic resource type(s) used in this report are those established by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO 1995).

4.1 Methods

4.1.1 Archival Research

Records relating to the ownership and developmental history of this project were sought to identify any associated historic persons, historic events, or architectural significance. Records research was conducted at the BFSA research library, the SCIC, the San Diego Historical Society, the Escondido History Center, the San Diego Public Library, and the offices of the San Diego Assessor/County Recorder/County Clerk. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps were searched for at the San Diego Public Library. Title records for the property were also obtained. Appendix E contains maps of the property, including historic USGS maps from 1929 and 1949, the original subdivision map, and the current Assessor’s parcel map (Figures 1 through 4). No Sanborn maps are available for the property as it is located outside the Escondido coverage area.

4.1.2 Survey Methods

The survey methodology employed during the current investigation followed standard field procedures and was sufficient to accomplish a thorough assessment of the project. Archaeologist David Grabski conducted a thorough pedestrian reconnaissance of the Site P-37-038444 area on May 28, 2019 under the direction of Principal Investigator Brian Smith. The field methodology employed for the project included a photographic survey of the 2510 Summit Drive building. Preparation of architectural descriptions was conducted in the field and supplemented with photographic documentation. All discovered resources were recorded according to the Office of Historic Preservation’s manual, Instructions for Recording Historical Resources, using DPR forms.

4.1.3 Structural Assessment

Methods for evaluating the integrity and significance of the 2510 Summit Drive building included photographic documentation and a review of available building records and permits. During the survey, photographs were taken of all elevations. The photographs were used to complete an architectural description of the building. The original core structure and all
modifications made to the building since its initial construction were also recorded. The current setting of the building was compared to the historic setting of the property. This information was combined with the archival research in order to evaluate the building’s seven aspects of integrity, as well as its potential architectural significance based upon the architectural definitions provided in Virginia McAlester’s (2015) *A Field Guide to American Houses: The Definitive Guide to Identifying and Understanding America’s Domestic Architecture*.

### 4.2 Survey Results

The survey methodology employed during the current investigation followed standard field procedures and was sufficient to accomplish a thorough assessment of the project. The historic resources survey of the property was focused upon the built environment and identified one historic residence at 2510 Summit Drive, which has been recorded as Site P-37-038444 (Plates 4.2–1 and 4.2–2). The location of the building is illustrated on Figure 4.2–1. The bedrock milling feature (SDI-22,651) identified on the property by LSA in 2019 (Brodie 2019) was noted within the current project boundaries; however, the prehistoric site is not associated with the 2510 Summit Drive building.

### 4.3 Field Investigation

Included below are the pertinent field results for the significance evaluation of the 2510 Summit Drive building, which has been assigned the primary number P-37-038444 by the SCIC. The significance evaluation was implemented for the building in accordance with County of San Diego guidelines and site evaluation protocols on June 3, 2019. The 2510 Summit Drive building was constructed in 1936 as a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence with a detached garage owned by Kenneth Westover and Elizabeth Westover, née McLucas. Provided below is a description and significance evaluation of the historic resource.

**History of the Project Area**

The subject property, which was originally owned by the ELTC, was purchased in 1936 by Kenneth Allan and Elizabeth McLucas Westover. That same year, the original 2510 Summit Drive residence and detached garage were constructed on the property. Kenneth Westover was born in London, England in 1909 and Elizabeth Westover was born in Nebraska in 1909. The couple was married in Los Angeles in 1932 (*Los Angeles Times* 1932). In 1933, Elizabeth Westover’s parents, Judge Victor and Mrs. Eva McLucas, both passed away, leaving Westover an estate worth approximately $50,000 (*Los Angeles Times* 1933). In 1935, the Westovers resided in Los Angeles before relocating to Escondido and constructing the 2510 Summit Drive building in 1936, which is visible in a 1946 aerial photograph (Plate 4.3–1).
Plate 4.2–1
East Façade of the Building, Facing Northwest
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Northeast Corner of the Building, Facing Southwest
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Figure 4.2–1

Historic Resource Location Map
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USGS Escondido Quadrangle (1:24,000 series)
In 1938, Westover was listed in the San Diego County directory as a “grove owner” residing on Summit Drive in Escondido. In 1940, the Westovers were recorded in the census as residing on San Pasqual Road with their 1-year-old foster son, Allen Barber. At the time, Summit Drive was not listed in the census at all. While the census lists Kenneth Westover’s occupation as a retail gas and oil station attendant, all directories list him as a rancher or grove owner.

A plumbing permit was issued to K.A. Westover of Escondido in 1950 for one fixture. The work was completed by C.A. Heard. It is unclear what the permit may have been for, as no known modifications were made to the building at that time.

Between 1940 and 1950, Kenneth and Elizabeth Westover were divorced, and Kenneth Westover remarried in 1951. In 1952, he transferred ownership of the property to Elizabeth, who began to use her maiden name McLucas after the divorce. In 1953, the property was sold to K. and Erika Behdjou via Clair M. Houghtelin, guardian of the Elizabeth McLucas Estate. Houghtelin and his father Abram L. Houghtelin helped develop the orange and avocado groves in the area and constructed the large tepee on an adjacent hill in the 1930s (San Diego Union 1934).

In 1953, the same year it was purchased by the Behdjous, the property was sold to Miguel Velez, who, with his wife Ulla, sold it a year later to John and Mary Blodgett. While the property was owned by the Blodgetts, all subsequent modifications were made to the original 2510 Summit Drive building. In 1963, the original detached garage was converted to living space and enclosed patio additions were constructed on the north façade of the residence and west façade of the garage (Plates 4.3–2 to 4.3–4). The 1963 modifications were likely made for the Blodgetts’ son John III, who is first listed as residing at 2510 Summit Drive in the 1963 directory. In 1966, the Blodgetts’ daughter Florence is listed as residing at 2510 Summit Drive. John III was married in 1971 and from 1972 to 1975, he and his wife, Patricia, lived at 2510 Summit Drive with the Blodgetts.

Between 1980 and 1989, the enclosed patio on the west side of the original garage was removed and an attached two-car garage was constructed in its place on the north façade of the remaining enclosed patio addition (Plate 4.3–5). Mary Blodgett passed away in 1980 and John remarried in 1981. His second wife, Anna Dreher Floyd, passed away in 1994. Blodgett continued to live at 2510 Summit Avenue until his death in 1999.

In 2000, the property was transferred to Duane and Patsey Anderson. That year, “Diane Anderson,” likely a typo of Duane, was listed as residing at the home. The address was not listed in directories between 2001 and 2010, and was then occupied by “Dan Anderson” in 2011. Duane Anderson passed away in 2011 and the property was transferred to Patsey Anderson. Between 2012 and 2018, the directory lists only “XXXX” for the 2510 Summit Drive address.
Plate 4.3–2

East Façade of the Building Showing the 1963 Enclosed Porch (Center) and Converted Garage (Right), Facing North
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Plate 4.3–3

East Façade of the Building Showing the 1963 Enclosed Porch (Center) and Converted Garage (Right), Facing Northwest
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Plate 4.3–4

West Façade of the Building Showing the 1963 Enclosed Porch Between the Original Residence (Right) and the 1980 to 1989 Garage Addition (Left), Facing Northeast
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Plate 4.3–5

North Façade of the Building Showing the 1980 to 1989 Two-Car Garage Addition (Right), Facing Southeast
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**Description of Surveyed Resources**

According to the Residential Building Record, the 2510 Summit Drive building was constructed in 1936 as a cross-gabled, gable-and-wing, Minimal Traditional-style, single-story, single-family residence with a detached garage, both of which were built on concrete foundations. Due to various modifications that have been made to the building over time, the 2510 Summit Drive building’s form is no longer representative of the gable-and-wing, Minimal Traditional style and instead currently resembles a highly modified, Ranch-style residence with Modern Contemporary-style elements.

The building was originally constructed using standard wood frame construction and clad in smooth stucco with horizontal wood siding present in the gable ends. The bottom row of the horizontal wood siding is scalloped above the transition to smooth stucco (Plate 4.3–6). This is the only decoration present on the original portion of the building.

The original portion of the roof is cross-gabled with a moderate eave overhang and is covered in composite shingles (Plates 4.3–7 and 4.3–8). Fenestration in the original portion of the building has been retained, except for one window on the south façade (Plate 4.3–9), and consists of multi-pane, wood-framed, double-hung windows. The replacement window is aluminum-framed and horizontal-sliding (see Plate 4.3–9). The original front entryway appears to have been located on the west façade of the residence in the ell created by the gable-and-wing footprint (Plate 4.3–10). With the conversion of the original garage into living space, however, it appears that the enclosed concrete patio area with the porch on the east façade of the residence became the preferred main entryway (see Plate 4.3–3).

In 1963, enclosed concrete patios were constructed on the north façade of the residence and the west façade of the detached garage, connecting the two and exhibiting a shed-style porch roof (see Plates 4.3–2 to 4.3–4). That same year, the original detached garage was converted into living space, which resulted in the installation of new doors and windows and hipping of the once gabled roof on the north end (see Plates 4.3–2 and 4.3–3). The south end of the converted garage roof is still gabled, as originally indicated on the building record. Between 1980 and 1989, a flat-roofed, two-car garage addition was constructed on the north façade of the residence (see Plate 4.3–5). As such, the building currently exhibits an irregular footprint and a cut-up roof comprised of several different roof forms.

The enclosed concrete patio roof and the converted garage roof are both covered in composite shingles. Their exterior walls are clad in vertical wood siding. Windows in the converted garage are aluminum-framed and horizontal-sliding (Plate 4.2–11). The two-car garage addition exhibits a flat roof covered in rolled roofing, the exterior walls are clad in vertical wood siding, and the north façade features two pull-up-style wood garage.
Plate 4.3–6
East Façade of the Building Showing the Decorative, Scalloped, Wood Siding in the Gable End, Facing Southwest
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Plate 4.3–7
Southeast Corner of the Building, Facing North
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Plate 4.3–8
South Façade of the Building, Facing Northeast
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Plate 4.3–9
South Façade of the Building Showing a Non-Original Window, Facing Northeast
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Plate 4.3–10

West Façade of the Building Showing the Original Entryway, Facing Southeast
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Plate 4.3–11
East Façade of the 1963 Converted Garage, Facing Northwest
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Significance Evaluation

CEQA guidelines (Section 15064.5) address archaeological and historic resources, noting that physical changes that would demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those characteristics that convey the historic significance of the resource and justify its listing on inventories of historic resources are typically considered significant impacts. Because demolition of the 2510 Summit Drive building would require approval from the County of San Diego as part of the proposed project, CEQA eligibility criteria were used to evaluate the structure located within property as a potentially historic building. Therefore, criteria for listing on the CRHR were used to measure the significance of the resource.

Minimal Traditional Architecture

The 2510 Summit Drive building was constructed in 1936 as a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence. The building was constructed during the style’s height of popularity, which lasted from circa 1935 to 1950 (McAlester 2015). Within the Minimal Traditional style, McAlester (2015) has identified three principal subtypes: Gable-and-Wing Roof, Side-Gabled Roof (commonly called Cape Cod), and Other Roof. The 2510 Summit Drive building is classified as the Gable-and-Wing Roof subtype since it exhibits a “low-pitched front facing gable added on one side of a side-gabled roof. Typically the front-facing gable does not protrude very far in front of the side gable and consists only of a small extension added to one room of the house” (McAlester 2015). According to McAlester (2015):

Minimal Traditional homes can be found throughout the United States. During the early 1940s, concentrations were rapidly built where new sites for World War II production plants created an urgent local need for worker housing. After the war, developers built instant communities – such as Levittown, New York on Long Island, and Brentwood in Denver, Colorado – filled with Minimal Traditional houses, sometimes using only a few designs in a subdivision. These were sometimes located outside the city’s built-up edge, where large tracts of land were available and new broad highways and arterials were planned for easy automobile access. In postwar subdivisions, the style is found with early Ranch houses (sometimes called Minimal Ranches or Ranchettes).

The Minimal Traditional house was “the little house that could.” It was the small house that could be built with FHA [Federal Housing Administration]-insured loans in the midst of the Great Depression between 1935 and 1940; the house that could be built quickly to accommodate millions of relocating World War II production-plant workers (1941-1945); and the house that could be built rapidly during the late 1940s in large post-World War II developments (1946-1949). (McAlester 2015)
Identifying features of the Minimal Traditional style include:

Low- or intermediate-pitched roof, more often gabled; small house, generally one-story in height; roof eaves have little or no overhang; double-hung windows, typically multi-pane or 1/1; minimal amounts of added architectural detail; rarely has dormers. (McAlester 2015)

The original portion of the 2510 Summit Drive building possesses all of these characteristics. The building is one story with an “L”-shaped floorplan, a minimal eave overhang, multi-pane, wood-framed windows, and minimal amount of added architectural detail. The 1963 conversion of the original detached garage and enclosed patio additions, however, introduced Ranch-style elements (wide eave overhang, vertical wood siding, aluminum-framed windows) and the 1980 to 1989 two-car garage addition introduced Contemporary-style elements (flat roof, wide eave overhang, vertical wood siding). While the additions were constructed in styles that were popular when the work was completed (McAlester 2015), none of the modifications made to the building are considered good examples of the Ranch or Contemporary styles and the additions have not achieved significance in their own right. Instead, they have eliminated any features once located on the north façade, which both additions cover entirely, and their construction has negatively impacted the original design, materials, workmanship, and feeling of the original Minimal Traditional-style building (see integrity evaluation, below).

**Integrity Evaluation**

When evaluating a historic resource, integrity is the authenticity of the resource’s physical identity clearly indicated by the retention of characteristics that existed during its period of construction. It is important to note that integrity is not the same as condition. Integrity directly relates to the presence or absence of historic materials and character-defining features, while condition relates to the relative state of physical deterioration of the resource. In most instances, integrity is more relevant to the significance of a resource than condition; however, if a resource is in such poor condition that original materials and features may no longer be salvageable, then the resource’s integrity may be adversely impacted.

In order to determine whether or not the building is eligible for listing, CRHR eligibility criteria were used. Furthermore, BFSA based the review upon the recommended criteria listed in the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). This review is based upon the evaluation of integrity of the building followed by the assessment of distinctive characteristics.

1. **Integrity of Location** [refers to] the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of location was assessed by reviewing historical records and aerial photographs in order
to determine if the building had always existed at its present location or if it had been
moved, rebuilt, or its footprint significantly altered. Historical research revealed that
the 2510 Summit Drive building was constructed in its current location in 1936. Therefore, the building retains integrity of location.

2. **Integrity of Design** [refers to] the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of design was assessed by evaluating the spatial arrangement of the building and any architectural features present. The 2510 Summit Drive building was originally designed as a Minimal Traditional-style, single-family residence with a detached garage. The changes made to the building include: construction of two Ranch-style enclosed patio additions on the north façade of the residence and the west façade of the detached garage, connecting the two and exhibiting a shed-style porch roof; conversion of the original detached garage into living space in 1963; and construction of a Contemporary-style, flat-roofed, two-car garage addition onto the north façade of the residence between 1980 and 1989. Additionally, a window was replaced on the south façade of the building; however, this did not change the design of the residence. The remaining additions, however, incorporated new design elements, including wide eave overhangs and differing roof forms, and altered the overall form, plan, space, structure, and style of the 2510 Summit Drive building. Therefore, the building does not retain integrity of design.

3. **Integrity of Setting** [refers to] the physical environment of a historic property. Setting includes elements such as topographic features, open space, viewshed, landscape, vegetation, and artificial features (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of setting was assessed by inspecting the elements of the property, which include topographic features, open space, views, landscape, vegetation, man-made features, and relationships between buildings and other features. When originally constructed in 1936, the 2510 Summit Drive building was located on top of a hill surrounded by orchard trees. Between 1964 and 1980, many of the trees to the east and west of the building were removed (Plates 4.3–12 and 4.3–13). The orchard was then almost entirely removed between 1980 and 1989 (Plate 4.3–14). The loss of the surrounding orchard represents a significant loss of original integrity of the building since it originally functioned as the residence for a citrus farmer. Integrity of setting was also negatively impacted by the construction of the 1963 to 1989 additions to the building, which substantially increased the square footage and replaced original open space along the north façade of the building. As a result of these modifications, the property no longer retains the same topographic features, open space, viewshed, landscape, and vegetation that it originally possessed, and therefore, does not retain integrity of setting.
4. **Integrity of Materials** [refers to] *the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property* (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of materials was assessed by determining the presence or absence of original building materials, as well as the possible introduction of materials that may have altered the architectural design of the building. Since its original construction, several significant alterations, modifications, and replacements of materials have occurred. Ranch-style materials were introduced with vertical siding and aluminum-framed windows in the 1963 garage conversion and enclosed patio additions and Contemporary-style materials were introduced with the flat roof and vertical wood siding on the 1980 to 1989 garage addition. Additionally, an original wood-framed window was replaced with an aluminum-framed window on the south façade of the building. Due to the introduction of these new materials, which represent different time periods and obscured all original materials along the north façade, the building does not retain integrity of materials.

5. **Integrity of Workmanship** [refers to] *the physical evidence of the labor and skill of a particular culture or people during any given period in history* (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of workmanship was assessed by evaluating the quality of the architectural features present in the building. The original workmanship demonstrated by the construction of the 2510 Summit Drive building appears to have been average. While the non-original portions of the building also appear to have been constructed using the same level of workmanship, the loss of the original north façade of the residence and construction of the structural additions have impacted the initial workmanship portrayed by the original building. Therefore, the building does not retain integrity of workmanship.

6. **Integrity of Feeling** [refers to] *a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time* (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of feeling was assessed by evaluating whether or not the resource’s features, in combination with its setting, conveyed a historic sense of the property during the period of construction. As noted previously, the integrity of setting for the 2510 Summit Drive building has not been retained. In addition, the modifications affecting the original size, plan, shape, style, and design of the building have negatively impacted its appearance since 1936. Therefore, due to the changes made to the building that have altered its overall appearance and character, as well as the loss of the original surrounding orchard, the building does not retain integrity of feeling.

7. **Integrity of Association** [refers to] *the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property* (Andrus and Shrimpton 2002). Integrity of
association was assessed by evaluating the resource’s data or information and its ability to answer any research questions relevant to the history of the Escondido area or the state of California. Historical research indicates that the 2510 Summit Drive building is not associated with any significant persons or events. None of the individuals who owned or lived at the property were found to be significant and no known important events occurred at the property. Therefore, the building has never possessed integrity of association.

The 2510 Summit Drive building was determined to only meet one category of the integrity analysis: location. The 2510 Summit Drive building does not retain integrity of materials, design, setting, workmanship, feeling, or association due to extensive remodeling/modifications and a lack of association with any significant persons or events.

**CRHR Evaluation**

For a historic resource to be eligible for listing on the CRHR, the resource must be found significant at the local, state, or national level, under one or more of the following criteria:

- **CRHR Criterion 1:**
  *It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.*

  It was discovered through historical research that no significant events could be associated with 2510 Summit Drive building. Although many Minimal Traditional-style residences are associated with the demand for housing during and immediately after World War II (McAlester 2015), the 2510 Summit Drive building was constructed prior to the start of the war. Although funding for the construction of the home may have been acquired through an FHA loan, this could not be verified nor would the source of funding alone elevate the building to a status of significance. Because the property could not be associated with any specific historic event, the building is not eligible for designation under CRHR Criterion 1.

- **CRHR Criterion 2:**
  *It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*

  Historical research revealed that the 2510 Summit Drive building is not associated with any persons important in our past. None of the individuals who owned or lived at the property were found to be significant. Therefore, the building is not eligible for designation under CRHR Criterion 2.
• **CRHR Criterion 3:**

  *It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values.*

Although the 2510 Summit Drive building currently exhibits some of its original Minimal Traditional-style elements, the Ranch- and Contemporary-style additions on the north façade and northeast corner of the building have overshadowed the original design. As such, the building is no longer representative of any specific style, type, period, or method of construction. The 1963 garage conversion and 1963 enclosed patio additions, specifically, introduced Ranch-style elements and the 1980 to 1989 garage addition introduced Contemporary-style elements, both of which were not previously present on the building. The building was constructed by an unknown builder and does not represent the creative work of any individual, as it does not possess high artistic values. Because the building is no longer particularly representative of a specific style, type, period, or method of construction, and does not represent the work of a master or important creative individual, it is not eligible for designation under CRHR Criterion 3.

• **CRHR Criterion 4:**

  *It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

The research conducted for this study revealed that because the 2510 Summit Drive building is not associated with any significant persons or events and was not constructed using a unique or innovative method of construction, it likely cannot yield any additional information about the history of Escondido or the state of California. Therefore, the building is not eligible for designation under CRHR Criterion 4.

**Findings and Conclusions**

The 2510 Summit Drive building located within the Summit Estates Project is evaluated as not historically or architecturally significant under any CEQA criteria due to its lack of association with any significant persons or events and the large number of alterations it has undergone, which have impacted its original integrity. Because the building is not eligible for listing on the CRHR, no mitigation measures are required for any future alterations or planned demolition of the building.
4.4 Discussion/Summary
Site P-37-038444 was recorded as the historic structure located at 2510 Summit Drive. The building retains only limited significance and is evaluated as not historically or architecturally important under any CEQA criteria due to its lack of association with any significant persons or events and the large number of alterations that it has undergone since its construction in 1936.
5.0 **INTERPRETATION OF RESOURCE IMPORTANCE AND IMPACT IDENTIFICATION**

### 5.1 Resource Importance

The historic resources survey of the Summit Estates Project identified a historic single-family residence located at 2510 Summit Drive, which has been recorded as P-37-038444 with the SCIC. Site P-37-038444, which has been plotted on the project development map on Figure 5.1–1, represents a historic site that must be evaluated under CEQA criteria to determine the potential impacts from the proposed development (Table 5.1–1). The 2510 Summit Drive building, which was constructed in 1936, has been evaluated as not historically or architecturally significant under any CEQA criteria due to its lack of association with any significant individuals or events and the large number of alterations that it has undergone (loss of integrity). Because the building is not eligible for listing on the CRHR, no mitigation measures are required for any future alterations or planned demolition of the building.

**Table 5.1–1**  
Site Significance Summary and Impact Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Significance Evaluation</th>
<th>Impact Evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-038444</td>
<td>Not eligible for the CRHR; limited significance</td>
<td>No adverse impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon CEQA criteria and the requirements for resource assessments presented in the County of San Diego’s guidelines, the 2510 Summit Drive building located within the development footprint qualifies under the minimum age threshold to be a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA. However, it retains only limited significance and lacks any historic or architectural importance, research potential, or potential public benefit, and therefore, will not require preservation. Site P-37-038444 is considered ineligible for listing on the CRHR due to a lack of original integrity and association with historic persons or events.

### 5.2 Impact Identification

As part of the 22.89-acre development, Site P-37-038444, the 1936 single-family residence at 2510 Summit Drive, will be directly impacted by the proposed development; however, any impacts to the resource will not be considered adverse given the evaluation of the building as having limited significance and no historic importance under County of San Diego and CEQA criteria.
Figure 5.1–1

Historic Resource Shown on Project Development Map

The Summit Estates Project
6.0 MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS – MITIGATION MEASURES AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Mitigable Impacts
The development footprint for the Summit Estates Project will impact Site P-37-038444. This site has limited significance and is not historically important according to criteria listed in CEQA, Section 15064.5, or under County of San Diego guidelines, and therefore, is not a Historical Resource as defined by CEQA and is not eligible for the CRHR. Any impacts to Site P-37-038444 associated with the development of the property are not significant.

6.2 Recommended Mitigation Measures
No site-specific mitigation measures will be recommended for non-CRHR-eligible Site P-37-038444.
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8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

The historic resource evaluation program for the Summit Estates Project was directed by Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith. Fieldwork was conducted by Archaeologist David Grabski. The report text was prepared by Senior Project Archaeologist Jennifer Stropes, M.S., RPA and Brian Smith. Report graphics were provided by Carrie Kubacki. Technical editing and report production were conducted by Elena Goralogia. The SCIC at SDSU provided the archaeological records search information. Records research was conducted at the BFSA research library, the SCIC, the San Diego Historical Society, the Escondido History Center, the San Diego Public Library, and the offices of the San Diego Assessor/County Recorder/County Clerk. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps were searched for at the San Diego Public Library.
### 9.0 LIST OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Design Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-038444</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Resumes of Key Personnel
Brian F. Smith, MA
Owner, Principal Investigator
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road • Suite A •
Phone: (858) 679-8218 • Fax: (858) 679-9896 • E-Mail: bsmith@bfsa-ca.com

Education

Master of Arts, History, University of San Diego, California 1982
Bachelor of Arts, History, and Anthropology, University of San Diego, California 1975

Professional Memberships

Society for California Archaeology

Experience

Principal Investigator 1977–Present
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. Poway, California

Brian F. Smith is the owner and principal historical and archaeological consultant for Brian F. Smith and Associates. Over the past 32 years, he has conducted over 2,500 cultural resource studies in California, Arizona, Nevada, Montana, and Texas. These studies include every possible aspect of archaeology from literature searches and large-scale surveys to intensive data recovery excavations. Reports prepared by Mr. Smith have been submitted to all facets of local, state, and federal review agencies, including the US Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security. In addition, Mr. Smith has conducted studies for utility companies (Sempra Energy) and state highway departments (CalTrans).

Professional Accomplishments

These selected major professional accomplishments represent research efforts that have added significantly to the body of knowledge concerning the prehistoric life ways of cultures once present in the Southern California area and historic settlement since the late 18th century. Mr. Smith has been principal investigator on the following select projects, except where noted.


Archaeology at the Padres Ballpark: Involved the analysis of historic resources within a seven-block area of the "East Village" area of San Diego, where occupation spanned a period from the 1870s to the 1940s. Over a period of two years, BFSA recovered over 200,000 artifacts and hundreds of pounds of metal, construction debris, unidentified broken glass, and wood. Collectively, the Ballpark Project and the other downtown mitigation and monitoring projects represent the largest historical archaeological program anywhere in the country in the past decade (2000-2007).

4S Ranch Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources Study: Data recovery program consisted of the excavation of over 2,000 square meters of archaeological deposits that produced over one million artifacts, containing primarily prehistoric materials. The archaeological program at 4S Ranch is the largest archaeological study ever undertaken in the San Diego County area and has produced data that has exceeded expectations regarding the resolution of long-standing research questions and regional prehistoric settlement patterns.

Charles H. Brown Site: Attracted international attention to the discovery of evidence of the antiquity of man in North America. Site located in Mission Valley, in the city of San Diego.

Del Mar Man Site: Study of the now famous Early Man Site in Del Mar, California, for the San Diego Science Foundation and the San Diego Museum of Man, under the direction of Dr. Spencer Rogers and Dr. James R. Moriarty.

Old Town State Park Projects: Consulting Historical Archaeologist. Projects completed in the Old Town State Park involved development of individual lots for commercial enterprises. The projects completed in Old Town include Archaeological and Historical Site Assessment for the Great Wall Cafe (1992), Archaeological Study for the Old Town Commercial Project (1991), and Cultural Resources Site Survey at the Old San Diego Inn (1988).

Site W-20, Del Mar, California: A two-year-long investigation of a major prehistoric site in the Del Mar area of the city of San Diego. This research effort documented the earliest practice of religious/ceremonial activities in San Diego County (circa 6,000 years ago), facilitated the projection of major non-material aspects of the La Jolla Complex, and revealed the pattern of civilization at this site over a continuous period of 5,000 years. The report for the investigation included over 600 pages, with nearly 500,000 words of text, illustrations, maps, and photographs documenting this major study.

City of San Diego Reclaimed Water Distribution System: A cultural resource study of nearly 400 miles of pipeline in the city and county of San Diego.

Master Environmental Assessment Project, City of Poway: Conducted for the City of Poway to produce a complete inventory of all recorded historic and prehistoric properties within the city. The information was used in conjunction with the City’s General Plan Update to produce a map matrix of the city showing areas of high, moderate, and low potential for the presence of cultural resources. The effort also included the development of the City’s Cultural Resource Guidelines, which were adopted as City policy.

Draft of the City of Carlsbad Historical and Archaeological Guidelines: Contracted by the City of Carlsbad to produce the draft of the City’s historical and archaeological guidelines for use by the Planning Department of the City.

The Mid-Bayfront Project for the City of Chula Vista: Involved a large expanse of undeveloped agricultural land situated between the railroad and San Diego Bay in the northwestern portion of the city. The study included the analysis of some potentially historic features and numerous prehistoric sites.
Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Audie Murphy Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 1,113.4 acres and 43 sites, both prehistoric and historic—including project coordination; direction of field crews; evaluation of sites for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; assessment of cupule, pictograph, and rock shelter sites, co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February-September 2002.

Cultural Resources Evaluation of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Otay Ranch Village 13 Project, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 1,947 acres and 76 sites, both prehistoric and historic—included project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on County of San Diego and CEQA guidelines; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. May-November 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey for the Remote Video Surveillance Project, El Centro Sector, Imperial County: Project manager/director of a survey of 29 individual sites near the U.S./Mexico Border for proposed video surveillance camera locations associated with the San Diego Border barrier Project—project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; site identification and recordation; assessment of potential impacts to cultural resources; meeting and coordinating with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Border Patrol, and other government agencies involved; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. January, February, and July 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Menifee West GPA, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of nine sites, both prehistoric and historic—including project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. January-March 2002.

Mitigation of An Archaic Cultural Resource for the Eastlake III Woods Project for the City of Chula Vista, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program including collection of material for specialized faunal and botanical analyses; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; co-authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. September 2001-March 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the French Valley Specific Plan/EIR, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of two prehistoric and three historic sites—including project coordination and budgeting; survey of project area; Native American consultation; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; cultural resources project report in prep. July-August 2000.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Lawson Valley Project, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 28 prehistoric and two historic sites—including project coordination; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; cultural resources project report in prep. July-August 2000.


Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Prewitt/Schmucker/Cavadias Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—including project coordination; direction of field crews; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. June 2000.
Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Menifee Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of one prehistoric and five historic sites—includes project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; feature recordation; historic structure assessments; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February-June 2000.

Salvage Mitigation of a Portion of the San Diego Presidio Identified During Water Pipe Construction for the City of San Diego, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis and authoring of cultural resources project report. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Tyrian 3 Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Lamont 5 Project, Pacific Beach, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Reiss Residence Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. March-April 2000.

Salvage Mitigation of a Portion of Site SDM-W-95 (CA-SDI-211) for the Poinsettia Shores Santalina Development Project and Caltrans, Carlsbad, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis and authoring of cultural resources project report in prep. December 1999-January 2000.

Survey and Testing of Two Prehistoric Cultural Resources for the Airway Truck Parking Project, Otay Mesa, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of testing recovery program; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. December 1999-January 2000.

Cultural Resources Phase I and II Investigations for the Tin Can Hill Segment of the Immigration and Naturalization Services Triple Fence Project Along the International Border, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director for a survey and testing of a prehistoric quarry site along the border—NRHP eligibility assessment; project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; feature recordation; meeting and coordinating with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. December 1999-January 2000.

Mitigation of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Westview High School Project for the City of San Diego, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program including collection of material for specialized faunal and botanical analyses; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; co-authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. October 1999-January 2000.

Mitigation of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Otay Ranch SPA-One West Project for the City of Chula Vista, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; assessment of
site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. September 1999-January 2000.

Monitoring of Grading for the Herschel Place Project, La Jolla, California: Project archaeologist/monitor—included monitoring of grading activities associated with the development of a single-dwelling parcel. September 1999.

Survey and Testing of a Historic Resource for the Osterkamp Development Project, Valley Center, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; budget development; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July-August 1999.

Survey and Testing of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Proposed College Boulevard Alignment Project, Carlsbad, California: Project manager/director—direction of field crews; development and completion of testing recovery program; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. July-August 1999.

Survey and Evaluation of Cultural Resources for the Palomar Christian Conference Center Project, Palomar Mountain, California: Project archaeologist—included direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July-August 1999.

Survey and Evaluation of Cultural Resources at the Village 2 High School Site, Otay Ranch, City of Chula Vista, California: Project manager/director—management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July 1999.

Cultural Resources Phase I, II, and III Investigations for the Immigration and Naturalization Services Triple Fence Project Along the International Border, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director for the survey, testing, and mitigation of sites along border—supervision of multiple field crews, NRHP eligibility assessments, Native American consultation, contribution to Environmental Assessment document, lithic and marine shell analysis, authoring of cultural resources project report. August 1997-January 2000.

Phase I, II, and III Investigations for the Scripps Poway Parkway East Project, Poway California: Project archaeologist/project director—included recordation and assessment of multicomponent prehistoric and historic sites; direction of Phase II and III investigations; direction of laboratory analyses including prehistoric and historic collections; curation of collections; data synthesis; coauthorship of final cultural resources report. February 1994; March-September 1994; September-December 1995.


Reports/Papers

Author, coauthor, or contributor to over 2,500 cultural resources management publications, a selection of which are presented below.

2015  An Archaeological/Historical Study for the Safari Highlands Ranch Project, City of Escondido, County of San Diego.

2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment for the Decker Parcels II Project, Planning Case No. 36962, Riverside County, California.

2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment for the Decker Parcels I Project, Planning Case No. 36950, Riverside County, California.


2015  Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for the Woodward Street Senior Housing Project, City of San Marcos, California (APN 218-120-31).


2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resource Assessment for the Lake Ranch Project, TR 36730, Riverside County, California.

2015  A Phase II Cultural Resource Assessment for the Munro Valley Solar Project, Inyo County, California.


2014  National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Compliance for the Proposed Saddleback Estates Project, Riverside County, California.

2014  A Phase II Cultural Resource Evaluation Report for RIV-8137 at the Toscana Project, TR 36593, Riverside County, California.

2014  Cultural Resources Study for the Estates at Del Mar Project, City of Del Mar, San Diego, California (TTM 14-001).

2014  Cultural Resources Study for the Aliso Canyon Major Subdivision Project, Rancho Santa Fe, San Diego County, California.

2014  Cultural Resources Due Diligence Assessment of the Ocean Colony Project, City of Encinitas.

2014  A Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Assessment for the Citrus Heights II Project, TTM 36475, Riverside County, California.

2013  A Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Modular Logistics Center, Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California.
2013 A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Ivey Ranch Project, Thousand Palms, Riverside County, California.
2013 Cultural Resources Report for the Emerald Acres Project, Riverside County, California.
2013 A Cultural Resources Records Search and Review for the Pala Del Norte Conservation Bank Project, San Diego County, California.
2013 An Updated Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for Tentative Tract Maps 36484 and 36485, Audie Murphy Ranch, City of Menifee, County of Riverside.
2013 El Centro Town Center Industrial Development Project (EDA Grant No. 07-01-06386); Result of Cultural Resource Monitoring.
2013 Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Renda Residence Project, 9521 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California.
2013 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Ballpark Village Project, San Diego, California.
2013 Archaeological Monitoring and Mitigation Program, San Clemente Senior Housing Project, 2350 South El Camino Real, City of San Clemente, Orange County, California (CUP No. 06-065; APN-060-032-04).
2012 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Los Peñasquitos Recycled Water Pipeline.
2012 Cultural Resources Report for Menifee Heights (Tract 32277).
2012 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Altman Residence at 9696 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California 92037.
2012 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Payan Property Project, San Diego, California.
2012 Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Rieger Residence, 13707 Durango Drive, Del Mar, California 92014, APN 300-369-49.
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the 1887 Viking Way Project, La Jolla, California.
2011 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the 10th Avenue Parking Lot Project, City of San Diego, California (APNs 534-194-02 and 03).
2011 Archaeological Survey of the Pelberg Residence for a Bulletin 560 Permit Application; 8335 Camino Del Oro; La Jolla, California 92037 APN 346-162-01-00.
2011 A Cultural Resources Survey Update and Evaluation for the Robertson Ranch West Project and an Evaluation of National Register Eligibility of Archaeological sites for Sites for Section 106 Review (NHPA).
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the 43rd and Logan Project.
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Sewer Group 682 M Project, City of San Diego Project #174116.

2011 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Nooren Residence Project, 8001 Calle de la Plata, La Jolla, California, Project No. 226965.

2011 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Keating Residence Project, 9633 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California 92037.


2010 Pottery Canyon Site Archaeological Evaluation Project, City of San Diego, California, Contract No. H105126.

2010 Archaeological Resource Report Form: Mitigation Monitoring of the Racetrack View Drive Project, San Diego, California; Project No. 163216.

2010 A Historical Evaluation of Structures on the Butterfield Trails Property.

2010 Historic Archaeological Significance Evaluation of 1761 Haydn Drive, Encinitas, California (APN 260-276-07-00).

2010 Results of Archaeological Monitoring of the Heller/Nguyen Project, TPM 06-01, Poway, California.


2010 An Archaeological Study for the 1912 Spindrift Drive Project

2009 Cultural Resource Assessment of the North Ocean Beach Gateway Project City of San Diego #64A-003A; Project #154116.

2009 Archaeological Constraints Study of the Morgan Valley Wind Assessment Project, Lake County, California.

2008 Results of an Archaeological Review of the Helen Park Lane 3.1-acre Property (APN 314-561-31), Poway, California.

2008 Archaeological Letter Report for a Phase I Archaeological Assessment of the Valley Park Condominium Project, Ramona, California; APN 282-262-75-00.


2007 Result of an Archaeological Survey for the Villages at Promenade Project (APNs 115-180-007-3, 115-180-049-1, 115-180-042-4, 115-180-047-9) in the City of Corona, Riverside County.

2007 Monitoring Results for the Capping of Site CA-SDI-6038/SDM-W-5517 within the Katzer jamul Center Project; P00-017.

2006 Archaeological Assessment for The Johnson Project (APN 322-011-10), Poway, California.
2005 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the El Camino Del Teatro Accelerated Sewer Replacement Project (Bid No. K041364; WO # 177741; CIP # 46-610.6).

2005 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the Baltazar Draper Avenue Project (Project No. 15857; APN: 351-040-09).

2004 TM 5325 ER #03-14-043 Cultural Resources.


2003 Evaluation of Archaeological Resources Within the Spring Canyon Biological Mitigation Area, Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


2002 An Archaeological/Historical Study for the Audie Murphy Ranch Project (et al.). Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


2001 A Cultural Resources Survey and Site Evaluations at the Stewart Subdivision Project, Moreno Valley, County of San Diego. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


1999 Results of an Archaeological Evaluation for the Anthony's Pizza Acquisition Project in Ocean Beach, City of San Diego (with L. Pierson and B. Smith). Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


1995 Results of a Cultural Resources Study for the 4S Ranch. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


1994 Results of the Cultural Resources Mitigation Programs at Sites SDI-11,044/H and SDI-12,038 at the Salt Creek Ranch Project. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


Jennifer R.K. Stropes, MS, RPA

Project Archaeologist/Historian
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road • Suite A •
Phone: (858) 484-0915 • Fax: (858) 679-9896 • E-Mail: jenni@bfsa-ca.com

Education

Master of Science, Cultural Resource Management Archaeology 2016
St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Bachelor of Arts, Anthropology 2004
University of California, Santa Cruz

Specialized Education/Training

Archaeological Field School 2014
Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project

Research Interests

California Coastal / Inland Archaeology
Zooarchaeology

Historic Structure Significance Eligibility
Historical Archaeology

Human Behavioral Ecology
Taphonomic Studies

Experience

Project Archaeologist / Historian
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
November 2006–Present

Duties include report writing, editing and production; recordation and evaluation of historic resources; construction monitoring management; coordination of field survey and excavation crews; laboratory and office management. Currently conducts faunal, prehistoric, and historic laboratory analysis and has conducted such analysis for over 500 projects over the past 10 years. Knowledgeable in the most recent archaeological and paleontological monitoring requirements for all Southern California lead agencies, as well as Native American monitoring requirements.
UC Santa Cruz Monterey Bay Archaeology Archives Supervisor
Santa Cruz, California
December 2003–March 2004
Supervising intern for archaeological collections housed at UC Santa Cruz. Supervised undergraduate interns and maintained curated archaeological materials recovered from the greater Monterey Bay region.

Faunal Analyst, Research Assistant
University of California, Santa Cruz
June 2003–December 2003
Intern assisting in laboratory analysis and cataloging for faunal remains collected from CA-MNT-234. Analysis included detailed zoological identification and taphonomic analysis of prehistoric marine and terrestrial mammals, birds, and fish inhabiting the greater Monterey Bay region.

Archaeological Technician, Office Manager
January 2000–December 2001
Conducted construction monitoring, field survey, excavation, report editing, report production, monitoring coordination and office management.

Certifications
City of San Diego Certified Archaeological and Paleontological Monitor
40-Hour Hazardous Waste/Emergency Response OSHA 29 CFR 1910.120 (e)

Scholarly Works
Big Game, Small Game: A Comprehensive Analysis of Faunal Remains Recovered from CA-SDI-11,521, 2016, Master’s thesis on file at St. Cloud University, St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Technical Reports
Buday, Tracy M., Jennifer R. Kraft, and Brian F. Smith

Kennedy, George L., Todd A. Wirths and Jennifer R. Kraft

2013 Negative Paleontological, Archaeological, and Native American Monitoring and Mitigation Report, Tri-City Christian High School, 302 North Emerald Drive, Vista, San Diego County,
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Kraft, Jennifer R.

Kraft, Jennifer R., David K. Grabski, and Brian F. Smith

Kraft, Jennifer R. and Brian F. Smith


2016 Historic Structure Assessment for 8585 La Mesa Boulevard City of La Mesa, San Diego County, California. APN 494-300-11. Prepared for Silvergate Development. Report on file at the City of La Mesa Planning Department.


2016 A Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the State/Columbia/Ash/A Block Project San Diego, California. Prepared for Bomel San Diego Equities, LLC. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.


2015 *Historic Structure Assessment for the StorQuest Project, City of La Mesa, (APN 494-101-14-00).* Prepared for Real Estate Development and Entitlement. Report on file at the City of La Mesa.


2014 Historic Structure Assessment for 8055 La Mesa Boulevard, City of La Mesa (APN 470-582-11-00). Prepared for Lee Machado. Report on file at the City of La Mesa.


2014 Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the 915 Grape Street Project. Prepared for Bay View SD, LLC. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.

2014 Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Altman Residence Project, 9696 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California 92037. Prepared for Steve Altman. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.


2014  *A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Palm Creek Ranch Project, Thousand Palms, Riverside County, California (APNs 650-230-002, 650-310-001, and 650-310-002).* Prepared for Palm Creek Ranch, LLC. Report on file at the California Eastern Information Center.


2013  *Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Knight Residence Project, 7970 Roseland Avenue, La Jolla, California*. Prepared for Mr. Dennis Knight. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.


2013  *Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the 3364 Randy Lane Project, Chula Vista, California*. Prepared for H&M Construction. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.


Kraft, Jennifer R. and Tracy A. Stropes


Kraft, Jennifer R., Tracy A. Stropes, and Brian F. Smith

Smith, Brian F., Claire M. Allen, and Jennifer R. Kraft

Smith, Brian F., Claire M. Allen, Mary M. Lenich, and Jennifer R. Kraft
Smith, Brian F. and Jennifer R. Kraft


Smith, Brian F., Jennifer R. Kraft, and Mary M. Lenich


Smith, Brian F. and Jennifer R.K. Stropes


Smith, Brian F., Tracy A. Stropes, Tracy M. Buday, and Jennifer R. Kraft
2015 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 1900 Spindrift Drive – Cabana and Landscape Improvements Project, La Jolla, California. Prepared for Darwin Deason. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.


Stropes, J.R.K. and Brian F. Smith


2016 Results of a Cultural Resource Testing Program for the Maker's Quarter – Block D Project, City of San Diego. Prepared for L2HP, LLC. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.

Stropes, J.R.K., Tracy A. Stropes, and Brian F. Smith
2016 Results of the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Amitai Residence Project 2514 Ellentown Road La Jolla, California 92037 Project No. 388734. Prepared for David Amitai. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.

Stropes, Tracy A., Jennifer R. Kraft, and Brian F. Smith

Stropes, Tracy A., Brian F. Smith, and Jennifer R. Kraft
2015 Results of the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Keating Residence Project, La Jolla, California. Prepared for Brian Keating. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.

Contributing Author /Analyst


2010 Faunal Analysis and Report Section for An Archaeological Study for the 1912 Spindrift Drive Project, La Jolla, California by Brian F. Smith and Tracy A. Stropes. Prepared for Island Architects. Report on file at the California South Coastal Information Center.
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Aislin-Kay, Marnie and Christeen Taniguchi
2004 Record search and Site Visit Results for Cingular Telecommunications Facility Candidate SD-591-01 (Village Nursery), 2415 San Pasqual Valley Road, Escondido, San Diego County, California. Michael Brandman Associates. Unpublished report on file at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

American Pacific Environmental Consultants, Inc.

Anderson, Shawna
2005 San Dieguito River Park Lake Hodges Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration in the City of San Diego, Lake Hodges Region. San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. Unpublished report on file at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, San Diego, California.
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APPENDIX E

Historic Documents
### RESIDENTIAL BUILDING RECORD SHEET

#### DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS &amp; SHAPE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
<th>ROOF</th>
<th>LIGHTING</th>
<th>AIR CONDITION</th>
<th>ROOMS</th>
<th>FLOORS</th>
<th>FLOOR FINISH</th>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>INTERIOR FINISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>V Frame</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>K.T.</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>Forced Cooling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B.G.</td>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Standard</td>
<td>Sheathing</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Hip</td>
<td>A.K.</td>
<td>B.K.</td>
<td>Gravity Humid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Standard</td>
<td>Concrete Block</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>A.K.</td>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Shingle</td>
<td>Dormers</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>Floor Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Design</td>
<td>Adobe</td>
<td>Shake</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATION</td>
<td>B.B. T.G.</td>
<td>Gutters</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Floor Joist</td>
<td>B.B. T.G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Sub-Floor</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat-Court</td>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>Concrete Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Insulated Ceilings</td>
<td>Metal Sash</td>
<td>Campas</td>
<td>Campa</td>
<td>Shingle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION RECORD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit No.</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>EFFEC. YEAR</td>
<td>APPR. YEAR</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>REMAINING LIFE</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Cond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>E SS 60</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4 24</td>
<td>R 6 52</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4 23</td>
<td>R 6 72</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SPECIAL FEATURES
- Built in rang
- Oven plate
- Dishwasher
- Venetian Blinds

#### COMPUTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraiser &amp; Date</th>
<th>1968 4/22/77</th>
<th>1968 4/22/77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Area</td>
<td>1160 72</td>
<td>208000 12680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>8352 1.90</td>
<td>17950 1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>9164</td>
<td>16260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Area</td>
<td>200 200</td>
<td>1248 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>4500 4500</td>
<td>800 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>624 624</td>
<td>1248 1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Area</td>
<td>312 2.24</td>
<td>5130 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>2280 2280</td>
<td>5120 5120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>2280 2280</td>
<td>5120 5120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL
- 1160 72 208000 12680
- 200 200 1248 800
- 312 2.24 5130 720
- 2280 2280 5120 5120

#### NORMAL % GOOD
- 60 50 52 72

#### R.G.L.N.D
- 7144 7120

#### 77 U.S.C. 18000 200000
## Description of Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg. No.</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Found.</th>
<th>Wall &amp; Exterior</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Floor &amp; Interior Detail</th>
<th>2nd Story or Loft</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Effec Year</th>
<th>Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pump SHP Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>01/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pump 1 HP Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>01/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall Av Pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Computation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg. No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>R.C.N.</th>
<th>L.N.D.</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>R.C.N.</th>
<th>L.N.D.</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>R.C.N.</th>
<th>L.N.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     |      | 720        | 346  | .47    |        |        | 7720      | 5567 |        |        |        | 4425      | 7150 |        | B.53 D2|

## Appraiser - Date

D. Laffey 5-24-63  1968  E. Koontz 3-19-74

### Computation for 77 VSC 4000

- Total: 7150
- B.53 D2
## COMPUTATIONS

- $D \approx 0.40$
- $12 \times 34 = 408$
- $16 \times 67 = 752$
- $1160$

## Remarks:

- G. Conduct cavity and footing of 6
- Of 6" cellular material
- G. Conduct Vents per approx. 3'-0" x 4'-0"
Legend
- Original residence and detached garage (1936)
- Original detached garage converted to living space (1963)
- Enclosed patios (1963)
- Window replacement (unknown date)
- Site boundary

Site Plan With Footprint
2510 Summit Drive
THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY ASSESSOR LOT BLOCK BOOK PAGE SHOWS THE FIRST YEAR WITH ASSESSED IMPROVEMENTS AS BEING 1937.
Ownership and Occupant Information
CB California Lot Book, Inc.
*dba California Title Search Co.*
P.O. Box 9004
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
(858) 278-8797 Fax (858) 278-8393
WWW.LOTBOOK.COM

**Chain of Title Report**

Brian F. Smith and Associates
14010 Poway Rd., Ste. A
Poway, CA 92064
Attn: Jennifer Stropes

**CTS Reference No.: 0619273**

**Title Search Through:** June 6, 2019

**Property Address:**
2510 Summit Drive
Escondido, CA 92025

**Assessor’s Parcel No.:** 237-090-05-00

**Assessed Value:** $810,472

**Exemption:** None

**Property Characteristics**

**Use:** SFR

**Improvements:** 1,730 square feet

**Short Legal Description**

Chain of Title
(April 18, 1936 through June 6, 2019)

1. Grant Deed
  Grantor: Escondido Land and Town Company
  Grantee: Kenneth Allan Westover and Elizabeth McLucas Westover
  Recorded: April 18, 1936, #24491, Official Records Book 508, Page 172
  Relates to: A portion of Lot “H”

2. Grant Deed
  Grantor: Escondido Land and Town Company
  Grantee: Kenneth Allan Westover and Elizabeth McLucas Westover
  Recorded: June 30, 1937, #31884, Official Records Book 490, Page 441
  Relates to: Lot “F”

3. The San Diego County Assessor Lot Block Book Page shows the first year with assessed improvements as being 1937.

4. Grant Deed
  Grantor: Kenneth Allan Westover
  Grantee: Elizabeth McLucas Westover
  Recorded: January 11, 1952, #3953, Official Records Book 4342,
  Page 259
  Relates to: Lot “F”

5. Order Confirming Sale of Real and Personal Property on Bid in Open Court
  Estate of: Elizabeth McLucas Westover
  Confirmed to: K. Behdjou
  Recorded: January 21, 1953, #9051, Official Records Book 4722,
  Page 417

Please be advised that this is not Title Insurance. The information provided herein reflects matters of public record which impart constructive notice in accordance with California Insurance Code 12340.10
6. Guardian’s Deed and Bill of Sale
Grantor: Clair M. Houghtelin, as Guardian of the Estate of Elizabeth
McLucas Westover
Grantee: K. Behdjou
Recorded: January 21, 1953, #9052, Official Records Book 4722,
Page 420

7. Grant Deed
Grantor: K. Behdjou and Erika Behdjou
Grantee: Miguel Velez
Recorded: January 21, 1953, #9055, Official Records Book 4722,
Page 427

8. Grant Deed
Grantor: Miguel Velez and Ulla Velez
Grantee: John M. Blodgett and Mary B. Blodgett
Recorded: February 1, 1954, #12304, Official Records Book 5126,
Page 599

9. Grant Deed
Grantor: John M. Blodgett and Mary B. Blodgett
Grantee: Edgar Ellsworth Thomas, Jr. and Jacqueline Bates Thomas,
20% interest; Thomas R. Shook and Suzanne M. Shook, 10% interest;
Leonard W. Glass or Catherine S. Glass, 10% interest; Zenas Y. Coleman, III, 10% interest;
Thomas Michael Hudak and Mary W. Hudak, 10% interest; Adelito M. Gale
and Ann B. Gale, 10% interest; Marvin W. Levenson and
Nancy Rita Levenson, 10% interest; Leon H. Golden and Jane
Golden, 10% interest; and Donald L. Gilbert and Marjorie J.
Gilbert, 10% interest
Recorded: December 23, 1974, Recorders File No. 74-331453

10. Trustee’s Deed Upon Sale
Grantor: First American Title Insurance Company
Grantee: John M. Blodgett and Mary B. Blodgett
Recorded: April 9, 1976, Recorders File No. 76-106192

Please be advised that this is not Title Insurance. The information provided herein
reflects matters of public record which impart constructive notice in accordance
with California Insurance Code 12340.10
11. Community Property Order
Estate of: Mary B. Blodgett
Passed to: John M. Blodgett
Recorded: May 20, 1981, Recorders File No. 81-157443

12. Community Property Order
Estate of: Mary B. Blodgett
Passed to: John M. Blodgett
Recorded: May 22, 1981, Recorders File No. 81-160509

13. Quitclaim Deed
Grantor: John M. Blodgett and Anna M. Blodgett
Grantee: John M. Blodgett
Recorded: May 13, 1985, Recorders File No. 85-166486

14. Quitclaim Deed
Grantor: John Blodgett, Jr.
Grantee: The John Blodgett, Jr. 1989 Trust
Recorded: March 28, 1990, Recorders File No. 90-164218

15. Grant Deed
Grantor: The John Blodgett, Jr. 1989 Trust, The John Blodgett, Jr., Trustee
Grantee: John Blodgett, Jr.
Recorded: April 5, 1994, Recorders File No. 1994-0225152

16. Grant Deed
Grantor: John Blodgett, Jr.
Grantee: Florence Blodgett Thomas
Recorded: April 5, 1994, Recorders File No. 1994-0225161

17. Quitclaim Deed
Grantor: Timothy R. Thomas
Grantee: Florence Blodgett Thomas
Recorded: March 19, 1999, Recorders File No. 1999-0180100

18. Grant Deed
Grantor: Florence Blodgett Thomas
Grantee: Duane H. Anderson and Patsey L. Anderson, Trustees
Recorded: March 19, 1999, Recorders File No. 1999-0180101

Please be advised that this is not Title Insurance. The information provided herein reflects matters of public record which impart constructive notice in accordance with California Insurance Code 12340.10
19. Affidavit of Surviving Trustee
Decedent: Duane Harold Anderson
Recorded: August 31, 2011, Recorders File No. 2011-0451598

20. Quitclaim Deed
Grantor: Patsey L. Anderson, Surviving Trustee
Grantee: Patsey L. Anderson, Trustee
Recorded: September 16, 2011, Recorders File No. 2011-0481348

21. Grant Deed
Grantor: Patsey L. Anderson, Trustee
Grantee: 2510 Summit LLC, 40% interest; MREV Summit, LLC, 30% interest; and Unisom Communities, LLC, 30% interest
Recorded: April 12, 2018, Recorders File No. 2018-0145896

22. Corrective Grant Deed
Grantor: Patsey L. Anderson, Trustee
Grantee: 2510 Summit LLC, 40% interest; MREV Summit, LLC, 30% interest; and Unisom Communities, LLC, 30% interest
Recorded: November 29, 2018, Recorders File No. 2018-0492253

--- End of Report ---

Note: We find no recorded evidence of a Notice of Completion.

***************
Please be advised that this is not Title Insurance. The information provided herein reflects matters of public record which impart constructive notice in accordance with California Insurance Code 12340.10. Note that we are not a Title Insurance Company, and that no express or implied warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information provided herein is granted. Our work has been performed under short time constraints with a quick turn around, and is based in part on the use of databases outside of our control. The recipient hereby acknowledges that California Lot Book, Inc. assumes no liability with respect to any errors or omissions related to the information provided herein. Also note that this search has been performed without the benefit of a Statement of Identification from the property owners, and if a search was performed for liens recorded against owner names, we cannot be sure that the information provided relates to the actual property owners, or is complete with respect to the property owners. In any event, our liability is limited to the amount of fees collected for the information provided herein.
***************
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Address Not Listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Westover Kenneth A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Blodgett John M III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Blodgett Florence D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blodgett John M III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Blodgett John M III (Patricia)</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Blodgett John M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Blodgett John M (Mary B)</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Blodgett John M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Blodgett John M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Blodgett John M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Anderson Diane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Anderson Dan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS INDENTURE, made the 16th day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-six, between the ESCONDIDO LAND AND TOWN COMPANY, a corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of California, party of the first part, and ERNEST HOLMES and ELIZABETH HOLMES, husband and wife, as joint tenants, the party of the second part, WITNESSETH, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars lawful money of the United States of America, and other valuable consideration to it in hand paid by the said parties of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and in consideration of the full performance of the covenants hereinafter contained, does by these presents grant to the said parties of the second part, as joint tenants, all the certain lot and parcel of land situate lying and being in SAN DIEGO COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, and bounded and particularly described as follows, to wit: That portion of Lot 28 in the Northeast corner of the Northeast Extension of Block 344 as per map No. 1894 filed in the office of the County Recorder, October 6, 1915, San Diego County, California, BEGINNING at the corner common to Lots 28, 29, and 30, Block 344, thence S 28° 41' W 269.0 feet to a point; thence N 31° 58' W 269.0 feet to a point; thence E 28° 41' W 269.0 feet to a point; thence S 12° 52' W 269.0 feet to a point; thence N 30° 58' W 763.0 feet to the point of beginning, containing 35.65 acres, more or less,

subject to a right of way for pipe lines and ditches heretofore granted to the Escondido Irrigation District,

It is hereby covenanted and agreed (and this covenant shall run, with the land) that if at any time said second party, their heirs, assigns or successors in interest of them or of the survivors of them or those holding or claiming under them, shall, with the knowledge or consent of the owner of said premises, use, or cause to be used, or shall allow or authorize in any manner, directly or indirectly, said premises, or any part thereof, to be used for the purpose of vending intoxicating liquors for drinking purposes, whether said vending shall be direct or under some evasive guise, therefore the said hereby granted shall revert to and be vested in the Escondido Land and Town Company, a corporation, its successors and assigns, and it, or said successors or assigns, shall be entitled to the immediate possession thereof, provided that any bona fide mortgages of said premises, in case the foregoing covenant be broken, shall have the option to at once claim and foreclose the foregoing reversion for himself and for his own use and benefit, subject, however, to the foregoing covenant, running against any further violation thereof, otherwise the foregoing covenant shall have the same force and effect as if said premises were not herein vested, in the dedication of the streets and alleys to public use, there is hereby reserved from such use the right to vend or otherwise dispose of intoxicating liquors for drinking purposes, and to the extent said streets are not hereby and forever shall remain the private property of said grantor or its assigns.

All districts, city, state or county taxes or assessments of whatever nature that may become subsequent to the date hereof, are to be paid by the parties of the second part.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said party of the first part has hereunto caused its corporate name to be signed by the hand of its President and its corporate seal to be affixed, and attested by its Secretary, the day and year first above written,

ESCONDIDO LAND AND TOWN CO.

By: John W. Schofield

President

Secretary

San Diego, Cal.

On this 16th day of April, in the year 1936, before me, H.L. Couper, a Notary Public in and for said County and State duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared John W. Schofield known to me to be the President, and Walter H. Berry known to me to be the Secretary, of Escando...
LAND AND TOWN COMPANY, the corporation which executed the within instrument, and known to me to be the persons who executed the within instrument on behalf of SECUNDO LAND AND TOWN COMPANY, the corporation which executed the within instrument, and known to me to be the persons who executed the within instrument on behalf of THE FIRST NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS BANK OF SAN DIEGO, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States of America, with its principal place of business in the City of San Diego, in the County of San Diego, State of California, party of the second, hereinafter called the Trustee, and THE FIRST NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS BANK OF SAN DIEGO, a corporation, party of the third, hereinafter called the Beneficiary (the singular in each instance being plural), if there be more than one; WITNESSETH: And, in consideration of the indebtedness hereinafter specified, and in order to secure the same, the said Trustee does hereby Grant and Convey unto said Trustee, IN TRUST, WITH POWER OF ALLotte, that certain property situated in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, described as follows: Lot Twenty-seven (47) east of Twenty-eight (28) in Block One Hundred Ninety-four (194) of City Heights, according to an amended map thereof No. 1357, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, October 7, 1906, including all buildings, fixtures and improvements thereon or that may hereafter be erected thereon, water rights, pipes, easements, ways, rights, appurtenances, and privileges thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, and the reversion and reversions, remainders and reversions, rents, issues and profits thereof.

This Deed of Trust is made for the purpose of securing the performance of the promises and obligations, and compliance with the covenants, hereinafter set forth, as follows:

First: The payment of the indebtedness evidenced by one certain promissory note (and any renewals or extensions thereof), the same being substantially in words and figures following hereinafter:

EMITTENT NOTE
[Principal and Interest in Regular Payments]

1,000.00

San Diego, California, April 5th, 1929.

In consideration and at the time hereinafter stated, for value received I agree, to pay to THE FIRST NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS BANK OF SAN DIEGO, a corporation or its successors, at its main office in the City of San Diego, the principal sum of FIFTEEN THOUSAND AND NO/100 Dollars, with interest from April 5th, 1929, on the amount of principal remaining from time to time unpaid at the rate of seven (7) per cent, per annum; principal and interest payable in monthly installments of FIFTEEN AND NO/100 Dollars, ($15.00), or more, each on the 9th day of every succeeding month, beginning May 5th 1929, and continuing until April 5th, 1941, at which time the then remaining unpaid principal balance shall be due and payable. Each of said payments shall be credited as follows: First on the interest then due and the remainder on the principal sum; and interest shall thereupon cease upon the amount so credited on the said principal sum, if defaults be made in the payment of any such interest, then the same shall thereupon bear the interest on the principal sum. Should there be any arrearage in the payment of any of said installments when due, then the whole amount of principal and interest shall become immediately due and payable at the option of the holder of this note. Principal and interest payable in gold coin of the United States of the present standard, should suit be commenced, or an attorney be employed to enforce payment of this note, I agree to pay the further sum of 10% on principal and interest herein, as attorney's fees. This note is secured by a certain deed of trust to THE FIRST NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS BANK OF SAN DIEGO, a corporation.

In witness whereof the words "payable in United States gold coin" or words of similar import or effect appear herein, shall be construed to mean and mean "payable in lawful money of the United States."

SECOND: The payment of attorney's fees, in a reasonable sum to be fixed by the court in any action, suit or proceeding affecting the rights of the Trustee or Beneficiary hereunder, whether resulting in judgments or not, but in no event less than $100, for appearance by each or either; also payment of all costs and expenses of such suit.
80 feet of the west 40 feet of said Lot 1 distant thereon 10.76 feet northerly from the southeasternly corner thereof; thence southerly along the easterly line of said parcel of land a distance of 10.76 feet to the southeasternly corner thereof; thence southerly along the southerly line of said Lot 1 a distance of 48.00 feet to the point of commencement, containing 460 square feet of land, more or less.

And the grantees herein hereby consent and agree to the use of the right of way herein granted for the purposes designated, and they do hereby waive all claim for compensation for any and all damages on account of the location, dedication, establishment and construction of a street or highway and incidents thereto over and across the above described easement.

WITNESS our hands and seals this eighteenth day of November, 1930.

WILLIAM C. STOLL (SEAL)
ANDRAS STOLL (SEAL)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

On this 19th day of November A.D. Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-five before me Lucille H. Trezise, a Notary Public in and for said County, residing therein, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared William C. Stoll and András Stoll known to me to be the persons described in and whose names are subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that they executed the same.

STATED By hand and official seal this day and year in this certificate first above written.

LUCILLE H. TREZISE
Notary Public in and for the County of San Diego, State of California.

RESOLUTION NO. 64668

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of San Diego, as follows:

That the deed of William C. Stoll and András Stoll, executed in favor of the City of San Diego, bearing date November 10, 1935, conveying to said City an easement and right of way for street purposes through, along and across a portion of the South 80 feet of the West 40 feet of Lot 1, Block 1, Cadrewood, according to Map thereof No. 1930, filed in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, California, be, and the said deed is hereby accepted on the conditions therein expressed; and the lands therein conveyed are hereby set aside and dedicated to the public use as and for a public street, and the same are hereby named El Cajon Avenue.

And the City Clerk of said City is hereby authorized and directed to file the said deed of record in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, California, together with a certified copy of this resolution.

I HEREBY CERTIFY the above to be a true, full, and correct copy of Resolution No. 64668 of the Council of the City of San Diego, as adopted by the said Council.

APR 10 1936

ALLEN H. WRIGHT City Clerk
CLARK M. FOGES, JR. Deputy

By CLARK M. FOGES, JR. Deputy

RECORD AT REQUEST OF UNION TITLE INSURANCE CO. APR 24 1936 AT 9 A.M.
S.M.B. COUNTY RECORDS
DI DEPUTY R.M. 19362

6/30/1937 31884
Official Records Book 490, Page 441

[Address Form]

THOMAS SCHMIDT, Made the 15th day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty six, between the RECORDED LAND AND TOWN COMPANY, a corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of California, party of the first part, and KENNETH ALLAN WESTOVER and ELIZABETH no LUCAS WESTOVER, husband and wife, as joint tenants the parties of the second part, Witnesseth, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars lawful money of the United States of America and other valuable consideration to the last paid by the said parties of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and in consideration of the full performance of the covenants hereinafter contained, do by
presents grant to the said parties of the second part, and to their heirs and assigns forever, all the certain lot and parcel of land situate lying and being in San Diego County, State of California, and bounded and particularly described as follows, to wit:
Lot 72 in the Subdivision of Block 270 of the Rancho Riondo del Diablo,
according to map thereof No. 1076, filed in the office of the County Recorder of said
San Diego County, October 6, 1916.

U. S. L. & C. SAN DIEGO, CALIF.
APR 25 1930
2 DOLLARS 50 CENTS

subject to a right of way for pipe lines and ditches heretofore granted to the Escondido
Irrigation District.

It is hereby covenanted and agreed (and this covenant shall run with the land) that if at any time said second party, their heirs, assigns or successors in interest of them, or of the successors of them or those holding or claiming under them, shall, with the knowledge or consent of the owner of said premises, use, or cause to be used, or shall allow or authorize in any manner, directly or indirectly, said premises, or any part thereof, to be used for the purpose of vending intoxicating liquors for drinking
purposes, whether said vending shall be direct or under some evasive guise, thereafter the title hereby granted shall revert to and be vested in the Escondido Land and
Town Company, a corporation, its successors and assigns, and it, or said successors or assigns, shall be entitled to the immediate possession thereof, provided that any bonds or other mortgage of said premises, in case the foregoing covenant be broken, shall have the option to at once claim and enforce the foregoing reversion for himself and
for his own use and benefit, subject, however, to the foregoing covenant, running against any further violation thereof, otherwise the foregoing covenant shall have the
same force and effect as if said proviso was hereof inserted. In the dedication of the
streets and alleys to public use, there is hereby reserved from such use the right
to vend or otherwise dispose of intoxicating liquors for drinking purposes, and to
that extent said streets and alleys are hereby and forever shall remain the private property of
said property of said grantor or its assigns.

All district, city, state or county taxes or assessments of whatever nature that
may become due subsequent to the date hereof, are to be paid by the parties of the
second part.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said party of the first part has hereunto caused its
corporate name to be signed by the hand of its President and its corporate seal to be
affixed, and attested by its Secretary, the day and year first above written.

ESCONDIDO
LAND AND TOWN
COMPANY
SAN
DIEGO, CAL.

By JOHN W. SCHOFIELD President
Attest: WALTER M. BERRY Secretary

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

On this 16th day of April, in the year 1930, before me, H. L. GUNWEN a Notary
Public in and for said County and State duly commissioned and sworn, personally appr
oach (H. L. GUNWEN) having sworn as to me to be the President, and Walter M. BERRY known to me to be the Secretary, of Escondido Land and Town Company, the corporation which executed the
within instrument, and known to me to be the person who executed the within
instrument on behalf of Escondido Land and Town Company, and acknowledged to me that said
Corporation executed the same,

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal
at my office in the County of San Diego, State of California, the day and year in this
Certificate first above written.

My commission expires Feb. 11 1940.

H. L. GUNWEN
Notary Public

RECORDED AT REQUEST OF UNION TITLE INSURANCE CO.
APR 24 1930 AT 9 A.M.
O. H. SWIFT COUNTY RECORDER
BY DEPUTY B. N. HOLS

1,90
7 - 22048.
Maps
Figure 2
1949 USGS Map
The Summit Estates Project
USGS Escondido Quadrangle (1:24,000 series)
Figure 3
Original Subdivision Map With Site Location
The Summit Estates Project
Figure 4
Current Assessor’s Parcel Map
The Summit Estates Project